SELECT BOARD MEETING September 13, 2018 5:30PM

Ouorum noted

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

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

Absent: Mr. Donhauser.

C. Pledge of Allegiance recited

D. Moment of Silence observed

E. Public Comment:

5:32 PM 1) Introduction of New Officer – Adam Watson

Mr. Murphy introduced Officer Adam Watson and welcomed him to Eliot.

Mr. Lee said that he was happy to have our newest officer, happy to have him, and invited him to introduce himself.

Officer Watson said that he was born and raised in Portsmouth. He added that his law enforcement career started in Eliot when he first took a ride-along with a friend of his back around 2000/2001, got hooked, and then decided to get into the career. He said that he started as a reserve officer in Eliot around 2002, as well as Berwick; that, in 2003, he got hired in Sanford as a full-time officer and spent 10½ years in Sanford; that he then transferred down to Berwick and did 2½ years there. He added that he then decided to take a little time off, about 2 years, but at that point decided to get back into it because he missed a lot of the work. He explained that, in Sanford, he was on the Special Response Team, a Canine Handler, and a Field Training Officer; that one of the things he does, even though it's a tough thing to do, is a Vehicle Autopsy Technician for the State of Maine; so, whenever there's a bad crash or a prosecutable crash (driving to endanger) or a fatal crash, he takes the car apart, dissects it, and see if there are any defects with the car that may have contributed to the crash and includes his report.

5:34 PM

Ms. (Roberta) Place, Spring Lane (Spinney Creek), said that she's here because she's not sure if the SB is aware of the **Spinney Creek Shellfish Company proposed expansion** in Spinney Creek, which is enormous. She added that we, who live on the Creek (about 50 households on both Kittery/Eliot sides), are very concerned about the health of the Creek. She said that she's lived on the Creek for a long time and, when she first moved there, she used to swim and she always had to wear at least a wetsuit top, and the temperature in the Creek, lately, is about 75 degrees; that, at that temperature change, she thinks something is wrong. She

added that she knows they say that farming oysters is supposed to clean the water but she isn't seeing that; that there's no more eel grass in front of her house where before, when she walked out, there was plenty of eel grass. She said that she knows that this Board doesn't have jurisdiction but we need to, as a community, protect that creek because, once 800 cages are put in that creek, we all feel that that will be the end of the ecological system in the creek; that you can't bring that back. She said that it's a small salt pond; that she thinks it's vital to our area and we live there because we love the peace, the quiet, and the water and, once the creek is gone, the creek is gone. She added that that is why she and some of her neighbors are here this evening to make the SB aware of this and ask for help, whatever you can do to help us.

5:36 PM

Mr. (Mike) Dowling, Meadow Lane, said that he was also here to talk about the proposed installation by the Spinney Creek Shellfish Company. He said that we've spoken to the Eliot Conservation Commission and, as Ms. Place said, many of us are very concerned, especially since the voters of Eliot and the Conservation Commission have identified Spinney Creek as a focus area of ecological significance. He added that for especially those that live on Spinney Creek, and for those who use it for recreation, we all feel that with such a large installation going from 180 cages - that each of those cages have 2 floats on them - so there are 360 floats that are visible and nobody is really complaining about them, it's okay, it's what it is, it's business. He added that one of the things we wanted to make everyone aware of is that we aren't against aquaculture, we're not against small business and we think that's fine; that we'd like to see small businesses survive, as he is a small business owner, as well. He said that we think it needs to be done in the right space, in the right spot, and at the right size and scope; that we know that, if this gets approved, there will be 800 contiguous cages and 1,600 floats, and we think that's a bit much in size and scope; that, secondly, after three years they can apply for a regular license, which would give them the potential to grow to 100 acres. He added that we are also concerned about the additional boat traffic; that they have 3-4 boats right now manning 180 cages; that trying to harvest 800 cages, we expect that noise, traffic, and navigational issues to increase. He said that, as has already been said, we know the SB doesn't have any jurisdiction, but we think that this is something the community and SB should be aware of.

5:39 PM

Mr. Murphy said that he, and some of the other members, is aware of this; that his opinion is that it should be brought before the PB as an expansion of a waterfront commercial activity. He asked if this Board could require the PB to look into this, officially, for the Town or does it go through the Town Manager.

Mr. Lee said that it is in the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine Resources (DMR) and that is who you should direct comments to. He added that he checked with the Planner and we checked with the owners of Spinney Creek Shellfish

Company and they said that they don't intend to expand their facility; that that would be the only thing...if they were to propose to expand their Eliot building then they would certainly fall under the PB. He said that he asked because he thought the number of boats (floats?) and the number of trucks coming out onto Route 103 might be a concern but, since all of this growth, about 4 acres, is in Kittery, he believes the PB does not have jurisdiction, either, to bring the Company before them.

5:41 PM

Mr. (Norm) LeMoine, Kittery resident, said that he lives across the Creek within 1,000 feet of the proposed expansion; that we were informed of this after-the-fact, after the application was submitted, so there was no chance to have a scoping meeting with the applicant or discussion with the Town of Kittery. He said that we have grave concerns for the residents of both Kittery and Eliot with plans by the Shellfish Company to over-commercialize Spinney Creek by substantially increasing the already robust shellfish farming operation. He explained that the proposal submitted to the DMR is called an experimental lease, calling for the installation, on the Kittery side, of 800 floating metal cages and over 1,600 flotation devices and will occupy a space greater than three football fields; that when this lease period is over three years from now, the Shellfish Company will be eligible, according to the DMR protocol, to apply for a standard commercial lease, which is his biggest concern; that it could last as long as 20 years and occupying as much as 100 acres. He said that the whole Creek is about 125 acres so this is a concern of many to the impact of navigation, recreation, and safety in what is, for all intents and purposes, a landlocked, non-tidal, saltwater pond. He discussed the impact of noise and odors; that oysters occupying the surface of the water give off a distinct smell; that they are out there now with a much smaller operation, which appears to be fine and what most people can deal with, but this expansion is really overkill. He also discussed his concern regarding how this might transform what is now a picturesque, serene environment into a commercial body of water. He said that he worries about practical things in life, like the valuation of his home, he really cares about keeping his wife real happy; that she is not happy about this situation. He added that he has a concern for the short- and long-term impact on this very delicate ecosystem (eelgrass die-off, which is a protected species); that he is a small business owner and he enjoys seeing small businesses thrive, but not at the expense of neighbors, the environment, and those kinds of things; that that is just wrong. He said that a question he has is who empowered a private company to be in charge of Spinney Creek, also asking where the oversight is on this body of water. He asked what are the limitations of this operation at this location. He said that the people at the Shellfish Company are fine people but the Company controls the frequency and duration of opening and closing of the tidal gate; that he calls it the 'tidal prevention gate' because it stops the tides from changing; that rather than having two tides/day that naturally occur in an ocean body of water, this happens maybe seven times a year; that the

water just sits there and heats up; that it's warm and beautiful to swim in but wonders about E.coli and things of that nature.

5:46 PM

Mr. LeMoine added that they seed the Creek bed, as they have been doing for years that this helps them grow and then they rake the bed as these baby oysters grow to full size; that this is all below the surface and on the bed; that during this time they also prevent anyone from taking any shellfish from the water due to potential legal impacts. Additionally, they have farmed the surface of the Creek with 180 metal cages for the past four years on the Eliot/Kittery line and he would say he wasn't pleased about it, at the time, because they didn't notify us and the cages just showed up one day but it doesn't seem to be a big, incompatible issue for most people; that it seems they can peacefully co-exist with that arrangement. He said that they purchase and process shellfish from other companies, which brings in many of the trucks. He explained that they have a discharge system where, when they depurate, they have these tanks and, as the water comes in and it cleans out the shellfish, it has to go somewhere and it basically leaves their back yard to right outside their dock; that he's not sure what that discharge does but it is a question.

5:48 PM Mr. Murphy asked if they put that discharge back into the water.

Mr. LeMoine said yes, back into the Creek; that they draw the water from out by the tidal gate, out by the Piscataqua River, where it's cleanest and coldest, then run it about ¾ of a mile to the cleaning system and back out into the Creek. He said that they want to unreasonably expand and we don't know, into the foreseeable future, when it's going to end while affecting over 50 homeowners; that he went back to his original question of who oversees Spinney Creek and who is looking out for the residents of these two towns. He added that a hearing, moderated by the DMR, will be held September 19 at 6 PM at the main Kittery library; that the outcome of this hearing will determine the decision to either approve or reject this imposing 3-year lease and we are asking for whatever local support or representation or advice you may offer us.

5:51 PM

Ms. Place said that the current lease application is for 3.673 acres, which is significant; that what they have now is three sections and she thinks it's about ½ acre. She added that it was said that there would be no significant change in their operation in Eliot; however, the lease states that any product of these 800 cages will be processed in Eliot, asking how you go from processing 180 cages to 800 cages and have no significant growth in your business; that she doesn't think that's possible.

5:52 PM Mr. Lee said that they discussed that and the only thing he could think of is additional shifts, which still may be an issue; that maybe they will run in 24/7 and he doesn't know if they do that now or not.

Ms. Place said that she knows they are grandfathered in Eliot but their growth in business is only supposed to increase by 25% in ten years.

Mr. Lee said that he suspected that they would have to stay within the same footprint.

5:53 PM

Mr. Murphy said that the number of trucks coming and going and the number of boats going back and forth across the water he thinks are questions that are still open.

Ms. (Kathy) LeMoine, Kittery resident, said that she came to talk about Spinney Creek; that her concern was who were the stewards of Spinney Creek. She added that, when we were notified last month that the DMR public hearing would be held in Kittery, we were very surprised because the applicant, Spinney Creek Shellfish, is an Eliot-based business; that we were told by the DMR that the reason the public hearing was being held in Kittery was due to the fact that all of the aquaculture apparatus, if approved, would be installed in Kittery. She added that we tried, in Kittery, to get some answers about things and getting some support; that during our search for local officials, in a board or committee capacity, to represent the interests of the homeowners on Spinney Creek, we really came up empty-handed. She added that we learned that Spinney Creek was not under their jurisdiction, including the Harbor Master, Shoreland Administrator, Clam Warden, Kittery Land Trust, the EPA, Nature Conservancy, the Conservation Commission, and the Kittery Port Authority. She said that, apparently, there are no boards, committees, or agencies that can affect literally anything that goes in in Spinney Creek; that from what we can ascertain, there are only two government agencies involved in Spinney Creek development – the State agency, which is DMR, and the federal agency, which is the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACE). She reiterated her question of who the caretakers are of Spinney Creek and where are the checks and balances for this special body of water. She said that, in preparing their response to the upcoming DMR public hearing, we were given a strict set of statutory regulations to dispute so as to how we can present an argument as to how the aquaculture expansion is "unreasonable"; that she believes these regulations do not consider the uniqueness of Spinney Creek. She discussed that the Creek is not navigable, as there is no access, which means that no local, State, or federal agency officials can gain access to the Creek for the purposes of perusing the pond for compliance to boating and licensing regulations, evaluating the ecology of the pond, or to save or rescue a human being in the event of an emergency. She said that adding over 2,000 obstacles into the water not only increases the chance of a problem but an unthinkable accident. She again asked who was responsible and/or liable for the issues that result from having a commercial business, intentionally or unintentionally, harm the Creek, as well as the humans who live and recreate on this body of water. She said that we respectfully ask the SB members for their

recommendations on how to affect this quagmire, thanking them for their time and the opportunity to speak.

5:57 PM Mr. Lee said that, in full disclosure, he has water views of Spinney Creek.

Mr. Murphy said that he's quite concerned and he doesn't know what to do but he does think the expansion of the business in Eliot deserves a review by the Eliot government in a way that any expansion of a business is looked at to determine that nothing is wrong; that that may be the result but, at least, it's gone through the process, and for it not to go through the process bothers him. He added that there should be an application for review, at least, by the owners just to satisfy human concerns of the citizens of Eliot to this expansion that is perfectly legal by Eliot's ordinances and, as far as he knows, that has not been done.

F. Committee Resignations and Appointments

5:59 PM 1) Resignations: Clean Water Committee – Erika McCreedy, Becca Lower

Mr. Murphy said that both people had sent in their resignations and it would be appropriate for the SB to accept them, with regret.

Mr. Lytle moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board accept the resignations of Erika McCreedy and Becca Lower from the Clean Water Committee, with thanks.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

6:01 PM 2) Appointments: H. Pope, J. O'Donoghue, R. Pendleton

This is regarding appointments to the Adult Retail Cannabis (ARC) Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. (Richard) Pendleton was present.

Mr. Lee said that the SB knows Ms. Jessica O'Donoghue and she advised him that she could not be here this evening; that he didn't know how well they knew Mr. Hughes Pope but the SB could wait on his appointment, if they wish, until he's present; that he was invited.

Mr. Murphy acknowledged that the SB was familiar with Ms. O'Donoghue and Mr. Pope. He invited Mr. Pendleton to speak.

6:02 PM

Mr. Pendleton said that he thinks we have changing times, changing perspectives, and that Eliot has to keep an open mind; that he wanted to be part of that consideration.

Mr. Orestis said that the applicant, in his application, selected 'yes' under Conflicts of Interest, with nothing stated as to why, and he doesn't know if that was a mistake.

Mr. Pendleton said that he didn't know of any conflicts.

6:03 PM

Mr. (Jim) Tessier, Johnson Lane, asked if we were going to have some discussion of the qualifications of the members applying for this committee; that quite frequently, when members are applying for a committee or board, they come before the SB to explain their experience and background and education to identify qualifications.

Mr. Murphy invited Mr. Pendleton to speak to that.

6:04 PM

Mr. Pendleton said that we moved here in 2000; that he went to college and he works for Liberty Mutual Insurance Company. He considers himself a very objective person and try to consider all sides; that he tries to listen and hear different perspectives and understand where people are feeling and coming from. He added that he recently traveled to Colorado and he was very intrigued with the way the cannabis industry has taken off there, from a financial standpoint; that it's extremely well-regulated, and kind of an inspiration in that way, but he really wanted to look at what the landscape was. He said that coincidently, he didn't know his nephew was in the business but he is apparently into this, so, he has been able to talk with different sides of the issue because he knows people have a lot of concerns about what it is and, in our backyard, what would it mean. He explained that why he wanted to join this was to try to understand Eliot people and try to look outside Eliot to see what this could possibly mean and whether it's right for us.

6:05 PM

Mr. Murphy asked Mr. Pendleton if, in his experience, he found anything that Eliot should be concerned about in moving in this direction, are there any dangers, and so forth, involved.

Mr. Pendleton said that he thinks that, when you talk about any change in this regard, and you're talking about something that's been illegal and taboo for so many years, we need to change how we think about it, science has proven many

things about cannabis, a lot of benefits from medical; that a lot of the detrimental sides of cannabis are a lot less harmful than alcohol, yet alcohol is prevalent, and there is still that mentality in our heads that this is something we should hide; however, it's a changing landscape and he thinks we need to look at what the landscape is changing to and whether this is right for Eliot. He said that he didn't know the answer and that is why he wants to be part of this committee, do more research, and understand what the implications really are, and how it works in other small towns like Eliot.

6:07 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Hanscom Road, said that she knew the SB didn't have any control over this, as it's the Town Manager, but she knows that two applicants are very pro-marijuana and she doesn't know if there are any efforts that can be made to try to make this into a balanced committee so that we have another point of view, to possibly advertise.

Mr. Murphy said that it was his understanding that we've been talking about this for six months and not many people have been interested.

6:08 PM

Mr. Orestis said that he thinks it's the intention of this Board to have exactly thatacross-the-board, making sure that it is a group of individuals with different views so that we can get that unbiased opinion. He added that, since it's only been a couple meetings since we've actually introduced this committee, we should continue to weigh and entertain more applicants before we appoint anyone to the committee; that would be his opinion.

Mr. Lee said that one of the questions on the application is whether the applicant can be fair and unbiased; that all three candidates have agreed they will try to be fair and unbiased and he would expect that of any of our board/committee members if they are doing the Town's work. He agreed that we should try to strike a balance; that he brought forth these three candidates so that we could at least populate this committee and get it started; that maybe we should have the two alternates in place, as well. He encouraged anyone who is considering a position to come see him or the Town Clerk straightaway, including those concerned about the committee.

6:09 PM

Mr. (Denny) Lentz, Creek Crossing, said that he has spoken to this SB before, as well as the Town Manager, about this being an extremely important subject, as far as he is concerned, for the Town; that he asked them to come up with a scope and an objective for this committee, and asked them to look at the Kittery examples; that there was a framework made by the town manager that that committee worked within and there was a committee made up of stakeholders; that he thinks Mr. Pope is an excellent choice, as he grows medical marijuana, and you should have someone like that; but what about the Police Chief, what about the Fire .going to have to deal with the aftermath of this committee.

6:11 PM

Mr. Murphy said that he thinks the Police have been notified that this was here, we have our meeting and where are the Police, that's a good question. He asked the SB if they thought we should continue or postpone.

Mr. Pendleton said that a practice we have at work is to identify stakeholders, we talk to the different perspectives; that this is how we design the products that we build where he works. He added that this is employed to any model you want to do; so, with this, if a concern is too many pro-marijuana members, those people have to be objective and listen to the Town of Eliot; that they have to speak to the Police because it would be irresponsible if they didn't, and the Fire Chief definitely. He said that when we consider anything like this we really have to look at all perspectives and speak to people with all perspectives.

6:12 PM

Mr. Tessier said that he would like to read from the Charter because he thinks there's one thing that definitely needs to considered when forming this committee. He read from §8.4, "It is the policy of the Town of Eliot that proper operation of democratic government requires that public officials and members of all boards and committees be independent, impartial, and responsible to the citizens as a body; that public service not be used for personal gain; and that the public have confidence in the integrity of its municipal government."; that he thinks we need to make sure that people who are on this committee aren't going to be benefitting from the fact that you're on the committee. He added that that was why he was a bit surprised there was no discussion with each candidate about background experience related to this particular topic.

Mr. Murphy said that eliminating the possibility of personal gain from being on a committee sounds good but it may not be easy to apply, across the board. He asked Mr. Lee if he had any experience in this direction.

6:14 PM

Mr. Lee said that he thinks Mr. Tessier raises a good point; that if it was decided by the committee to advance a recommendation to permit retail sale of recreational marijuana in the Town of Eliot, would one or more of these people be in a position to open a business in Eliot and to use their position on the committee to persuade voters, the SB, and then, ultimately, use the approval and the inclusion in the zoning ordinance to open a retail adult use facility; that that is a potential problem but he's not sure how you quiz somebody about that. He added that Mr. Pope was in front of the PB for the medical marijuana and would he be tempted to go with retail adult marijuana, he didn't know that and he can't accuse him of that; that it's a bit hard to say what's in your heart.

6:15 PM

Mr. Murphy said that his mind is searching for other activities and whether this same rule applies to other businesses or other organizations or other municipal organizations.

Mr. Tessier said that he has been the Chair of the Solid Waste Recycling Committee for many years in Town and, if he was running a business related to recycling or the handling of trash, it would be totally inappropriate for him to be on that committee to be influencing the decisions that are made in the Town. He added that he would think you would apply the same kind of rationale when you're talking about any kind of committee that's being formed and adding new members to that kind of committee.

6:16 PM

Mr. Lee again agreed that Mr. Tessier makes a good point; that he thinks the SB should hold off and rethink this a bit, if the SB would consider that.

Mr. Murphy suggested aiming to get a little more involvement of people who might want to be on the other side of tis committee, if there is another side.

Mr. Lytle said that we've been talking about this, now, for about a month and he's just afraid we're going to lose people if we don't do something pretty quick; that it isn't going to be any of the group out here because nobody wants it; that if you want to get involved, then get involved but he doesn't see anyone coming forward.

6:17 PM

Mr. Lentz said that he doesn't mean to be harsh and, maybe, he can ask a question regarding what the SB's expectation of this committee is; also asking if the whole SB agreed on what was expected of this committee, what's important in order to screen people and appoint them.

Mr. Lytle said that he puts his faith in you, your group, to look at it.

Mr. Lentz said that our group is the PB and that's land use; that we can look at restrictions and setbacks and most of that is established. He added that all of the other issues that go along with the sale of retail marijuana...he asked what does the SB want this committee to come back with and maybe that would tell you; that that's the way he did business.

6:18 PM

Mr. Lee said that the draft by-laws approved recently have the stated purposes of the group in them; that he could make that available but it is published. He added that most towns are having to go through this and it is very difficult; that it can be a divisive issue and he has heard from town managers on the listserve about this regarding the fact that every town is struggling with this issue – if to allow it, where to allow it, how many to allow, is it right for our town. He said that there are a lot of tough questions and a balanced body, much like a Charter Commission or Comprehensive Plan Group needs to be balanced, he thinks is in order, given the nature of the discussion; therefore, he would again recommend that perhaps we hold off until we have at least five candidates, with a couple at least that may have a skeptical view of the idea and then seat a balanced group.

6:20 PM

Mr. Murphy said that he is not a proponent of it and is not subtly or quietly trying to promote this but he is looking at citizens rights to do what is allowed by law.

Mr. Orestis said that the purpose of the committee isn't to be pro or anti or looking to do, or not do, anything; that it's to advise the SB, as well as the PB, on matters associated with the retail sale of cannabis; so, if we load the committee up and ask questions of individuals who are very positive-minded about cannabis, it may tailor the recommendations to the PB, as well as the SB, in a certain area. He added that it would be beneficial for us to wait for more applicants, maybe come up with a list of questions for those applicants in order to properly question them on their thoughts and ideas around cannabis; that that may be the best way to do it rather than taking the first that apply and putting them on the committee. He said that he feels we're probably not going to get the best result from that; that he doesn't know the thoughts of the rest of the SB but that's where he stands.

Mr. Lytle was agreeable to wait.

6:22 PM

Mr. Murphy said that it looks like the SB might want to agree with the Town Manager to delay a bit more and can find a wider range of applicants who re willing to deal with this issue. He asked if we could have a motion to postpone this to a later time and do we have any action we would do in the meantime in order to help resolve this

Mr. Pendleton asked if he could request that the SB set a date by which the SB would close applications and move forward; that he would like to be involved but he wasn't willing to wait around too long; that it look like people are apprehensive and he doesn't know why just for a committee to go look at this; that that is what the committee is for and they are not here to promote something or get an agenda. He added that he's not pro and not anti; that he's doesn't know where he falls yet; that he has an open mind and wants to look at this issue and investigate it to find out if it's right for our community; that he wants to talk to the Police and the public; that he wants to learn about it and figure out where we stand as a community and he would assume that's why people want to be a part of this committee.

6:24 PM

Mr. Lee suggested this go on the agenda for the second meeting in October; that, in the meantime, we could post that we are actively seeking at least two more members with varying views of the possible retail sale of recreational marijuana. He added that, if there is no one, then we move forward with the three that we have; that they don't really have any decision-making power other than to advise and make a recommendation; that they cannot decide for the Town, as the voters have to decide.

It was the consensus of the Select Board to wait until the October 25 meeting.

G. York River Scenic and Wild Report Presentation/Q&A

6:26 PM Present are Jennifer Hunter, Jennifer Fox, and Chuck Ott, representing this presentation. Stefan Clayson and Jack Murphy are the Eliot representatives.

Ms. Hunter, Coordinator for the York River Wild & Scenic Study, gave the 3-year background and summary of their findings. She gave her thanks for all the Town organizations that have supported this study. She said that Eliot citizens have a question before them on the November ballot, Article #10, on whether to support the recommendation to pursue a partnership with a Wild & Scenic River designation for the York River and the stewardship plan. She explained why the committee recommends approval of designation:

- Provides crucial financial resources/technical assistance to protect York River
- Less than ¼ of 1% of all US rivers part of this national program
- Annual funding supports a local committee to conduct conservation projects, resource surveys, outreach activities
- Enables a coordinated approach among the four watershed communities
- Does not put land under federal control
- Does not change any existing land uses or private property rights
- Does not force any changes in local land use decision-making processes
- Does not create new federal permits or regulations
- Does not affect hunting/fishing laws
- York River watershed is only 33 square miles but has significant resources at the State, regional, and federal levels
- Abundance of historic/archeological sites that tell the story of settlement and resource use of the region over time
- Highest biodiversity of any region in Maine, that includes many endangered plant and wildlife species
- Clean water that supports many recreational uses & includes drinking water supplies for the Kittery Water District
- Large, healthy salt marshes/large unfragmented forest areas that are increasingly important as they are increasingly threatened habitats
- Vibrant working waterfront contributes millions annually to the local economy
- Unique combination of natural resources/open spaces/traditional uses of the river/historical resources collectively define our community's character

Ms. Hunter also discussed the stewardship plan approved by the committee in July, which would preserve important historic, cultural, economic, and natural

resources in the York River Watershed consistent with goals in the towns' Comprehensive Plans

- Characterizes watershed resources and threats
- Identifies strategies for long-term protection
- It is advisory/identifies key actions to maintain values/resources for future generations
- Recommendations to preserve natural resources, cultural/historical resources, working waterfront, recreational resources, other values important to community character

Ms. Hunter encourage people to read the Stewardship Plan available on their website (yorkrivermaine.org), with copies for viewing at the Town Hall and Fogg Library; that there will be several events in the area and people are welcome to attend their meetings. She invited Stefan Clayson to speak.

6:36 PM

Mr. Clayson, Eliot resident, said that, to him, this is really a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity; that we probably won't have another chance for us to build a partnership that brings together all our communities around a common resource. He added that Eliot is the headwaters and source of the York River – York Pond – so it's important that Eliot take a lead role in its stewardship and conservation. He said that the Town is faced with significant growth and climate change impacts, such as sea level rise, asking how we can work together to build a more resilient community and healthy watershed; that he thinks a designation and partnership is the key to this. He said that it's also about education and research and, when issues come up, being able to have a collective voice, rather than as individuals or separate communities...the Spinney Creek case is a really good example of that; that if there was a partnership that could support that effort that individuals in the community could approach and could discuss their issues, that's what the partnership would serve. He said that he hopes to leave his kids the river in the condition he found it and, hopefully, even better, reiterating that he really thinks that Eliot is the key to making this happen; so, he hopes the community will support this effort and its designation.

Mr. Murphy thanked them for coming.

H. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

6:40 PM Motion by Mr. Lytle, second by Mr. Orestis, to approve the minutes of July 26, 2018, as written.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Donhauser – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes

Mr. Lytle – Yes Mr. Orestis - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

I. Department Head/Committee Reports

6:43 PM 1) Energy Commission: HVAC Update/Solar Update – No Correspondence

Ed Henningsen (Energy Commission) and John Branagan (Affinity LED Light) were present.

Mr. Henningsen said that we had a meeting with Thermo Dynamics (HVAC contractor), we selected locations so, wherever you see a little blue tape, indoor units will be mounted, and picked outside locations for the condensing units; that we are in the process of scheduling a future meeting with the electricians to locate the electric baseboard back-up heating system. He added that we are coordinating with the trenching that Mr. Moulton is doing. He also said that we had a meeting with ReVision at the landfill and we are moving forward with that; that ReVision is waiting for final permitting from the DEP. He added that we found out that the Transfer Station is built on part of the landfill and affects the location of the fence to protect the solar array, which will have to be discussed regarding possible cost impact and whether we even need the fence.

6:48 PM Mr. I

Mr. Lee said that we would be re-utilizing the Cummins generator from the pump station rebuild and bringing it here and setting it out in this back corner; that it is part of the trenching project to put the necessary utilities in for the generator.

Mr. Henningsen discussed that, with the utilization of the Cummins generator, we are hoping there may be some cost-savings; that the SB would then allow us to use some of that saved money to put in an air conditioning heat pump for the computer room.

6:51 PM 2) Energy Commission: LED Bid Results

Mr. Henningsen said, regarding the bids, that we went out to five companies and got two responses; that Affinity was the low bidder and we don't have a problem with that; that we would like the SB's approval to award the contract to Affinity to start this process.

Mr. Lee clarified that the second bidder did not include a cost (book value of existing pole structures) that ends up separating the bids by about \$20,000.

6:54 PM Mr. Lytle asked, once these light fixtures are up, what is the cost to maintain them.

Mr. Henningsen said that, if a pole goes down, CMP will put in a new fixture and charge us; that, as he understands it, that becomes an insurance claim for the Town to the carrier.

Mr. Lee confirmed that it would become an insurance claim; that previously a claim was submitted and the insurance paid it.

Mr. Henningsen said that, regarding maintenance, there is some cleaning of the lights on a 5- or 7-year cycle; that lights are warrantied for 10 years by the manufacturer and the labor to do the warranty work is set up for one year, with an option to renew it every year.

6:57 PM

Mr. Branagan said that we assemble our lights here in Dover and employ US Veterans to do the work; that our company has changed lights for many surrounding communities. Discussing the failure rates, he said he thinks it's a little difficult for any company to give you a hardline number on maintenance because the equipment, broadly speaking, like most mechanical items, have a tendency to fail early on or last through its projected life cycle of about 20 years. He added that these calculations are based on third-party independent testing looking at the sub-assemblies and components of the chips, the drivers, the things that go into the lights to look at their average failure, their mean time between failures, and other statistics to very comfortably come up with that data. He said that we've seen, in the thousands of lights we've put up, most of the incidents that anybody would define as a failure was someone who hit a pole or the utility infrastructure that suffered some damage. He added that it's really hard to say what his annual fixed cost is going to be because he doesn't anticipate the natural demise of these fixtures; that we could look at an agreed-upon dollar per transaction just as the utilities do now; that some municipalities have chosen, if they have their own bucket truck and properly trained employees, to take it on themselves. (There is some talk of going with master electricians.) He said that, working with Eliot, we have chosen to go with COOTS Brothers out of northern Maine who does about \$10 million/year with CMP doing line repair work, so they are exceptionally qualified. He added that the insurance piece is important, as well.

7:01 PM

Mr. Tessier said that there were several articles in the Portsmouth Herald recently talking about some issues in York about how they were approved under budget about 1½ years ago and they still haven't got them installed; that it was really difficult to understand the issue reading the paper and he was wondering if Mr. Branagan could address if that is somehow going to be an issue with us.

7:02 PM

Mr. Branagan commented that they chose the wrong company. He explained that the conversion process in Maine is relatively new; that there is a lot of misinformation out there and, unfortunately, he feels there were a few companies, who are outside of Maine, that saw this as a great opportunity to come in and change streetlights and there was a lot of conversation about policies and promises; that there were articles in the Portland Press Herald about the free WIFI they would be offering, and this other stuff. He discussed his own career path in energy efficiency and LED lighting, which helped him bring a slightly outsider's perspective and watched this mature; that when we started changing lightbulbs in NH, the tariff (billing mechanism) allows municipalities to pay for streetlights (they are unmetered) under a set of laws that assume it's dark for a certain number of hours. He added that this tariff in Maine was only recently settled and, so, there were some agreements with some neighboring municipalities with companies really before it was mature; that our company wanted to make sure we partnered with CMP, the right installer, etc. to make sure we presented an opportunity that is accurate and fair. He said that he thinks that, in some cases, there was some salesmanship that went on before the rules were fully understood; that, as a result, there have been some slowdowns and challenges with early adopters.

7:04 PM

Mr. Henningsen explained that we had, at one point, a conversation back from York saying that they were going to stay with CMP, lease the lights from CMP, and save 30%. He said that we looked at that and found we can save more money by owning them than that; that he talked with CMP at one point, asking for a proposal, and they wouldn't give a proposal, that they were working on it.

Mr. Lee said that he thinks, to some degree, it became somewhat of a political issue, there were two sides to it and he thinks that bogged it down and got away from them; that they ultimately settled with the least common denominator, which was take the 30% discount CMP was willing to give if you don't pull all your business away from them, and they went the easy route. He said that, tonight, we are looking for the award of the bid to LED Affinity (\$30,208) and up to \$11,876 to CMP for residual power of fixtures (net book value).

7:07 PM

Mr. Henningsen said that all of that is calculated into the approved bond.

Mr. Lee discussed that they may have some residents asking for a streetlight in dark neighborhoods; that we can and have negotiated with Affinity on each of those if we decide to do it, with varying costs depending on location. He said that we started with \$75,000 and we're at about \$42,000, so there is some room if we find we want to add a light for safety or even remove a light.

There was further discussion regarding necessary and unnecessary streetlight locations, the inventory survey that was done, and contacting the Police Department for any areas of concern they might have.

7:13 PM

Mr. Branagan said, regarding the survey, it is a full GIS audit that not only finds all the lights the Town has been paying for but we put them on a map with coordinates; that this layer will be delivered to the Town as part of our deliverable cost. He added that what is really nice about that is that it allows us to look at relationships of the lights – are there key intersections that are missed regarding safety issues or places that are overlit.

There was discussion regarding glare and how/why that is very low, as well as having demonstration lights that the public can take a look at, which will happen.

7:18 PM

Mr. Orestis moved, second by Mr. Lytle, that the Select Board award the bid to Affinity LED Light for the base bid of \$30,208 plus a net book value of up to \$11,876 for a total approved bid of \$42,084 for the LED lighting contract.

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:21 PM

3) Planning Board: Updated By-laws

Mr. Murphy suggested, under Membership, that there be a subparagraph inserted that reads, "Any resignation by a board member must be submitted in writing to the Select Board and becomes effective when accepted by the Select Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting." He said that there's no discussion of how resignations are handled that he could find and he thinks it is good to have in the by-laws.

Mr. Lentz said that we sent those through sometime in May, after spending a lot of time re-writing them; that they sat dormant without any word back from anyone, nothing formal, nothing documented, about what needed to be changed. He added that we went back and listened, a few weeks ago, to the tape of one of the SB meetings and we heard one thing being said; that that was revised and changed and we've had nothing else; so, he's not doing it again, that's a waste of time for that Board, as we spent months.

7:23 PM

Mr. Murphy said that this is a very direct and definite insertion; that he believes he may have made this change in an earlier version and it never got in but he isn't sure.

There was discussion regarding who was on the SB at the time and the possible transition impact.

7:24 PM

Mr. Murphy said that he humbly requests that this change be in there.

Mr. Lentz asked that it be documented and made formal.

The SB members agreed that it should be added.

Mr. Lytle moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board accept the Planning Board by-laws, as presented, but adding 2.a.6. Any resignation by a board member must be submitted in writing to the Select Board and becomes effective when accepted by the Select Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:27 PM 4) Police Dept. – National Night Out

This was informational regarding the annual Police Department event happening at the Boat Basin on October 2nd from 4:30 PM to 6:30 PM.

J. Public Works

7:29 PM 1) Tree Maintenance Bids

Mr. Lee discussed the three bids received by Mr. Moulton for this project and the recommendation is to accept Tom Chase & Sons, Inc. as the lowest bidder.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board accept Tom Chase & Sons, Inc. of York, Maine for a bid amount of \$1,400 per day for tree removal plus \$600 per day for stump grinding.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:30 PM 2) Road Salt Bids

This included the results from SMRPC (GPCOG) for their RFP bid results; that Granite State sent an independent bid to the Town of Eliot that was even lower; that the recommendation is to go with Granite State Minerals.

Mr. Lytle moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board award the road salt bid to Granite State Minerals in the amount of \$47/per ton, delivered, for the 2018/2019 year.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

K. Administrative Department

7:33 PM 1) Town Manager Report

There was no discussion.

7:34 PM 2) Request to Reconsider Select Board Meeting Time – No correspondence

Mr. Murphy said that a number of people have reminded him in the past few weeks that a lot of citizens would like us to return to the historic time of 7 PM for SB meetings; that this hasn't been discussed by the SB at a meeting for some time. He asked if SB members had any comments regarding this.

Mr. Lytle said that he has no problem with 5:30.

Mr. Lee said that this came up probably two years ago and, for a period of three months, we tried it, and we didn't get a single new person at a meeting. He added that he thinks what happens is that a particular topic comes up and a person can't make a meeting on that particular night at that particular time and it becomes a universal problem that we have to deal with. He added that some of our meetings go fairly long and would be much later in the evening; that he doesn't see a need to change it; that he thinks people make it to the meeting if they want to make it to the meeting.

7:36 PM Mr. Lentz suggested a consideration of employees that you ask to come here to testify or ask questions of; that they are staying later and later, and 5:30 is late enough for them as they have worked a whole day; that he thinks it's a bit much to ask them to come to a meeting that starts at 7PM.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy agreed with Mr. Lentz; that she is also looking at tonight and that there was some consideration given at the last meeting; that she's watching Mr. Moulton sitting here and leaving at 7:25, and she thinks there was some consideration for department heads of putting their issues on even earlier so they are not sitting here or coming back. She agreed that the SB had changed it to 6PM and there was not a single new person here.

7:37 PM

Mr. Orestis said that we should monitor requests that we get but, at this point, it doesn't seem, based on the comments from the citizens we typical see, that there is much reason to move it, at this point.

Mr. Lee said that he has heard that maybe 3 or 4 times in his years here, regarding people who wanted to change the time; that with one of them we moved it to 6PM in deference to them and then he didn't show up.

7:38 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that another approach to take is if you have someone that really needs to come and wants to speak on an issue and can't make a particular time then, perhaps, that one-time accommodation could be made on the issue they want to speak on towards the end of the meeting.

Mr. Murphy agreed that that could be the public option that people could be made aware of.

Mr. Lee said that that was a very good idea; that if someone said that they couldn't make it until 7PM, we could put them down later in the agenda.

Mr. Lytle agreed that it wasn't right for the Town Planner, CEO, etc. to get out of here at 4PM and have to come back later.

The SB agreed to take no action on this item.

3) Sept. 27 Public Hearing – General Asst. Ordinance – No Correspondence

This Public Hearing will be held at 7PM at the September 27th SB meeting.

7:40 PM 4) Approve Warrants

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Orestis, that the Select Board approve A/P Warrant #16 in the amount of \$1,056,005.04, dated August 16, 2018; A/P Warrant #17 in the amount of \$132, 543.00, dated August 17, 2018; A/P Warrant #19 in the amount of \$109,110.97, dated August 23, 2018; A/P Warrant #21 in the amount of \$81,947.03, dated August 31, 2018.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

L. New Business:

There was no new business.

M. Old Business:

7:42 PM Mr. Orestis asked if there was an **update on the skate park** as far as working to figure out what needs to be done to turn that into something.

Mr. Lee said no; that we won't make a lot of progress on that until he gets his staffing situation straightened out; that it's pretty much all applicants, all interviews, all the time.

Mr. Tessier said that it completely slipped his mind at the beginning of the meeting but he did have one question he was hoping to address. He said that, in Kittery, there's been a big, big issue about what **screening process** was handled before **hiring a new employee**; that he knows we are going through a transition in Town, now, where we could potentially be hiring quite a few people. He added that he was wondering if we have looked at our process to see if we aren't making the same mistakes that Kittery was making.

7:43 PM

Mr. Lee said that that was a very good question. He added that he is happy to report that he sadly got down to one applicant for the Treasurer's position that he made a conditional offer on; that he ran the background check and withdrew the offer. He said that we are back to square one but he has an interview tomorrow; that, when screening (including at the national level), we run a financial background check, a criminal background check, and kind of the Google social media-type stuff, as well, which actually turns out more than some of the formal records did. He said that we put that in our personnel policy that 'these' will be the checks you make and, also, a physical exam.

7:44 PM

Mr. Murphy said that, as you all are aware, we adopted a **pay scale plan** a month ago and, as a result of one feature of that plan, we have lost four of the most important workers of our staff. He added that this is angering to him and something which required him to think a bit; that he wants this Board to consider taking the action of accepting the pay plan, for the time being, with the one major

change of striking that red line top because every one of these four members went to a nearby town doing the same thing for a new value above our red line; that we couldn't save them by giving them more money. He said that he is suggesting that we alter that pay scale plan so that it's more open at the top for what the administration of this Town can do to retain our most qualified and most experienced and exceptional workers who weren't listened to enough when that pay scale was being worked on. He added that, if we did that, then the question would be that we would have to expect in our budget the ability to spend more in the plan for an increase in wages; that that would require looking at our budget. He asked if this Board could ask the Town Manager to proceed if it's budgetarily possible, in the current budget, to take this step. He asked if there is an money available so that we could not lose any more valuable people in the way that we did because a number of them were at that and, in retrospect, it looks like an artificially low top limit in pay; that that bothers him that four people can go, quickly, to nearby towns and get what they want; that that means we are not competing with the labor force and the market study, so called, that was done was certainly inadequate.

- 7:47 PM
- Mr. Orestis said that we've had discussions about revisiting the pay plan but he thinks it's a bit premature to ask to revisit budgeting as well as eliminating part of that pay scale prior to us reviewing it, as a whole. He added that we've had several workshops, now, we've had that discussion that the plan is to take another look at it but today it would be a little premature to take a look at and review the budget, as a whole, to see what we can add and retain employees.
- 7:48 PM

Mr. Lee said that he thought what Mr. Murphy was suggesting was for him to look into the budget to see, if we were to revise it in any way, how would you go about adjusting line items to make that happen; that that's what he heard Mr. Murphy say.

Mr. Murphy said yes; that that was his intention because we have people who have not yet left and, yet, have expressed themselves as being very angry at that cut-off point; that they've been here for years and years and, of course, they've reached the top of the previous level; but, if the market out there is exceeding that level, we have to plan to exceed that level, too. He added that the question is can we do that for those that are left and are tempted to leave. He said that losing four people in two months is a crisis and he is angry; that there should be the ability for top management to consider the value of people and the cost to us of losing them and those four that we have lost represent a great cost to this Town, in his opinion. He clarified that he didn't want to redo the whole budget but just trying to find a way so that we can be allowed to work with the Town Manager and, maybe, the department heads to see that we don't lose any more of our most experienced workers.

7:49 PM Mr. Lytle said that we have lost a couple of police officers, too, for the same reason.

Mr. Orestis wanted to clarify that the Chair just wanted to explore the opportunity to see if we can adjust, or move funds around, to potentially to save someone's position who has not left yet.

Mr. Murphy said that that's right, before we do a full review study looking at new towns, or something like that, doing it in a formal manner.

7:50 PM

Mr. Lee added one thing; that from his discussions with the staff, it's not really so much about the money, really; that it was the feeling that they had by being told, basically, you have a maximum value and, after that, we may very well freeze for two or three years; that that was a huge morale killer; that the moment they heard that message, forget the plan, people started looking because they saw how they were valued. He added that he does think that the staff look around and they see anyone under a union contract is getting 2 to 2 ½ % and they're getting zero; they're unionizing, those that are left and those who have most wanted to unionize have left; that he has two very senior people who are very upset about this, reiterating that it's more about the message that was sent. He said that it wasn't how the pay plan was first structured by the person who is a paid consultant; that it was supposed to be a growth band and it didn't have an end, a cap at the end of it; that that was something we created, locally, at a table at a workshop and it sent a terrible message.

7:52 PM

Mr. Lentz said that he's sure that the SB has looked at all the exit interviews for those four people and you can substantiate the fact, on paper, that this was the reason they left – a financial reason. He said that, if that's the reason, he would like to have copies of those, if he may.

Mr. Murphy asked if we have such exit interviews.

Mr. Lee said no, besides which, he just said that it's more about morale.

7:53 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that she's spoken to a couple of people and one of them left because she took a job closer to her own home so that she didn't have a significant commute; that she spoke to the Treasurer and she said she took a job because Rye is a bigger operation and she has room to move up, which is not true of any operation in a very small town; that she also lives in NH and, by taking a job in NH, it added about \$6,000 to her income as she no longer has to pay income taxes to the State of Maine; that every job has a value, every job has a starting and an end value. She added that it's true in State government where she works; that she is maxed out and, if she would like a higher pay then she would, perhaps, get further education or apply for another job there. She said that we

don't need to be raising it and creating these unrealistic salaries and put the burden on the taxpayer just simply because somebody is unhappy. She added that this wage study that's been looked at in depth, it is fair, and the documentation is there; that when she spoke with the Town Manager prior to this even being looked at and hiring somebody, he was in agreement that we would accept the results of this. She said that she thinks that before you raise it just to give people raises, you ought to consider the taxpayers and the reality of what the job is worth.

7:55 PM

Mr. Lee commented that he was in a position where he was going to accept it, no matter what, because the votes were there; that he never liked it because he thought there was a thumb on the scale right from the get-go; that when you pick some of the towns they picked – Lebanon is like Eliot – no; that it was done based on tax base, which is not what we were instructed to do; that it was supposed to be operational similarity and we did not pick towns that were operationally similar. He said that the whole thing was a farce, in his estimation; that he was not in favor of it and he can tell you that he works with them every day, not just one conversation; that he hears it every single day from every single person; so, you might have heard something and maybe they didn't dare tell you the truth.

7:56 PM

Mr. Lytle said that he talked to every single person that left and they have different stories than what Ms. Murphy has; that he doesn't believe they lied to him. He added that, right now, he would pay double just to keep them and bring morale up, again; that it's really gone downhill and is just a terrible situation right now.

Mr. Murphy said that Eliot, in general, is not a poor Town and the Town mil rate is lower than the towns around us in a significant manner and, maybe, that should go up and we should be paying people more. He asked how you run a town when the towns around you, the competition, are paying more for the same work. He added that it is true that some of those people were happy to be able to go home but they also went home to a higher salary when they did that; that they really wanted to get home and avoid the cost of commuting; that they would go home for maybe even slightly less than they were getting here just to make life easier; that that is what he understands happened.

7:57 PM

Mr. Lee said that he would be happy to look into some sort of a remedy to this but he doesn't think we're going to solve it, here, tonight; that the hour is late, reiterating that he would be happy to look into it and forward something to the SB over the next little bit; that he thinks just knowing that the SB is open to the fact that these are valuable employees is going to help morale.

7:58 PM

Mr. Orestis said that he thinks there is no question that we value the employees in tis Town, there's no question about that; that not being privy to those discussions about the previous wage scale and he still hasn't seen the wage study, which he

would like a copy of and that would be awesome. He added that he has no issue with you looking into...

Mr. Lee said that there was no wage study.

Mr. Orestis said that he thought you had a consultant.

Mr. Lee said yes, he has the consultant's report and he would give that to Mr. Orestis.

Mr. Orestis said that, yes, he thinks it makes sense for the SB and Town Manager to at least look into it and see what he comes up with, reiterating, again, that we obviously value the employees of the Town of Eliot and that should go without saying. He added that we have at least expressed interest in taking another look at it.

7:59 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that, at the beginning, it was made crystal clear that this was nothing personal and the Town's employees were valued; that this is about a wage study that was quite fair and it was about putting value on a job. She reiterated that every job has a value; that she maxed out at hers but that is no reflection on her value as an employee.

Mr. Lytle said that he didn't want to get into a contest but he has heard a lot of different things about during the wage study regarding what happened; so, he's not sure how the wage study ended up where it is but there was a lot of bad conflict during the wage study.

8:00 PM

Mr. Lee said that he knew there was a scheduled executive session but, in the absence of Mr. Donhauser and who is on our negotiation team, he respectfully requests that we put it off; that furthermore he thinks we'll be closer to knowing what the proposed contract for the Maine Association of Police will be, probably two weeks hence.

Mr. Murphy agreed that that was a perfectly good reason not to have one tonight.

The SB agreed.

N. Selectmen's Report (Seeking Committee Members for TIF, Clean Water, Cannabis, Cable TV)

There were no Selectmen's reports tonight.

O. Executive Session

There was no executive session.

P. Adjourn

There was a motion and second to adjourn the meeting at 8:01 PM.

VOTE 3-0 Motion approved

Respectfully submitted,

Ellen Lemire, Recording Secretary

S/Mr. Richard Donhauser, Secretary

Date approved: November 29, 2018