SELECT BOARD MEETING September 8, 2016 5:30PM

Ouorum noted

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

B. Roll Call: Ms. Davis, Mr. Fernald, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Pomerleau.

C. Pledge of Allegiance recited

D. Moment of Silence observed

E. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

5:31 PM Motion by Mr. Fernald, seconded by Mr. Murphy, to approve the minutes of August 18, 2016, as written.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Fernald – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Ms. Davis – Yes Mr. Pomerleau – Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

F. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

G. Public Works

5:33 PM 1) Diesel Fuel Bids

Mr. Moulton said that he discussed the bid prices with the vendors, as presented, and all three said that they would hold the price for this evening's meeting. He added that his memo shows an over-the-rack price of \$0.10 to \$0.15/gallon and, if you look at what it would cost the Town today, the actual best choice is the one who has the highest over rack price and a lot of that has to do with volume purchase by certain vendors.

5:35 PM Mr. Lee clarified that what Mr. Moulton was saying is that, even though the over rack price varies, he is actually recommending the one with the highest over rack; that they must also be the ones that buy at the greatest volume because it appears they are getting the base price much cheaper, if they are able to charge an overhead price for delivery that's higher than other people.

Mr. Moulton said yes, discussing the three options and saying that there wasn't a big variation between the \$0.10 and \$0.15; that the department has obtained diesel fuel from all three vendors since he has been here and has no preference; that he has just fiscally looked at it as a lump sum, given that there is that slight margin of cost per gallon; that in the long run, Gagnon may be the better beneficial vendor for the Town.

5:36 PM

Ms. Davis said that, if they have given us a fixed price, does that mean that, if the over-the-rack price is cheaper than the fixed price, will they give us the over-the-rack price until we reach a point where over-the-rack price exceeds the cap.

Mr. Moulton said no; that it's either, or.

Ms. Davis said that she looked at some billing on P. Gagnon and she thinks all times, but one, we purchased diesel from them it was at \$1.71/gallon; that she ran some calculations on the fixed prices and the fixed price from Hanscom was, by far, the best; that if diesel prices go up, and we have a fixed price of \$1.85, it's a savings of \$6,735. She added that she guessed what we are doing is betting whether diesel is going to go up, or not. She asked if Mr. Moulton had some sense of that.

5:37 PM

Mr. Moulton said that, from his conversations with each of the vendors, there has been a fluctuation of \$0.11+ over five days; so, either way you look at it, it's a gamble because, currently, it's \$1.60/gallon to us should it be Gagnon; that that is \$0.05 cheaper than what it is today. He added that, from what he was told, there will be no major price fluctuation going forward but continue as it is right now.

Mr. Pomerleau said that this was really a snapshot in time; that you could look at this in three weeks and they'd all have variations and the lower one might be somebody else. He asked Mr. Moulton if he was relatively confident that P. Gagnon does significantly more volume.

Mr. Moulton said that, looking at probabilities, he would say yes.

Mr. Pomerleau asked if Jenkin's cap was gone from this revised memo.

Mr. Moulton said that the cap is still there.

There was further discussion around volatility in the market and its impact on pricing.

Mr. Murphy asked, during the year, can we be monitoring the prices and say deliver now, making our own decision on when to buy at this fluctuating rate. He asked if Mr. Moulton could do that or did he have a fixed delivery every month.

5:42 PM

Mr. Moulton said that the risk you take is during the winter months, not knowing what winter is going to be like; that having that fuel ready and available for storms that are large enough that he could use half a tank of fuel in one storm, and we might have back-to-back storms. He added that, in his opinion, it's easier to try to secure something and have that known; that they come every two weeks in the summer and every week in the winter and, if there's a significant amount of snow falling and operations are heavy, they'll come during the storm if you need it. He added that that is how he looks at it and how we've dealt with it in the past.

5:45 PM

There was further discussion regarding pricing and the premium that might be paid, depending on whether prices go up or down.

Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Select Board go with P. Gagnon & Son, Inc. for \$0.15 over rack.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Fernald said that the concerns are a crapshoot either way; that we don't know and we've had experience P. Gagnon and think we should go with them.

Mr. Pomerleau said that he would concur on the conditions that Gagnon could be the safest bet and, at \$0.15 over rack and doing a better volume, they're likely to have a better overall base price over the course of the season.

DISCUSSION ENDED

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Fernald – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Ms. Davis – Yes Mr. Pomerleau – Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

5:48 PM 2) DEP Response to Sewer Pump Concerns

Mr. Lee read the letter from the Maine DEP, dated August 18, 2016, from Mr. Brian Kavanah, Director, which said, in part:

- "The expected design life of a sewage pump station is about 20 years. These pump stations have been in place since 1983, or 33 years. They need to be replaced soon.
- Older pump stations are less reliable and inefficient, both because they are old and because wastewater technology has improved greatly in the

last 3 decades. This is important because pump station failures are expensive, require emergency response by the town to try to prevent illegal discharges and often result in illegal discharges anyway.

- Because of illegal discharges last year, the Department has put the town on notice that more formal enforcement will result from further illegal discharges. Such an enforcement case would likely result in significant monetary penalties, in addition to replacement of the pumps.
- If pump station upgrades are funded and plans are being developed and implemented in a timely fashion, the Department may use enforcement discretion if there are additional illegal discharges."

Mr. Lee read the Town's response to this letter, which said, in part: "The plan moving forward is as follows:

- To put forth a referendum ballot article for the November ballot (against all suggestions and recommendations by the Secretary of State of Maine) to bond the upgrades and repairs for a sum of \$1.7 million dollars (see attached).
- Upon some approval of funding regardless of a positive vote by residents for the bond question or through a special assessment to sewer rate payers the Town intends to fund the completion of final design and put forth contract documents for the bidding for construction of the pump station(s) upgrades and repairs by March 2017 with the intent to complete construction of the upgrades and improvements by December 2017."

Mr. Lee said that, hopefully, we have given them good reason to believe we are willing to go so far as to considering special assessments, if necessary, if we cannot otherwise fund these things through a positive vote on a bond, or whatever method you folks decide on September 14th, when you have that special meeting. He added that, hopefully, that was a satisfactory answer; that we did want to get back to Mr. Kavanah quickly and he thought we would put everything in there that we really are dutifully moving forward on this.

Mr. (Charlie) Rankie asked if we could have Mr. Kavanah's title, please.

Ms. Davis said that it was Director of Division of Water Quality Management from the Department of Environmental Protection.

5:53 PM Ms. Davis asked Mr. Moulton to clarify, in more detail, where exactly we are at in preparation for next week's meeting.

Mr. Moulton said that where we're at, so far, is looking at the cost-savings, past \$6,000 in that ESR; that it's looking at the review of the design to see if there are any cost-saving mechanisms that can be put forth to reduce the cost of the project; looking at alternatives for pumps, reduction in building size, and one other; but the cost-saving mechanism-portion of it is what is being worked on right now and

there is current pricing in evaluation in one alternative to the other, like submersible pumps versus what we currently have for a system, and what the cost-savings, or difference, would be and is there any cost-savings or adjustments in the design of the buildings, as they were first proposed, given the fact that a lot of the discussions were with residents in the areas of the pump stations, with concerns with noise, esthetics, and such; that all of that is being looked at and reviewed, currently, and there will be a summary for discussion with you folks next week.

5:54 PM

Mr. Lee added that, from what he has read, they are really trying very hard to do an awful lot of work in a very short period and one of the principals that is working on it has been subpoenaed as an expert witness in some kind of pump station disaster, or something, so they haven't had a lot of time; that you may not get this information much before we actually meet; that they will do the best they can and we will get it to you as soon as we have it, trying to give all the time he can.

5:55 PM

Ms. Davis said that she understood that situation perfectly, adding that the meeting is on Wednesday and, if we could have it Tuesday night just, at least, so we could have some questions prepared; that it isn't that we need a week.

Mr. Lee said that he didn't think it would be that dense a document, either; that we have been pushing this and we would, hopefully see it Monday afternoon, Tuesday morning, giving you all the time we can.

Ms. Davis said even Tuesday night; that she understood the concern is that they don't want to release something that could possibly be misconstrued, or is incomplete and, therefore, could be misunderstood; that she supposed we have to take that and say that, if we can't have until Wednesday, okay, but it's really difficult to formulate our thoughts if we don't have a little time.

5:56 PM

Mr. Lee said that we are absolutely aware of that; that we are pushing.

Ms. Davis said that everyone is doing the best they can and thanked everyone.

H. Community Development Block Grant

1) Formation of an Ad Hoc Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC)

Mr. Lee said that the owners of Modernist pantry were present to night and that this is a required advisory committee, in receiving grant funds, and must be involved in the selection of consultants and/or contractors, community input, public relations, and handling complaints. He added that DECD said that the

committee may never meet, never have a complaint, etc., but we must have the committee in order to receive funds.

5:58 PM Ms. Davis asked if there was anything else we needed to know about in this process.

Mr. Lee said that this is the final thing; that on your agenda tonight were the CDBG Section 504 Self Evaluation and Transition Plan, which were the two remaining to be done, which are finished, as well as the revised Letter of Credit and legal opinion backing that. He added that these items will finish our involvement with being ready to receive those funds.

Ms. Wang said that the only thing additional is that, once we have all those documents to the State and they have approved them, they are going to send back to the Town a contract that the SB will have to sign, and that will be the last thing.

6:00 PM Ms. Davis said that this is not obligating us in any way to do anything that we're not already doing as a Town.

Mr. Lee said that that was correct.

6:02 PM

Ms. Davis said that, taking these three items and the package as a whole, her tremendous concern is plugging the holes, here; that she doesn't feel that even the second letter necessarily is 100% guaranteeing us against liability on this issue. She added that, if she understood this, we are making a guess as to how long this is going to take for the DECD to sign off on this project and, therefore, we are authorizing this letter of credit for six months and we don't actually have a guarantee that six months is going to do the job. She said that we put this before the people with the proviso that the grant money will not be accepted, nor the contract signed, unless the Town's potential payback of said funds are fully guaranteed; that she feels we need a proposal that will guarantee us fully against liability because this Board would have to go to the people of the Town and say that they are going to pay something on this unless we do that.

Town's attorney; that we had actually sent them an open-ended version that had no time limit on it and he suggested putting a time limit on it; that if that is part of what makes you uncomfortable, we can take it back out. She asked the Board what additional language would you need to see in order for you to feel comfortable; that, at this point, she is comfortable, the attorney is comfortable;

that if there is anything else, aside from this particular language of six months, which we can easily take out, is there anything else you want to see in here. She added that this actually allows the Town to withdraw money from a bank account

Ms. Wang said that the 6-month time limit was something suggested by the

and there's nothing to keep us from stopping this, so she's not sure what else you need to see at this point.

6:03 PM

Mr. Lee said that you did see in one of the legal opinions that what he said was that there was never any way that you are going to be 100% on these things; that although we put that out to the people that we could fully guarantee because he thought they could; that he thought we all believed that but the second legal opinion he gave us Mr. Lee believes he is saying, in essence, that you aren't going to get any better guarantee than what we have, here, especially with the way it was amended. He explained that the attorney has to be clear that there is always a percentage somewhere in there where it could all go south but he has also said that this is a dramatic improvement over what we had and maybe the best you're going to get.

Ms. Davis asked Mr. Lee if he had sent the attorney all the paperwork.

Mr. Lee said that he did; that the attorney asked for everything.

6:04 PM

Ms. Davis said that we have a verbal from DECD that six months would probably do the job but we went before the people with a 'fully guaranteed' promise; that she would like to see language that says that the letter of credit is in force until the DECD signs off on this project.

Ms. Wang said that that was perfectly fine; that there was no problem with that.

Ms. Davis said that she would be happy with that, asking how the rest of the SB felt.

Mr. Fernald said that that would be fine.

6:05 PM

Mr. Lee said that he and Ms. Wang could work to revise that to have that type of language and, tonight, maybe wrap up the committee and the 504 items, get that groundwork done, and wait two weeks to see if we can have that language in there - that that is in place until the DECD signs off; that only at that point will we not need it.

Ms. Davis asked Ms. Wang if that unduly disrupted her schedule.

Ms. Wang said that she didn't think so because DECD is not asking to see this; that this is purely between us; that at some point they will want it but not for their paperwork, they are waiting for the other two pieces.

Mr. Lee said that they don't have funds to release, at this point, so it's not holding up funding.

Ms. Davis clarified the contract revised and the revision reviewed by the attorney, with a stamp of approval saying that this is as close to a guarantee as humanly possible.

The Select Board concurred.

6:06 PM

Mr. Pomerleau asked if this list of names was the committee, as he was recommending it.

Mr. Lee said yes, explaining why he selected the names from Selectmen, PB, EBDC Chair, and community members.

There was discussion around Selectmen being on this committee because of the Charter and a decision was made by the SB to not include members of the SB on the committee.

6:11 PM

Mr. Pomerleau moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Select Board establish the Community Development Advisory Ad Hoc Committee, composed of members Stephen Beckert, Melissa Horner, Robert Fisher, and Roseann Adams.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Fernald - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Ms. Davis - Yes

Mr. Pomerleau - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

6:12 PM

Mr. Pomerleau moved, second by Mr. Murphy, that the Select Board appoint the Town Manager, Dana Lee, as Administrator for the Section 504 Self Evaluation and Transition Plan for the Community Development Block Grant Program.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Fernald - Yes

Mr. Murphy - Yes

Ms. Davis - Yes

Mr. Pomerleau - Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

I. Department Head/Committee Reports

6:13 PM 1) Board of Appeals Application: Mary Kate Hanson

Ms. Davis said that she believed we had a second application submitted by Mr. Charles Rankie, as well.

Mr. Lee said that, while Mr. Rankie is here, he doesn't see the other applicant, admitting he may have dropped the ball because he didn't call her to let her know to be here; that the SB would probably like to ask some questions so, perhaps, we should postpone this and take it up in two weeks, giving him time to call the applicant.

It was the **consensus of the Select Board** to wait two weeks on this item.

6:18 PM 2) Suspension/Disbandment of the Business Development Committee

Mr. Lee said that this was a letter from the EBDC recognizing the SB's action regarding disbanding this committee.

Ms. Davis said that there were a couple of things she wanted to discuss in this letter and asked to reserve time when we were under New Business.

6:19 PM 3) Sewer Committee/Conservation Commission/Solid Waste/ BOA/ Harbor Commission Self-Assessment Responses

Mr. Lee said that he sent out assessments, per the SB's request, to the boards and committees to give their opinions regarding their needs, level of support, their missions, etc.; that this is, basically, information to the SB, who appoints these committees, on how they are feeling about their committees, their functionality, ability to get a quorum, having proper resources, etc. He added that this is for the SB to review and, then, if any of the SB members would like to act on any of it, such as discussing the response received by XYZ committee, the SB would ask him to do that, and we could put that on a future agenda. He added that during his evaluation he heard the desire of the SB to hear from department heads about their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis) and where they are with these, as well, and he has been concurrently doing that so that, when we have a joint meeting with the Budget Committee, and you want to hear the departmental primary concerns, we have that; that that will be coming up in two weeks, as well as his opinion of where the various committees are.

There were some assessments that needed missing pages or were not clearly written.

6:24 PM Mr. Pomerleau said that there was a wide range of thoroughness in the completion of these surveys; that some did a really good job and others, obviously, didn't put

a whole lot of seriousness into it. He added that, if you're going to ask questions like this, you ought to be prepared to act on them, otherwise, you're shuffling paper and they won't take the next one seriously; that he thinks there are some really good points made in support of the issues across the board, here, and he thinks they all warrant attention; that we should make some effort to discuss these and he would like to see, starting with Mr. Lee's views, to begin with. He added that, as a Board, he felt we should be taking these committees one at a time, examining what they had to say, what can be or needs to be done, or that nothing can be done; at least, somehow, respond to them, suggesting they might do this in a workshop setting.

6:26 PM

Ms. Davis said that Mr. Lee did have some concerns, early on, a few weeks ago and she assumes he is going to take all of this information and that will weigh into his recommendations down the road that you are saying you're going to take department head information, as well, and then kind of come up with a package, some direction with where we want to go with the information.

Mr. Lee said yes, essentially.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy, Hanscom Road, said that it appears most took the survey seriously; that she had an opportunity to watch the Sewer Committee meeting and she sees that there is little to no comment on theirs; that it was very concerning, as she was watching it, that the presentation of this appeared to be somewhat of a joke and was not taken seriously by the Sewer Committee; that she would hope that, perhaps, this (their survey) could be turned back to them to have them reexamine – that there wasn't a member of that committee that could state what their mission was and she thinks that is important so that they can address that as they are meeting as a committee.

6:28 PM

Mr. (Denny) Lentz, Creek Crossing, asked if there was a reason we didn't assess all of the committees and boards or are those selected for a reason.

Mr. Lee said that those were the ones that responded.

Mr. Lentz said that the Energy Committee, the Budget Committee, the Planning Board did not respond.

Mr. Lee said that there are some that have not yet responded, yes, not omitting any committees; that some of them may have had a full agenda for that and there's only so much he can do to get responses.

Mr. Pomerleau said that, at the beginning of this, part of this was to do an overview of all the standing committees, questioning whether missions needed to change, composition, nature, eliminate some, add some; that it wasn't just a self-

assessment and Mr. Lee was focused on those where we had choices; therefore, the PB and the BOA were not in that in loop because they are required by statute and the Budget Committee is an elected committee and another one we had no options with. He added that the idea was to focus on those appointed committees where we could actually function and act on.

6:29 PM

Ms. Davis asked if there was any concern on the rest of the Board, do we want to send this back to the Sewer Committee so that we might get a more fulsome reply to assist the Town Manager in his evaluation.

Mr. Fernald said that the problem he has with what is in front of him is that he can't read any of the responses of the Sewer Committee and he would like to, at least, know what is on their assessment.

6:30 PM

Mr. Lee said that it was his intent to send it back to the Chair of the Sewer Committee and ask them to either re-write it more neatly, or something like that, or expound a bit on it if there's other thoughts; that he couldn't read it, either.

Ms. Davis said that she would go back to take a look at that meeting and try to get some feeling to compare these responses with the attitudes that were demonstrated at the meeting and possibly see where we might need to go from there.

4) Conservation Committee: Punkintown Easement

Mr. Lee said that he has had a number of conversations with Chairperson Richards (Conservation Commission), hoping that she would be in attendance at tonight's meeting and have particular cost figures in mind; that he thought we might want to postpone this, for now; that this is good information on the direction they want to move in terms of locking down Punkintown, the Johnson Lane Town Forest, roadside clean-up concerns they have, etc. He added that they would be coming to the SB to see if the SB would put an article on a Town Meeting warrant to take money from the Land Bank Trust/Reserve Fund to allow them to hire a survey lawyer-type professional to finally lock this down. He said that they went to Attorney McEachern, who has been helping with this for 30+ years, and he told them to just create their easement and, if anyone wants to challenge the Town, then it would be on them to do that; that the Conservation Commission has done their survey and others have not. He suggested we wait to hear from them, again, and take this as background information.

6:33 PM Ms. Davis said that they did say that no easement from Great Works would be forthcoming until this was resolved.

Mr. Murphy said that he is the liaison to the Conservation Commission (CC) and attended their meeting last night. He added that we can go ahead, recognizing that something may be challenged and essentially what they want to get it decided. He said that he believes there are sufficient, properly-prepared deeds, which completely cover questions of what land is being eased on and the degree to which those deeds or surveys differ slightly from the deeds the neighbor up there are very small. He added that he thought they might be ready to go; that it might be approval just for the funds to pull it together.

6:35 PM

Ms. Davis asked if Mr. Murphy knew if that parcel is granted an easement up Punkintown Road, do all the lots along Punkintown Road have a deeded access to the road, and does that parcel also have...she would be interested in knowing that.

Mr. Murphy said that he did not know.

Mr. Lee said that he believed that each of them own into the roadway because one of the stipulations is that, if we open up Punkintown under an easement to have the public go in and enjoy it, we cannot park in that area; that that is a common roadway to them. He added that one of the things that irritated them was that people would go to Punkintown and park in the middle of their driveway, in essence, and, so, in order to use it we may have to do something, with money, to create off-road parking on Town-owned land. He clarified that we have deeded rights to go in and he thinks it's limited to pedestrian but he isn't sure.

6:36 PM

Ms. Davis said that the reason she mentioned it was because, if they are going to go for a legal opinion on this to get a price, then part of that needs to be do we have legal rights to access Punkintown Road; that that needs to be part of what they are finding out because the impression from the letter is that they don't have access to the road.

Ms. Shapleigh said that this has been an ongoing thing for 40+ years that she knows of; that she believes Punkintown Road was an old county road; that if the county road is abandoned, then the property is divided by the people on either side, so the Town wouldn't have an interest in it.

6:38 PM

Mr. Lee agreed that was still the law; however, when we acquired Punkintown, it came with some sort of an easement of access.

Mr. (Phil) Lytle said that he was Chair of the Selectmen, at the time, when we bought that piece of land; that there is a stream that runs down through there and the Town didn't want to build a bridge across it. He added that they have tried to block it off a few times with big boulders, etc. and the Town has removed them; that they decided, years later, that they would use it for pedestrian only just because they didn't want them to park in the roadway where the residents were;

that that's pretty much where it has stood for quite a few years. He added that his concern for that land was that it was a solid 100 acres so good, prime hunting, and he doesn't think we should put up signs around that.

6:39 PM Mr. Lee clarified that he was just giving an example regarding that; that the conservation easement would list the things you can and cannot do.

Mr. Fisher said that they all know up there that we have rights to access up there, and by vehicle, not by foot.

6:40 PM Mr. Tessier, Johnson Lane, asked if the CC was proposing any action related to Johnson Lane or is all this related to Punkintown.

Mr. Lee said that he would be happy to share their memos with Mr. Tessier.

Mr. Lytle said that, at the time, when that piece was put up through there, they were supposed to establish a committee of that road and the Town of Eliot, due to the fact that they owned land in the back, they had to be part of that committee and maintain that road; that if they needed a couple loads of gravel, etc., for a wash-out, etc., the Town would haul it up and disperse it. He added that he doesn't know if that ever transpired.

Ms. Davis reiterated her curiosity if we have the right to bring vehicles back there; if we created a parking lot on Town-owned property, do we have rights for anybody to drive a vehicle to that parking lot, park there, and use the land. She added that she thought that knowledge was fundamental before proceeding with this.

5) Energy Commission By-laws

Mr. Lee said that the Energy Commission (EC) has drafted by-laws for the Board's review and looking for feedback.

Mr. Pomerleau said that, under Section 4.2, they are saying they will elect officers every two years and the Charter requires that they do that annually. He added that this also had video-streaming or telephone attendance in Section 6.1 (b) Regular Meetings, saying that video is fine but telephone is not.

6:44 PM Mr. Murphy said that the EC was established explicitly by Statute 30-A §3271 and thought that should be part of its source, so-to-speak.

Mr. Lee clarified that the statute should be referenced.

J. Administrative Department

6:45 PM 1) Town Manager Report

Mr. Pomerleau asked why no update from any committee to the Comp Plan Review Committee request for updates on tasks assigned, per the Comp Plan in 2009. Lines 27/28

Mr. Lee explained that he made several spreadsheets for the Comp Plan Review Committee, each one breaking out who was responsible for implementing what tasks and a cover letter asking each group if they had accomplished any of the tasks or working on them, etc., and we didn't get much in the way of responses back from any committee.

Mr. Pomerleau said that it sounded like something we might want to work in with our committee reviews; that that has been a real sore spot across a lot of different Town problems and criticisms, particularly the PB area and BOA area, with the failure of the Town to actually implement the Comprehensive Plan, or many aspects of it, at least. He added that he doesn't know how we just sit there and allow the Comprehensive Plan to go nowhere; that he saw what the Town Manager did and thought he had taken an excellent tack toward it but it has been floundering for a long time; that he thought the Town Manager had the exact right approach. He said that it should have been implemented by a steering committee, not an implementation committee, because they have no authority to implement anything; that other committees have that function but we really ought to follow up on this and get this right back out to them, asking where their responses are because this is required under our Comprehensive Plan.

6:49 PM

Mr. Lee said to the SB Chair that, if one of the Board members would like something on the agenda, then they should approach the Chair about it and ask if we want a follow-up two weeks from now, an item to discuss, re: why aren't you doing what the Comp Plan Review Committee asked; that if you wanted, he would do it that way.

Mr. Murphy suggested the Comp Plan Review Committee also review the possibility of the impending need to update our Comprehensive Plan; that it's been almost 10 years.

Mr. Tessier said that he did remember that being sent out and his recollection was that there were no items on that list that pertained to the Solid Waste Committee so he did not respond, as we had no action to take.

6:50 PM Mr. Lee agreed.

Ms. Shapleigh said that the Comprehensive Plan is kind of like a Christmas wish list; that the State requires you to write a plan every 10 years but many things

change in the Town; that this is not the Ten Commandments written in stone but a wish list, how the Town, at that time, would like to see how the town would go and what they see for their community and it is definitely not that everything in that Comprehensive Plan has to be enacted, reiterating that it is a wish list.

Mr. Pomerleau agreed, adding that, at the end of it, however, there are action steps that the committee recommended to take and, whether they are still pertinent, or not, there ought to be a follow-up on.

6:51 PM Mr. Lee said that these are your boards and committees and he is bringing this back to the SB.

Mr. Pomerleau will write a response/recommendation.

Mr. Pomerleau asked about **Line 61** regarding the DOL's final answer on, if overtime was a factor, at which capacity.

Mr. Lee said that you can very safely use the greater number, or, they will allow you to weight average.

Mr. Pomerleau clarified that the overtime was not in the task the overtime was being completed; that the overtime rate was not directly applicable to the task at which the overtime was applied.

6:52 PM Mr. Lee said that that was correct; that it would have been a weighted average between the two jobs that the person has and that is why we kiboshed it after it was brought to his attention.

Mr. Fernald asked about **Line 48** regarding clarification of the Mary Lizzie Spinney Trust.

Mr. Lee said that we would be dealing with that later on in the agenda.

Ms. Davis asked about **Line 84**, regarding speaking to the Harbor Master about building renovations.

Mr. Lee said that the Harbor Master is, to some degree, in favor and, with the money that we have, we might simply be able to put a little bit of it into renovations and get away with what we have, giving the rest back to the taxpayers; that we will be continuing that discussion and won't do anything until spring.

6:54 PM Ms. Davis asked about **Line 98** regarding the DEP permit for the Pleasant Street Embankment Stabilization project.

Mr. Lee said that DEP has approved that project.

Ms. Davis asked about Line 99.

Mr. Lee said that that was the long, on-going case with the Police Department where we are still marginally a party to it in the sense that they keep asking for FOAA stuff that the judge has said not to give them.

6:55 PM a. Sept 14 Special Meeting – Special Funding

Mr. Lee said that this would be a business meeting, and he does believe it is the intent to take comment, but it may be limited in some fashion; that we do need to make that decision that evening, if the SB is going to move forward because, on September 22nd when we meet, he is going to need the SB to finalize the stuff that will be on the November ballot; that this is the last shot at coming up with a decision on that Wednesday night, the 14th, at the High School Auditorium.

Ms. Davis asked about any other items on the ballot.

Mr. Lee said that the only other thing on the ballot is the growth permit number; that he thought the only other thing that would be going forward is the bonding or however you are going to fund the sewer repairs

6:58 PM b. Departmental Strengths and Weaknesses Survey

Mr. Lee said that this survey will be what you see from department heads coming back in two weeks.

Ms. Davis said that it seems negative, a solicitation for unhappiness to be put into writing.

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that the Budget Committee discussed this and it was really looking to see what the needs were to help them assist in their jobs to, maybe, save them time and money for the departments; that she didn't believe it had a negative connotation at all.

7:00 PMMs. Davis said that a lot of the questions just seem to lead towards soliciting dissatisfaction.

Mr. Lee said that he wasn't looking for negative stuff but, if negative stuff does come back, don't we want to know about it.

Ms. Davis said that she did, to a degree, but what do you hear when you ask somebody what more they need.

Mr. Lee said that, in many cases, people said that they were very satisfied; that in the cases where they were concerned, they were very polite and professional, and he thinks it's very good feedback.

7:01 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that her own work sent out something similar to this; that it's not just looking for complaints but employees coming up with solutions; as an example, Ms. Albert suggested the binding machine last year and, down the road, that will save the Town money with the Town Books, and also helpful in other areas.

7:02 PM

Mr. Pomerleau said that he is generally in favor of these kinds of feedback mechanisms but don't put it out there if you aren't ready to act on something; that if they had the money, there would be nothing more he would like to see than a formal management organizational review of staffing, titles, the Town's form and infrastructure of administration; that if it stays the same way for 30 years, some of them probably ought to change. He added that he thought it was a lot easier to do that if you have a mechanism for measuring some of the problems that could come from some of the issues on this survey; that, before we go with this, we narrow down questions where we are prepared to act on the answers. He clarified that he actually preferred to see these kinds of things done but there is a lot coming up on Mr. Lee's plate, which worries him; that he is not necessarily opposed to doing it but he is just questioning the timing of it.

7:04 PM

Mr. Lee said that he understood but he thought the timing was good; that one of the ideas that came up was that, if we had some lateral files, we could really change our workspace a lot; that right now we are using conventional filing and that's not room-friendly, so, it's ideas like that as we go into the budget process, or, if the clerk is concerned about ergonomic desks for staff before the budget season begins, we ought to discuss it; that a lot goes into these things prior to budget season and, yes, his plate runneth over, but he has to get this information out to the SB, Budget Committee, he's got to know and understand it, he needs their feedback. He added that he hoped he was doing the right mission.

7:05 PM

Mr. Fernald said that he thought this was a very positive thing and that the department heads should also look at this as positive; that it is an opportunity for them to tell us some of the problems they may have and some of the positive things that are going on; that he thinks that's the way we should look at it.

Mr. Lee said that he was able to tell them that both of the groups to whom you are presenting budgets kind of want to know where you're at and to take the opportunity to discuss where you're at and what you do, where the pinch points are and what they are.

Mr. Fernald said that they need to know that we want to know about them.

7:06 PM Mr. Lee said that it was a morale booster for them to know that you were interested.

Mr. Murphy said that, to him, this parallels the job study because they are doing the jobs we are looking at; that all that ties together; it's a total picture.

Mr. Lee agreed, saying that he thinks it all ties in together with the boards and committees, as well, as we enter into budget deliberations, with resources they might need; the HVAC system that isn't any good; that he needs to prepare for these things.

7:08 PM

Ms. (Donna) Murphy said that, looking at the survey, it isn't like they are making a wish list and getting it all this year; that it was really looking at what they see as the need and give the SB and Budget Committee an opportunity to look at what the department heads are prioritizing and look out into the future for the needs of the Town, how that will fit into a budget, presenting that to the Town, and being very mindful of the taxpayer impact. She said that she thought it was a lot of information that would be helpful.

Ms. Davis said that her concern was the perception that it came from the SB, expressly, and that it, in some way, codifies these requests so that, if it doesn't happen, then it becomes a source of dissatisfaction and that we are overwhelmed with all that is coming up. She added that it sounds like Mr. Lee has covered his bases and, maybe, some positive can come out of this.

7:09 PM

Mr. Lee said that he thought it would be positive; that he isn't trying to set anybody up but is trying to set up lines of communication so that we do understand each other and can understand and empathize where we do have pinch blocks, what could reasonably be done, and involve you in helping solve it.

Mr. Pomerleau said that what he sent Mr. Lee regarding performance evaluation tools could lead to feedback to the SB, which might dovetail with this.

7:10 PM

Mr. Lee said that some of these questions give an opportunity to take a throw at him; that he didn't need to put those questions in and, if he was setting people up, he was setting himself up, as well.

7:11 PM 2) Sale of Town Equipment/Vehicles – Bid Awards

Mr. Lee described the bids that came in, their suggested disposition, and that they would just scrap the rest of the list of items not bid on. He suggested awarding Mr. (Doug) Warrender his choice of the 4-drawer fireproof cabinet at \$55, Ms. (Evelyn) Marshall her second choice of one of the black, fire-proof cabinets at \$30, and the Chevy Impala to Ms. Marshall at a price of \$526.

7:14 PM Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Select Board approve the sales of these items, as described by our Town Manager.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Fernald – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Ms. Davis – Yes Mr. Pomerleau – Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:15 PM 3) Mary Lizzy Spinney Trust – Legal Opinion

Mr. Lee said that someone came in requesting help through this fund, we dug out the will, and he wrote to MMA asking for advice; that this is their response to that request; that we must comply with all the terms and conditions, which includes that funds can only be expended under the direction of a nurse employed by the Town and the SB does not have any authority to step in and expend any money from the Trust; that the Town may request modification, or termination, of the Trust if terms would be impracticable, wasteful, or impaired the Trust's administration. He added that we ought to seek out someone who is a registered nurse who would be willing to serve as the trustee of this fund, or, we would have to use money to get a court to amend the Trust so that it falls under the discretion of the SB. He said that the SB has a copy of the will for their review and, at this point, nobody here has any right to expend any funds unless we find a nurse or amend the will.

7:18 PMMs. Davis asked if it was possible to utilize the Home Health Visiting Nurses Agency that usually receives money from the Town.

Mr. Murphy said that he thought we had retired, registered nurses in Town; that Ms. (Sharon) Kibbatt and the lady who used to be our Health Officer (Shannon Darr) and, maybe, we could ask one of them to fill in.

Mr. Lee agreed one of them might be willing to help.

Mr. Fernald agreed that would be the way to go; that he thought going through the agency would be a problem.

There was discussion regarding legal guidelines for administering the trust.

7:20 PM Mr. Pomerleau asked how much was in this fund.

Mr. Lee said that he thought it was \$34,000 to \$36,000. He added that he could write some guidelines for administering this trust.

7:25 PM

Mr. Lytle said that it bothers him that you have two prior Selectmen up there and two in the audience that they don't know that his wife, Jan, has been the nurse of those funds for the last 15 to 20 years. He added that the Town Manager could not find anything on record that showed she was the nurse and he doesn't know how that ever came about; that to see this come up, tonight, and go another route without talking to her about it, is bad.

Mr. Lee apologized, saying that he did not know.

7:26 PM Mr. Murphy apologized for not remembering that.

Mr. Lee said that, perhaps, there is no issue at all if Ms. Lytle has been the nurse of record of this fund for some time; that he thought it was a matter of putting it in writing, somewhere, because there is a lot of verbal history in this Town and writing wasn't a big thing; that getting it in writing and having her continue as she has been would probably be the easiest solution. He added that, if the SB liked, he could pursue that with Phil and Jan Lytle to see if she is still willing to serve in that capacity.

There was discussion on how this trust has been administered in the past and that there should be some guidelines developed.

7:31 PM Ms. Shapleigh suggested that the nurse work with General Assistance in giving out funds to the sick and needy.

Mr. Lee agreed that might be a good way to go, to work with General Assistance (GA) and, whatever GA can't do, they could bring in the nurse to see what the Trust might be able to do.

7:33 PM The Board was in general agreement that that was the way to go.

Ms. Adams said that, as a point of history, the SB voted in 2010 to take \$5,000 from that fund and put it in to the Winter Fuel Assistance Program.

Mr. Lee said that, theoretically, we could take the \$5,000 back out of the winter heating program and put it back in the Trust to rectify that situation. He asked Ms. Adams to send him the portion of the minutes she was referring to.

7:35 PM Mr. Murphy moved, second by Mr. Fernald, that the Select Board rectify the conditions of the will, restore \$5,000 from the Winter Fuel Assistance Program to the Mary Lizzy Spinney Trust.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Fernald – Yes Mr. Murphy – Yes Ms. Davis – Yes Mr. Pomerleau – Yes

Unanimous vote to approve motion.

7:38 PM 4) Scheduling of a Virtual Town Hall Demonstration (Website Upgrade) – Oct. 13

Mr. Lee said that he has had some interest from some Selectmen in this website upgrade and, if it is going to make it into a budget, we need to look at it; that the fellow would be willing to come in and do an approximate 15-minute presentation of the functionality of this new website software; that it's much more practical than what we are now using; that he wanted to see if the SB wanted him to come in for a short demonstration. He added that it simplified life for the Town Clerk in a lot of ways; that he thought it was around \$7,000 and he doesn't know if we want to invest that kind of money but you won't know until you see it. He asked the SB if they would like to see a demonstration.

7:40 PM The Board agreed that they wanted to see a demonstration. It was also agreed that the Budget Committee would be invited to this.

7:42 PM 5) Amend Upcoming Workshop Topics

Mr. Lee said that this was for SB review and asking for feedback. He added that he would not be here for October 6th; that there would be a workshop this coming Thursday to wrap up financial policies.

K. Select Board Public Protocol Participation

7:49 PM

Ms. Davis said that she wrote out a protocol a couple of meetings ago, largely a result of behavior that was exhibited at the meeting at the school gym; that it's not really something that we've experienced since then but she thinks it's important to codify how we approach meetings so that we can treat everyone fairly and make sure that everybody has a chance to speak and, also, to demonstrate the fact that we want public participation; that we just need to have it in an orderly fashion. She added that there was a longer article that gave some of the legal justifications for certain actions that can be taken and how you set things up and, in some cases, she does think we do need to have an idea of how we are going to approach things and that we need some decisions about how next Wednesday is going to go

because it may not be nice; that we need to agree, as a Board, how we're going to approach that so that we know, if 'this' happens, 'this' is what we do and we treat everybody equally.

7:51 PM Mr. Fernald said that, regarding the SB by-laws, we do have by-laws and rules of order of the Eliot SB that is part of the power of the boards and committees and it gives complete instructions on how meetings should be handled.

Ms. Davis asked if there was anything that disagreed with the protocol.

Mr. Fernald said that she put public participation as 2 minutes and the by-laws says 10 minutes; however, the times can be voted on by the Selectmen at the beginning of the meeting. He added that one of the things he gets concerned about is that this is for all boards and committees, not just the SB, and we already have standards for it; that he thinks that is what we should follow. He added that he would say this, that these standards reference, for instance, the regularly scheduled meetings, the second and fourth Thursday of each month – "a sequence of business shall be outlined on Attachment One" – he has not been able to find that Attachment One and he believes that is an actual agenda that is formatted that we should be following.

7:53 PM Ms. Davis said that that is a separate issue; that we will talk about agenda after but let's talk about public participation.

Mr. Fernald said that it also talks about public participation in these rules of order for the Eliot SB; that he thinks this is something that we need to go down through to take a look at, and that it is his suggestion. He added that he doesn't have any qualms about what Ms. Davis put in their packets, for herself, for guidelines in conducting a meeting but, if we vote on adopting anything like that, then we need to adopt things that are for all boards and committees, including the Board of Selectmen.

Ms. Davis said that she thinks there are rules that are good for a general meeting and we ever hardly have a problem; that her feeling is that she doesn't like to be incredibly formal and she likes people to be able to...she likes for audience members, if they have a problem and Mr. Lee is the one that can answer the question, she likes to see a lot of give and take; that she is not really in favor of time limits, necessarily; that approaching it that way, then, you create a problem for yourself when you do need to have limitations, when the meeting does go on and disrupts business, and keeps people here beyond a reasonable time; that she would ask the Board, based on that, how do we set up parameters and how do we make it clear and when can we invoke them, do we do it before each meeting. She said that she was anticipating next Wednesday that we have some serious business to conduct and the truth is that we have heard every argument on this case, ad

infinitum; that when we come into the meeting on Wednesday, she would like to see some agreement from Board members about how we are going to handle this and, then, looking down the road, how we want to handle things in the future. She said that she would take another look at the by-laws but asked if we could focus on what is going to happen next Wednesday. She asked for the Board's feelings.

7:56 PM

Mr. Pomerleau said that there is nothing on this list that in any way conflicts with our by-laws; that it's pretty boiler-plate, standard, everyday recommendations from Robert's Rules of Order, what's in our by-laws; that there's nothing in here that is terribly unique. He added that he agreed that, if we are going to have 100 people in the room, then we need speaking limits; that it is pretty rare that anybody speaks over 2 minutes.

Mr. Murphy said that he thought Ms. Davis's list was perfectly workable. He discussed that Ordinance Governing Boards and Commissions that govern the way they run their meetings; however, he favors a significant amount of formality because it lets everyone know where you are and better supports more accurate minutes; that people don't understand how much a little noise can wipe out a significant word in someone's discussion up here. He emphasized that formality is necessary when you have...particularly this upcoming workshop where you will have many, many people.

7:58 PM

Ms. Davis said that, that being the case, in a situation where we have an overwhelming public presence, she needs the support of the Board and we need a foreknowledge of how we are going to handle the situation; that she needs to know what the Board wants and, then, when it comes up, you need to help with the situation; because it got out of hand the last time and we had set up no rule. She added that we can't force people to be quiet, to sit down and she was anticipating that they would use a certain level of self-discipline, which they did not demonstrate; so, we, as a Board, need to decide how we will cope with that.

7:59 PM

Mr. Lee said that he thinks what Ms. Davis wrote is very normal and appropriate, very much in-line with what we currently do, and Robert's Rules of Order; that he thinks it's very necessary when we have big meetings of a lot of people who have a lot they would like to share. He added that, for Wednesday, he thinks we should use what the Chair has developed and support her in staying by a 2-minute speaking rule, etc. He added that he agreed with Mr. Fernald that, somewhere, we are missing a so-called Attachment 1 or Attachment A; that he guessed it was around at some point but he cannot locate what that draft agenda (rules of protocol) is supposed to look like; that he thought we should finish this particular policy – do that Appendix A that would clarify the protocols for meetings; that he thought it would be good to write it down.

8:01 PM

Mr. Murphy said that we finished that; that it's just been replaced and someone took it out because it no longer applies because the Selectmen wanted a different format and they achieved the format; that the one we use, now, is perfectly good and works for us now.

Mr. Lee said that all he was saying is let's document whatever we have into a policy because he has noticed that we have different things that seem to be missing certain things.

Mr. Fernald read, "Any member of the public may interject an opinion, or raise a question, by securing recognition of the presiding officer and being authorized to speak. In a debate, a member must confine himself to the questions under consideration and must avoid personalities and must not arraign motives...", etc.; that we have a whole document of information that helps us run meetings of those kinds and, no matter if we have 100 people or 20 people, all our boards and committees, including the SB, should go by those.

8:02 PM

Ms. Davis said that she did think that there are special circumstances and what we had going on tonight is different than what we will have going on next Wednesday; that we need to be prepared and need to set the ground rules so that everybody knows what the expectation is. She added that she does think there is a little less formality tonight because we are facing a limited group of people and we're asking for conversation and opinions, whereas, Wednesday should be a lot more formal and constrained so that it doesn't get out of hand.

Mr. Murphy suggested she needed to make a very strong point that she recognizes someone and say no to anyone else who wants to speak until that person is finished within the 2 minutes, or whatever she says.

8:04 PM

Mr. Fernald said that it also indicates, when people get out of order, what to do when that happens; what the Chair is allowed to do, etc., to bring it back to the SB, and that is all documented in here.

Mr. Murphy suggested to the Chair that, if it becomes a riot, declare a recess; that the meeting is over until they stop.

Mr. Pomerleau agreed with what Mr. Fernald said but that, in there, it says that the Chairman may set restrictions and time limits on speaking; that it isn't specific what they are but that is saying to do is just what she did tonight, setting a 2-minute limit of that meeting. He added that that is not specified in there but it says in there that the Chairman 'may set' those limitations; that she is exercising what you are reading from.

8:05 PM

Mr. Fernald clarified that what we have, here, and what had already been written, and what the committees and boards should go by, have already been written and voted on by the Selectmen. He added that, if this is going to be a guideline for this particular meeting, he has no problem with that, but it is not something he would vote on as a policy.

Ms. Davis said that we just need some clear direction for Wednesday and, something like this, you guys need to weigh in on so that we all go in knowing how it will all happen; that, if we are in agreement, then we will present ourselves as a united Board with an understanding of how we're going to conduct this meeting so that things don't get out of hand. She added that this brief list gives everybody a head's up about how it's going to work; that she think Mr. Lee volunteered to read the ground rules, saying that she thought that was a good idea because he is an impartial mediator.

8:06 PM Mr. Fernald said that he had no problem with that.

Ms. Davis reminded everyone it was a business meeting, too, and feels that we have heard these arguments time and time again, four years' worth, and she is half-inclined that she writes down the things we've heard and say this is repetition, don't go there or we let the first person say it and, then, we're done; that that needs to be part of the situation, we aren't talking about TIF, we aren't repeating ourselves multiple times.

8:07 PM

Mr. Lee said that he would be happy to read them, upfront, so that everybody has a clear expectation regarding the speaking protocol; that he did agree that, as a Board, and with the Town Manager, to help the Chair keep order during the meeting.

Ms. Davis asked if it was set up so that we can put a microphone in one place and have people line up to ask questions.

Mr. Lee said that he and Ms. Albert are going to do a dry-run on streaming, etc. and suggested he and Ms. Davis discuss any logistics concerns she may have.

L. Old Business:

There was no old business.

M. New Business:

8:09 PM

Ms. Davis said that she would read her letter, not expecting any action from the Board this evening but just wanting to introduce the topic regarding the TIF Alternatives Committee and it being able to fulfill its mission, including a flow

chart of steps to be taken. She added that, when she thought about what occurred at the last meeting, there was some confusion because, in some ways, we haven't made clear, step-by-step, what our expectations are; that she isn't even sure we have been clear about what the steps are. She said that there is some project management information that is general and tied in who would be responsible for each of those steps; that the chart, in particular, gives the step-by-step of how we proceed. She added that this will give the TIF Alternatives Committee some very specific direction; that they were asking for specifically what we wanted from them and this, used in conjunction with the original mission statement paperwork, should help to make that clear. She asked the Board to review this, as well as the November 6, 2014 (Attorney Fortin presentation), and would like to add this to our workshop for next Thursday.

It was the **consensus of the SB** to add this to their Thursday workshop agenda.

8:15 PM

Ms. Davis discussed the EBDC letter. She said that, as part of this, and she hopes Mr. Lee issues an invitation for Chair Horner to have some thoughts on this, she thinks the EBDC is particularly important in making recommendations from local businesses about what ideas they would like to see implemented in the amended TIF, if we get to that point. She said that they must have some suggestions about what would benefit them and those ideas would be invaluable to add that information; that to say that this committee can't move forward isn't exactly true because they can have some say in an amended TIF, there are many things her letter listed that they could be doing and, to some degree, she felt we were a bit premature in suspending that committee. She asked Mr. Lee to reach out to Ms. Horner to see if the committee would like to make a contribution of ideas to this; that that would be very helpful to the SB.

There was some discussion regarding the reasons for the request to suspend the EBDC and the possibilities for them to become engaged again.

N. Selectmen's Report:

Ms. Davis said that agendas came up during public participation discussion earlier and she feels this needs to be addressed. She read a portion of Article 2.6 of the Charter, "The Chair, or Vice-Chair in his or her absence, shall with the assistance of the Town Manager, set the agenda..." She added that the fact is that the Charter says that the Chair sets the agenda; that the Chair works with the Town Manager, looks at the time constraints, who is attending, and the best management of our time during the meeting with many considerations in view. She said that, therefore, with the Charter as her guidance, she reserves the right to set up the agenda in any way that seems appropriate for each meeting and cannot agree to stick with a particular template; that there are times when a department head is here and she wants that department head to state their business and be

allowed to go home or there are items she knows will have a lot of public participation and she would like that to occur after we conduct our business. She said that, based on that, she appreciates everybody's participation and suggestions, and if you have things you want to go on the agenda, please submit them but, be aware that, in the final analysis, it is the Chair that sets the agenda and that is the way we will be proceeding in the future.

8:25 PM Mr. Fernald said that the agenda is pre-set with its categories, such as Department Heads, when the public can speak, etc., and the Chair fills in those items with the detail that is before her and the Town Manager at the time.

Mr. Murphy said that Ms. Davis is not her Chair, she is the Select Board's Chair to do what we want.

8:26 PM Ms. Davis reiterated that the Chair sets the agenda and that is the way it will occur in the future.

O. Committee Vacancy Report

8:22 PM Mr. Murphy said that the Conservation Commission would really like to have more members, as well as the Energy Committee.

P. Adjourn

There was a motion and second to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 PM.

VOTE 4-0 Chair votes in the affirmative

DATE : December 8, 2016	
	S:/
	Mr. John Murphy, Secretary