



**TOWN COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 3, 2010**

Michael Bowie, Chair District 2 2012
Gina Mason, Vice Chair District 1 2010
Fern Laroche, Jr., At Large 2010
Roger Cote, At Large 2011
Mark Lunt, District 1 2012
Dale Crafts, District 2 2010
Lori Pomelow, At Large 2012

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE TO THE FLAG. The Chairman, Michael Bowie, called the meeting to order and led the pledge of allegiance to the flag at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL. Members present were Councilors Bowie, Crafts, Laroche, Cote, Pomelow and Lunt. Councilor Mason was excused. Also present were Stephen Eldridge, Town Manager; Donald Fellows, Budget Advisory Board; and no citizens in the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING - NONE

CONSENT AGENDA

VOTE (2010-124) Councilor Pomelow, seconded by Councilor Laroche moved to approve the minutes of June 1, 2010, June 15, 2010, and a renewal Victualer's License for Mark LaRoche d/b/a Mark's Inc.

Order passed - Vote 6-0.

COUNCIL ORDERS, RESOLUTIONS, & ORDINANCES

STREET LIGHT ORDINANCE

(Final Passage)

Mr. Eldridge said we made one change. Councilor Bowie said the copy I got in my packet still reads under 7.3 General Residential "...minimal spacing interval of approximately 220 feet as feasible..." We were going to change that to read at "spacing intervals of no less than 220 feet or where feasible", according to my notes from the last meeting.

Mrs. Lycette said Mr. Chairman, I think, at the last Council meeting the Council wanted to delete the words "as feasible". Councilor Crafts said you did. Councilor Bowie said, yes, I think it should read "mid-block locations at a spacing interval of no less than 220 feet given existing utility pole and light pole spacing". Mr. Eldridge said my mistake. Councilor Bowie said that's all right. We can still pass it with that, we just need to publish it with that language. I think that was the only change we had to this particular ordinance.

VOTE (2010-125) Councilor Crafts, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to adopt the Street Light Ordinance with modifications to Section 7.3 to read: "at a spacing interval of no less than 220 feet", and to delete "as feasible" as corrected as follows:

Town of Lisbon Street Lighting Ordinance

1.0 BACKGROUND

Street lighting design is primarily concerned with the selection and location of street lighting equipment so as to provide adequate visibility and increased safety for pedestrians and vehicles while making the most efficient use of energy with minimal expenditure. By providing an adequate level of illumination and uniformity of distribution along roadways, satisfactory visibility and lighting patterns can be achieved that will aid vehicle and pedestrian travel and minimize potential conflict between the two.

Lighting also promotes the visual appeal of a community and creates an environment that pedestrians feel safe accessing during the night. Too much light cast by overhead streetlights creates glare for vehicles and pedestrians alike and obscures the aesthetics of a nighttime downtown environment, creating a streetscape that can appear dreary and empty. Sufficient street lighting provides a necessary amount of light and contributes to an environment that pedestrians feel comfortable accessing at night. Ornamental and streetscape lighting has demonstrated an improved visual appeal for the Town of Lisbon, along Main and Village Streets. Properly installed ornamental lighting creates an environment that is aesthetically pleasing and inviting to nighttime use by pedestrians.

The Town of Lisbon's street lighting standards as promulgated in this policy account for factors such as traffic volume, nighttime pedestrian activity, crime prevention, light pollution, and energy conservation. It is understood that while vehicle headlights are the preferred method of illumination for vehicles, street lighting is particularly useful in areas of potential vehicle and pedestrian conflict, such as intersections and other pedestrian crossing locations. Additionally, along routes with high vehicle travel volume, the pattern of poles and street lighting can provide guidance to motorists.

It is also understood that ornamental and streetscape lighting is the preferred method of lighting for pedestrian travel and safety. Overhead street lighting creates downward-cast shadows, while properly designed streetscape lighting illuminates the faces of pedestrians and creates an inviting ambiance for pedestrians. Based on studies of the relationship between street lighting and crime it can be concluded that streetlights will not reduce the likelihood that crimes will take place; however, properly located lighting reduces the perceived fear associated with crime, increasing the likelihood that pedestrians will access the Center and Falls at night, thus contributing to an effect of more "eyes on the street."

Lighting levels for roadway street lighting is generally based on Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IES) recommendations contained in IES publication RP-8-00 Roadway Lighting. IES guidelines are based on geometric, operational, and environmental factors and suggest average roadway luminance and uniformity ratios to reduce traffic accidents. Although the IES standards are desirable to attain for roadways with high traffic volumes, the IES standard do not easily translate to rural and residential roadway lighting applications where traffic flow and speed are not the primary concern. The standards recommended by the IES would be best applied to Lisbon on roadways where traffic flow, speed, and the potential pedestrian conflicts are of primary concern such as sections of Main Street (in Lisbon Falls,) and Village Street (in Lisbon Center.)

The standards and ordinances for streetlight that were referenced in the development of this policy include:

- “American National Standard Practice for Roadway Lighting,” Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.
- “Promoting Quality Outdoor Lighting in Your Community,” Maine State Planning Office, Lighting Technical Assistance Bulletin.
- “Roadway Lighting: Design Guide,” American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. October 2005.
- “Salt Lake City Street Lighting Master Plan and Policy,” Salt Lake City Community Development Department.
- “Town of Aberdeen Street Lighting Policy and Guidelines,” Town of Aberdeen, North Carolina.
- “Design Standards for Outdoor Lighting,” City of Lincoln and Lancaster County, Nebraska. Building and Safety Department Design Standards, Chapter 3.100.
- “Street Lighting Standards,” City of Bremerton, Washington, Department of Public Works and Utilities: Engineering Division, Design Standards: Division 7.
- “Street Lighting Policy,” City of San Angelo, Texas. Public Works Department.
- “Town of Chapel Hill Design Manual,” Town of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Engineering Department.

2.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to establish the standards for the placement, operation, and maintenance of street lighting within the public right-of-way. This policy intends to promote the public health, safety, and welfare of the Town by providing lighting that appropriately and adequately illuminates developed and future public right-of-ways by:

- 2.1. Providing street lighting levels that protect the safety, security, and nighttime-use and enjoyment in public right-of-ways by the public;
- 2.2. Providing adequate street lighting level that will promote pedestrian nighttime use in areas with high crime rates;
- 2.3. Reducing light pollution and glare caused by street lighting;
- 2.4. Promoting energy conservation; and
- 2.5. Enhancing the aesthetics of the built environment.

3.0 AUTHORITY

Pursuant to the Town of Lisbon’s Code of Ordinances, (Insert Code reference,) the Town Engineer / Public Works Department/Public Safety(Police and Fire) Department shall be responsible for all matters relating to all electrical utilities of the Town and shall coordinate and control the activities related to the operations and maintenance of all street lights.

4.0 DEFINITIONS

4.1. Arterial Roadway - A public roadway shown on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation, further classified as a major or minor arterial, providing longer through travel between major trip generators (large cities, recreational areas, etc.)

4.2. Alley - A public roadway providing access to the service entrances of buildings primarily used by service vehicles, where through traffic is usually discouraged, and carrying a low volume of traffic.

4.3. Collector Roadway - A public roadway shown on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation as a collector street which collects traffic from local roads and also connects smaller cities and town with each other and to the arterials.

4.4. Local Roadway - A public roadway shown on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation as a local street providing direct access within identifiable neighborhoods and lands, where through traffic is usually discouraged, and carrying a low volume of traffic.

4.5. Light pole - A pole owned by the Town, located in the public right-of-way used to mount ornamental lighting or an overhead streetlight.

4.6. Luminaire - A complete lighting unit consisting of a lamp or lamps together with the parts designed to distribute the light, position, and protect the lamp and connect the lamp to the power supply.

4.7. Ornamental and Streetscape Lighting - Lighting mounted on stand-alone light poles, within the public right-of-way, typically no more than ten to 15 feet in height, used to illuminate sidewalks, building facades, and in some instances the entire street.

4.8. Public Right-of-Way - A strip of land acquired by deed, reservation, dedication, forced dedication, prescription, or condemnation and intended to be occupied or occupied by a roadway, crosswalk, railroad, electric transmission line, oil or gas pipeline, water line, sanitary or storm sewer other similar use.

4.9. Roadway - For the purposes of this policy, any portion of a public right-of-way that is paved or graveled and used for vehicle and pedestrian travel.

4.10. Semi-cutoff - A luminaire where less than 5 percent of the lamp lumens occur at or above the horizontal plane and no more than 20 percent of the lamp lumens occur above 80 degrees above the vertical plane (nadir).

4.11. Streetlight - Any light operated and maintained by the Town that is used for the purpose of lighting a roadway within a public right-of-way mounted on a utility pole or light pole that directs light to the roadway from a typical height of 25 to 35 feet above ground.

4.12. Spacing - The distance between successive luminaires measured along the centerline of the roadway.

4.13. Utility pole - A pole owned and maintained by a utility company used to support power lines, telephone lines, cable lines, etc.

5.0 APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all streetlights located within public right-of-ways. Street lighting improvements shall be made:

- 5.1. During routine maintenance and capital improvements by the Town or its contractors.
- 5.2. When new public streets are constructed, improved, or closed.
- 5.3. When new development is proposed that impacts the downtown streetscape.
- 5.4. When the Town Council makes recommendations and has a majority vote.

6.0 GENERAL

6.1. The installation and maintenance of street lights within the limits of the Town of Lisbon shall conform to the standards set forth in this policy.

6.2. The Town Engineer is responsible to oversee the maintenance and operation of Town streetlights (A contractor) shall be responsible for the installation, replacement, removal, and maintenance of all Town street lights in conformance with the standards set forth in this policy.

7.0 STREET LIGHT PLACEMENT STANDARDS

Street Light placement within public right-of-ways shall conform to the following standards as feasible given utility pole spacing and light pole spacing:

7.1. Village Zone - For any roadway within the Village Area Zone indicated on the Street Light Service Map in Appendix B:

7.2.1. One streetlight shall be located at all roadway intersections *and mid-block locations* at a spacing interval of approximately 220 feet as feasible given existing utility pole and light pole spacing.

7.2.2. Street segments less than 350 feet in length shall only be lit at roadway intersections and dead ends.

7.2.3. Ornamental and streetscape lighting may be used to light roadways where sidewalks are present and highlight public building facades and public areas as determined. Ornamental lighting currently serves to light the public right-of-way for portions of Main Street, Village Street, Webster Street, and a short distance of Route 196 (Lisbon Street.) If Ornamental Lighting is the standard than all other lighting will be removed from poles unless it is determined by the Town Engineer, Public Safety (Police, Fire) and Public Works Department determine the need exists.

7.3. General Residential, Limited Residential, Limited Rural Residential

One streetlight shall be located at all roadway intersections and may be located at **mid block locations** at a spacing interval of no less than 220 feet given existing utility pole and light pole spacing. For any roadway within this area indicated on the Street Light Service Map in Appendix B:

7.3.1. For **principal arterial** as defined on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation, street lighting will be provided at a spacing interval of approximately 220 feet and at intersections, steep hills, and sharp corners, and or as feasible given existing utility pole and light poles spacing.

7.3.2. For **minor arterials** and **collector** roadways as defined on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation, street lighting will be provided at a spacing interval of approximately 440 feet and at intersections, steep hills, and sharp corners, and at mid-block locations as feasible given existing utility pole and light poles spacing.

7.3.3. For all **other roadways** within this zone, street lighting will be provided at intersections, steep hills, and sharp corners, and at mid-block locations at a spacing interval of 660 feet for street segments greater than 1,000 feet and at the end of all cul-de-sac and dead end streets longer than 440 feet.

7.0? Commercial, Industrial and Diversified Zones

7.3.1. For **principal arterial** as defined on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation, street lighting will be provided at a spacing interval of approximately 220 feet and at intersections, steep hills, and sharp corners, and at mid-block locations as feasible given existing utility pole and light poles spacing.

7.3.2. For **minor arterials** and **collector** roadways as defined on the most recent functional classification map generated by the Maine Department of Transportation, street lighting will be provided at a spacing interval of approximately 440 feet and at intersections, steep hills, and sharp corners, and at mid-block locations as feasible given existing utility pole and light poles spacing.

7.3.3. For all **other roadways** within this zone, street lighting will be provided at intersections, steep hills, and sharp corners, and at mid-block locations at a spacing interval of 660 feet for street segments greater than 1,000 feet and at the end of all cul-de-sac and dead end streets longer than 440 feet.

7.4. Rural Open Space I & II - For any roadway within this service area as indicated on the Street Light Service Map in Appendix B, street lighting will only be provided at public roadway intersections, steep hill, and sharp corners.

7.5. Situational Applications - Additional street lighting shall be provided up to the Roadway Standard suggested by the IES in RP-8-00 Roadway Lighting at the discretion of the Town Engineer in the following situations:

7.5.1. At highway entrances and exits, at-grade railroad crossings, bridges, schools, and transit stops as determined by the Engineer. Streetscape lighting shall be the preferred method of illumination at transit stops as feasible.

7.5.2. At locations of high vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-pedestrian accidents. Such lighting shall be installed by the Engineer in partnership with the Police Department.

7.5.3. At targeted locations where high crime is a documented problem as determined by the Police Department. Streetscape lighting shall be the preferred method of illumination as feasible.

8.0 STREET LIGHT POLES AND FIXTURE STANDARDS

Streetlight installation within public right-of-ways shall conform to the following standards as feasible given the existing spacing of utility poles and light poles:

8.1. Town streetlights shall be mounted on existing or future utility poles or light poles.

8.2. Street lights shall be installed at a height of approximately 25 to 35 feet or as determined by the Town and based on guidelines provided by the IES Roadway Standard.

8.3. To reduce glare and sky illumination, streetlights purchased and/or installed by the Town or its contractor shall be of the semi-cutoff type. Existing streetlights or equipment currently in stock shall not be required to conform to this requirement.

8.4. The Town shall seek to minimize energy usage by streetlights by choosing optimal lighting configurations (i.e. intersections lighting) and using the most cost-effective and innovative technology available including Light Emitting Diode (LED) or other future technologies as financially prudent.

8.5. Streetlights installed at intersections shall not exceed the equivalent electricity usage of a 250 watt High-Pressure Sodium (HPS) fixture.

8.6. Streetlights installed at midblock locations shall not exceed the equivalent electricity usage of a 150 watt HPS fixture. Fixture wattage may be reduced to an electrical usage of less than 70 watt HPS equivalent fixtures at the discretion of the Engineer.

8.7. Streetlights shall illuminate only roadways found within the public right-of-way. Public streetlights servicing private property or private roadways and the intersection between private and public roadways shall be discontinued within 90 days of verification.

9.0 INSTALLATION STANDARDS

9.1. The Town shall install and remove street lights not in conformance with this policy.

9.2. All installation, maintenance, and removal of existing Town streetlights shall be carried out by a licensed electrician contracted by the Town. New street lighting proposed for new subdivisions and roadways shall be installed and designed by private contractors and reviewed by the Planning Board to make sure that it is in conformance with this policy by to the specifications determined by the Town and in accordance with this policy.

9.3. Street lighting installed or removed in error may be requested by Town residents and property owners for installation or removal in conformance with this policy.

9.4 All requests for additional or new street lighting shall be directed to the City Engineer and will go through a review process. The review will include Public

Works Public Safety (Police, Fire) Department to insure that it is in compliance of the policy and safety codes.

9.5 All changes of street lights; removal, addition of or change in design must first be reviewed by the Town Engineer, Public Safety Departments (Police and Fire) and Public Works prior to installation. All changes or requests must be in writing and final approval must be documented by the Town Engineer and date of installation must be recorded.

10.0 REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL STREET LIGHTING

10.1. Property owners may request in writing (application) additional street lighting for roadway illumination purposes from the electrical utility company at no cost to the Town and on approval by the Town Engineer/Public Works/Public Safety and 100% of all property owners within 440 feet of the proposed streetlight location. The Town Engineer shall use the following criteria in evaluating requests:

10.1.1. General conformance with the Streetlight Policy Pole and Fixture Standard.

10.1.2. General conformance with uniformity, lumen output, and color of other streetlights along the roadway in question.

10.2. A written notice to the electrical utility company from the Town Engineer stating the reason for the additional lighting and documenting the 100% approval of property owners within 440 feet shall be provided before installation of additional lighting may commence. It shall be the electrical utility company's responsibility to ensure that line clearances and service are acceptable and adequate.

11.0 ORNAMENTAL AND STREETScape LIGHTING

Ornamental and streetscape lighting shall be installed for streets by the Town to illuminate pedestrian walkways, public building facades, and roadways at the discretion of the Town Council in areas designated by the Town Council. All lighting in this category must meet the guidelines of the proposed Downtown Revitalization Committee;

Design Committee and by review of the School Committee if there is any impact to the school department.

12.0 APPEAL Process

Refer to Town of Lisbon Code of Ordinances; Chapter 2, Division 4. Appeals; Zoning Board of Appeals*

13.0 EFFECTIVE DATE

TBD

14.0 APPENDIX

- A. ZONING MAP**
- B. STREET LIGHT SERVICE MAP**
- C. STREET LIGHT DESIGN MAP**
 - a. PRESENT PLAN**
 - b. FUTURE PLAN**
- D. STREET LIGHTING INVENTORY**

Councilor Lunt said have we seen the maps and stuff that are referred to in this document. Mr. Eldridge said you have a Planning Board meeting at the end of this month and as soon as those are approved by them, it will come before you, and then once you approve them, they will be attached to the back of this. If things don't turn out to be the way it is, we will change them here and bring it back to you. Councilor Cote said we aren't putting the horse before the cart are we here. Councilor Bowie said I don't think so, I think, we are putting an ordinance in place and then just finalizing the maps to support it.

Councilor Cote said the thing is, once you vote and agree with that. Councilor Bowie said, but an ordinance can be changed anytime. If the Planning Board comes through with something that they want changed based on the maps, or we decide when we look at it we want to change it, because some of your changes on the maps may not impact any of the language within the document, however, if you do make a change on the map that would impact the language, then we'll just modify the ordinance. Councilor Larochelle said we have to start somewhere. Councilor Pomelow said just for clarification, at the last meeting I thought we said that the Planning Board had already looked at this draft and that they didn't have any recommendations. Councilor Bowie said they had looked at this draft ordinance, but we haven't gone through the mapping changes for the lighting and everything. Mr. Eldridge said you mean zoning changes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Vote By Roll Call - Yeas: Councilor Bowie, Larochelle, Crafts, Cote, Pomelow, and Lunt. Nays: None. Order Passed - Vote 6-0.

US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
2010 COPS GRANT APPLICATION

Councilor Bowie said this item I brought back before Council, because I think we did an injustice to ourselves, we didn't pay attention to what was in our packets and we didn't pay attention to what was going on, so I don't think we did a very good job. As Chairman, I don't think I did a good job, because I didn't ask enough questions and had this put onto the Consent Agenda and us pass that. Once I found out what this grant entailed, my original thought was that this grant was just simply for radios and those types of things, but when I was questioned by an individual I did some research and found out this was actually a hiring resource. I don't think Council understood that when we voted. I don't think we did our job, right, so we are all to blame here, because we didn't ask the questions, have the literature in our packets, or even ask why it wasn't in there, so shame on us for not doing that. Once I found that out, I felt obligated to bring it back before Council to readdress this. This is a COPS Grant, which is actually funding a position at 100% through a Federal grant for three years, then we are obligated should we get awarded the grant, to keep that position for a fourth year in our municipal budget. There is no cost to the Town of Lisbon for the first three years, not knowing where we are going to be in that fourth year, we will still have to account for that resource for the fourth year. After that, everything is open for whatever happens. You can see in your paperwork that this was actually a grant that started in 2009; a number of agencies nationwide applied and only about 1,000 agencies were awarded it out of the 7,000 that applied. Now, this Grant in 2010, only those that applied in 2009 that were not awarded it can apply.

Councilor Crafts said say you take the grant and hire someone. Next year the State cuts back, who knows what, then we are locked into not reducing the size of the police force at all, right. Councilor Bowie said I believe you're locked into, and I wish the Chief was here, but he's on vacation and I didn't want to let this fester and go any additional length of time, is that this money is funded 100%, it's a revenue in and out, so for the next three years it's a net zero on our budget.

Councilor Crafts said I don't think you understand my question. My question is, you've hired an additional police officer. Councilor Bowie said he would be the lowest. Mr. Eldridge said he would come in at the basic rate. Councilor Crafts said I understand that. Mr. Eldridge said that position has to be held, that's my understanding, you can't eliminate that position, because you have committed to keeping that position. Councilor Crafts said so then you hire this new low man on the totem pole and so you can't reduce anybody else. I think it locks you in, so that if we have some tough financial times ahead, we're locked in. Mr. Eldridge said I can't answer that question. Councilor Bowie said I don't know what the answer to that question is either. Councilor Crafts said the other thing is, we don't know what the future is going to be like. Councilor Bowie said I don't know how this grants works within the union agreement from that standpoint and it, also, would depend upon what resources you were taking out of the Police Department. You could reduce non-union positions, right. Councilor Crafts said you could. Councilor Bowie said absolutely, because what we are getting tied around here is that when you bring this officer in under the grant onto the municipal books, it would be a union position, so now I think and I don't know how much control this is as a union position, based on it being funded by the grant. I don't know what things take place there. It could be that we could reduce and you just have to keep that individual, because that's the position funded by the grant.

Councilor Crafts said wouldn't everybody do that, Mike, that's perfect, let's do it; we'll reduce a guy and get the free money. Councilor Bowie said, well, you can't have everybody do it, because you have to be awarded the grant and it's only if the Federal government is passing out grant money. Councilor Crafts said, listen, we win the award. Councilor Bowie said I'm not defending whether or not we should have it or not, I'm just trying to explain it. Councilor Crafts said, I know, I'm just saying we win the award, we've got a police officer, and you are not going to convince me unless I see some more additional information, that the Federal government is going to allow you to pick somebody else. Councilor Lunt said what you're saying, Dale, is you get this free guy and you can't just lay another guy off immediately. Mr. Eldridge said it would be like any other process and if we decide to go to the Police Department to make those cuts, again, it's going to come through the whole budget process like we always go through; where are we going to make the cuts and still try to maintain our level of service.

Councilor Bowie said I think the question we are trying to get an answer to is, what legalities are we stuck to based on having this position in-house on the books that would limit us, right, because Dale has a very valid point. If we've got to make a decision next year and if we've got to cut heads across the board in all departments for whatever reasons, not saying we are going to have to, the way this is currently defined would lead us to believe that we can't touch the Police Department, because you can't cut the lowest guy on the totem pole who is covered by the grant so I can't take anybody else out. What we need to understand is, what are the rules, how does that impact us, and how would the union contract handle this position. I think we need to understand that first.

Councilor Cote said another thing, too, is that we cut Public Works, we cut all the other departments throughout the town, and then the police department adds positions through a grant, it just goes against the grain of everything that we've done. Councilor Laroche said if Public Works got a grant that would be kind of nice. Councilor Bowie said I don't dispute any of that, that's why I brought it back to the table, because I found out what it was about.

Councilor Laroche said it would be nice to find out if we hired Joe Smith and for some reason he does not stay with us for the length of that grant, how does that work. I'm just kind of curious. Mr. Eldridge said you're funding that extra position. Councilor Bowie said I don't think it's tied to an individual. You can't guarantee that the individual you bring in will stay that next year, he may decide he wants to go to Lewiston and if he goes to Lewiston, you've still got the grant money, so you're liable to fill that position for the remaining next two years, and then you've got to keep it for the next year.

Councilor Laroche said but there is a number value, meaning that if you had 10 officers before you got this grant, you got to maintain 11 officers, say next year in the budget he was to leave and we were to fund getting rid of two officers, but this grant would fill in for one of them. Mr. Eldridge said, no. Councilor Laroche said would it work that way or do you have to maintain that one beyond or could for the 2nd or 3rd year it maintain a position that would have been lost.

Councilor Bowie said I don't know how that works. There is probably language in the actual writing of the grant and there are stipulations, which we don't have, right, but I'm sure David does, and he could answer some of those questions.

Councilor Laroche said say next year for some reason, we lose one of the resource officers at the school and we not able to fund it, would this grant be able to step in and fill that position, if we got rid of somebody else. Councilor Bowie said I don't think something like that can be done. Councilor Laroche said you wouldn't think so, but it would be nice to know.

Councilor Crafts said this is a jobs stimulus grant, it's to create jobs. I'll be shocked if they allow you to reduce any other numbers of officers and still keep this grant. It defeats the whole purpose of it. They've given an incentive for every single town to apply for this grant just to get the Federal government to fund an officer. The other issue that I have is, we don't know what four years is going to bring and we'll be locked into hiring that person in four years. When we look at the economic times that we've got out there, it makes me a little nervous.

Councilor Bowie said understanding this now and knowing that we all have questions, we should bring this back on August 17 and give David a chance to answer some of the questions we talked about tonight. This would give David a chance to help explain the details about how it works, and then you can take another vote on it then.

Councilor Lunt said can you tell me the actual grant language, that would help. Councilor Crafts said he needs to get it from David. Councilor Pomelow said without being inundated with paperwork, if there is instructions, can you highlight information that would be crafted for review that would be helpful.

Councilor Bowie said the thing I want to emphasize is, Council we had a job to do, right, and we didn't do our job. We all have to remember that we get packets of information to review and go through. It is our responsibility as Councilors to do our job and be thorough in what we are doing. We can't be lax on things. We've got to make sure we are asking questions. We've got to make sure we are looking at stuff. It is important that we get our packets early, get through the data, and review it, so that we are prepared at these meetings. We will move this item to the next agenda.

PROMOTION COMMITTEE'S ITINERANT
VENDOR /12 MONTH MASS GATHERING PERMIT

Mr. Eldridge said there were some questions that arose during the Moxie Festival and during the Concerts in the Park about vendors and health inspections and permits and stuff. That's Twila's forte and I'm going to let her explain the dilemma and what you can do.

Mrs. Lycette said we adopted the Victualer's Ordinance in 1993 at Town Meeting, prior to that we were governed by State Statute, which had very little definition. I do recall a discussion the previously Selectmen had surrounding Victualer's licenses and Moxie Day. It was my understanding that the Selectmen required Health Officer inspections for all food vendors on Moxie Day, but that they intended licenses and fees be waived, which has been the procedure for over a decade now. For clarification, perhaps the Council should specifically waive these requirements each year at renewal time.

At this time, the Revitalization Group/Promotions Committee would like the Council to do the same thing for their festivities this year and would like the Council to amend their permit to include that privilege.

Councilor Bowie said this is more for mass gathering events that are sponsored by the town. Mrs. Lycette said like festivals. Councilor Bowie said, right, the whole Moxie thing is a town item. Now with the revitalization that's going on and the economic efforts there, which are all basically sponsored by the town, what I think they are referring to is that the town sponsored mass gathering efforts would be free from fees. However, I strongly agree that the health inspector needs to inspect everything to make sure it's in compliance, because we are having citizens in our community as well as outside the community come in to participate in these things and should they get sick or things not go well, right, that's not good PR for our municipality. Councilor Cote said not only that, what would happen if we had a mass problem and made a bunch of people sick. Are we liable for that?

Mrs. Lycette said, for instance, the Promotion Committee currently has an application process for their vendors, so if you are part of the Concert in the Park series, you fill out an application and file it with Rosie. Then, either you are granted permission or not, based on their criteria on what they want at their festival, so what they are asking for is if it's a food vendor, they would like to not have to charge them an additional fee. This particular vendor at the Concert in the Park series is already paying a fee to the Promotion Committee, so they are asking that we not charge them an additional \$75 food-vending fee, but I understand you would like to do the same thing we do for Moxie Day and have the health inspector inspect all the food vendors. Councilor Bowie said, yes.

Councilor Cote said is there a cost involved in having the health inspector check all this. Councilor Bowie said, no, we already pay the health officer to perform those functions within the town; she does all the restaurants and all the vendors she's responsible for inspecting. She can go visit them on a moment's notice, just show up, if you don't meet the criteria she has the right to shut you down, and she has done that.

Councilor Lunt said how many events a year are we talking about here. Mrs. Lycette said the only ones I know about are the October Festival and the Christmas Tree Lighting event. Councilor Bowie said it's probably four or less. Councilor Larochelle said there are seven Concerts in the Park, so we're probably looking at 8-10 at most.

Councilor Larochelle said do you know if the vendor, like the Concert in the Park food vendor, when they come in to get permission and fill out a bunch of information as far as liability insurance and all that, do you know if the application that this group has is as complete as what the town would be asking for? I realize that we don't want to charge whatever the fee is again, but my concern wouldn't be so much the money as it is the application and whether it's as adequate as what the town would use, you know, proof of liability insurance and whatever. Mrs. Lycette said the itinerant vendor/mass gathering permit that you gave to the Promotion Committee gives them the right to hire or monitor the vendor activity so that's separate from the amendment that we are talking about, which is for food. The amendment they are asking for is for food vendors to not have to pay another fee on top of their registration fee. An itinerant vendor selling crafts and homemade things would fall under the itinerant/mass gathering permit section, and what they are asking for is to waive the licensing fee for the Victualer's or food part.

Councilor Larochelle said I guess that's what my question is, are we only looking at the fee or are we looking at the application process itself. I just want to be clear on it, is that when they fill out an application to be a vendor, say at a Concert in the Park, are they filling out an application and paying a fee to the Promotional Committee, and is it the same application.

Mrs. Lycette said it is not the same application. She does gather their information, names, phone numbers, and some stuff, but it is not identical to ours. Councilor Larochelle said do they meet the same requirements as far as liability insurance as so forth. Mrs. Lycette said the health officer as part of her inspection, makes sure that they have their State license and any local permits that would be required. For instance, the guy that is currently doing the Concert in the Park series has a State license and he has a local permit from Brunswick. Councilor Larochelle said so our local health officers signs off on his permit before he's allowed to go into the park. Mrs. Lycette said her policy has always been that they have to have a State license before she grants them permission to get a local permit. Councilor Larochelle said I was just wondering. I know there are two different fees so if we were to give them that application and they were to pay their fee for the Concert in the Park and to the town for a food vending permit, maybe we're double dipping. I'm just making sure they still meet the same requirements.

Mrs. Lycette said you would prefer they fill out an application, meet the health inspection and local licensing requirements; is that what you're thinking. Councilor Larochelle said I would just hope in the process that they meet the same requirements as any vendor would for any participation in town, regardless of the Concerts in the Park or the Promotional Committee's involvement, that's all. If there is a certain criteria or process that we have for vendors selling food in town to follow, I'm not talking about the dollar figure, but more the criteria, then we should make sure we have all the information. Mrs. Lycette said that would be an appropriate amendment, sure. Councilor Larochelle said maybe it's not a big deal, but it just seems as though the Concert in the Park shouldn't be any different than the guy selling hot dogs beside the road, to me they ought to meet the same criteria, if that's what we are looking at tonight.

Mrs. Lycette said I think you can just make it a requirement that they meet the local standards, waive the fee and the application. Councilor Larochelle said part of that \$75.00 fee we usually charge is the idea of the manpower for the code enforcement person, to make sure they meet the codes. Mrs. Lycette said I think you're right, it's important that somebody makes sure they have a items like a fire extinguisher, etc. and that their food service quality is up to standards. Councilor Larochelle said maybe they are all self-sufficient, but we'd hate to see a bunch of extension cords running across the park if it's raining out. I mean there are certain things you want to make sure of. Mrs. Lycette said so a code inspection and a health inspection should be required. Although a code inspection probably isn't required on Moxie Day, but we do have an electrician available that day who checks it all out to make sure that it's all appropriate. Councilor Larochelle said I don't want to make any extra work, I just want to make sure we're not skipping an avenue by trying to reduce the cost to the vendor. Mrs. Lycette said when I talked to the attorneys at MMA (Maine Municipal Association) they said that certainly you, as a Council, have the right to waive licensing requirements and fees for special events like these and I would assume adding a condition is fine, too.

Councilor Bowie said would it make sense to have Rosie or somebody come in and explain what their process is for going through what people have to fill out for an application and what they look for to understand [their process]. That way maybe they can get our understanding of the fact that we think it's important they are following the right codes and are protecting themselves and the citizens and are inspected health-wise correctly and just have that kind of communication with them. Mrs. Lycette said the information I saw that she gathers looks quite adequate. You could contact these individuals, you knew where they lived, had their phone numbers, their address, and names. Councilor Bowie said but how different is it. Mrs. Lycette said I'm only asking for a date of birth so that we could do a public background check if needed.

Mr. Eldridge said when they apply for a permit they have to fill out an application. Does the application contain the same information? Mrs. Lycette said pretty much the same except for a couple of things. It's pretty much the same, very similar. Councilor Larochelle said without asking, I didn't know if that would meet the same requirements or not.

Mr. Eldridge said I'll get you a copy so you can all see. Councilor Bowie said so does that mean we want to move this to the 17th. Mr. Eldridge said I'll put it in your packet, but it's the same information: name, address, phone number. What else does Rosie ask for? She doesn't ask for their date of birth, because we don't do background checks, you do that. Mrs. Lycette said it's not a requirement for a victualer's license, but if you needed it you would have it. Councilor Larochelle said I would assume that if they have a State license, that means they meet all of the liability insurance and all that stuff. Mr. Eldridge said yes. Councilor Larochelle said, which is fine, I just want to make sure we are covering all of our bases.

Councilor Crafts said we want to waive that fee tonight. Councilor Bowie said okay.

VOTE (2010-127) Councilor Crafts, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to waive the Victualer fees for the Promotion Committee's Itinerant Vendor/Mass Gathering Permit.

Councilor Pomelow said is there a fee associated with the background check. Mrs. Lycette said yes, \$21.00; she already collects \$50.00 though from the vendor when they apply. Councilor Pomelow said that covers the cost of doing this if you need to, so if we are waiving the fee we are not actually losing money. Mrs. Lycette said, no, we would be waiving the additional \$75.00 fee. Councilor Bowie said, just so you know, we are not doing background checks for these. Mrs. Lycette said that's correct. Councilor Bowie said we don't do background checks for Victualer's, just for the mass gathering permits that we are exempting the fees for. If somebody comes in for a regular Victualer's license, or whatever, to Twila to open up a shop or sell coffee, she may go through a background check if she sees it necessary. Mrs. Lycette said the fee we want to waive is under the Victualer's ordinance, it says that all these food vendors would have to be licensed as a victualer. We're saying we would like the Council to waive that fee under the Victualer's Ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Order passed Vote 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. FEE SCHEDULE REVIEW

Mr. Eldridge said I think I had mentioned to you before some State fees have changed, so Twila and I have discussed some of these changes that have to take place and we thought this might be an opportunity for us to review all of our fees in the schedule. Mike Cote, our Code Enforcement officer, put together some comparisons of other communities and how they are doing it. I know back in 2007, I think, you had made some minor changes to your fee schedule, but I think we have the time and it's a good opportunity to review our fees and how we do things. I've supplied you with the current schedule, as well as some comparisons with other towns. This is just for you to review. The Chairman has asked me to put this into a spreadsheet format so you can do comparisons: Lisbon, Lewiston, Auburn, Topsham, Brunswick, and Durham. We will redo that so it will be easier for you to read. Councilor Cote said would we be looking to raise these fees. Mr. Eldridge said that's really up to you. Councilor Bowie said we could raise or lower them depending upon what we think we need to do based on what's going on in the surrounding communities or we may not elect to do anything.

Councilor Cote said so what are you going to do, postpone this to another meeting. Councilor Bowie said we are not voting tonight. I recommended, Roger, that we put together a little matrix, so we can go down one side and see all the different fees and across the top all the different municipalities for comparison, and then the few State recommended changes we can identify and look at and say whether they are well within reason or not and why the difference. We may want to

do some additional follow-up work to find out why some people are so high and we're so low or why we're so high and other people are so low. We may want feedback from the various department heads based on what their fees currently are to explain why the value is what it is, and then we could make a decision. We might even want a workshop to do this. Councilor Cote said there's a lot of material to cover. Councilor Bowie said that's why I want to get it consolidated probably onto two pieces of paper so you can go through it. I think that would be a better use of our time to review that.

Mr. Eldridge said this gives you an opportunity to at least start looking at what kind of areas we charge fees for and what we're charging. It will be a little bit more than a one night process. We can take advantage of our workshop format that we'll do at our second meeting to utilize that time.

B. TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Eldridge said in my report I talked about the assessing and evaluation that Bill Van Tuinen has completed. I would like to schedule a workshop, if everybody can, for next Tuesday so Mr. Van Tuinen and Pat Dow can discuss with you the process, how he got his numbers, what they look like, and discuss the options we have so that we can move forward with the letters to the homeowners, businesses, and what have you. They've done a tremendous amount of work. If that's okay with you we'll schedule it for August 10. Is 6:30 PM a good start time?

Councilor Pomelow said I will not be able to do that; my daughter is getting married. Mr. Eldridge said we could tape it to make sure you get a copy of it. I'm also looking at August 17, if we need to go back and discuss it more, which is your next meeting. Councilor Bowie said can everybody do Wednesday August 11. Councilor Pomelow said that would be better for me. Councilor Larochelle said the 11th I can. Councilor Crafts said the 11th is fine with me. Councilor Bowie said that maybe we could do just a workshop on the 11th. I really think it's important to have as many of the Councilors there as possible to make sure we understand this. I have asked Steve to put this in as elementary terms as possible so that we can understand it, because this is going to be very complicated.

Councilor Cote said is this workshop going to be open to the public. Councilor Bowie said they can come, but I won't let them speak. This is something we need to understand fully and we need to get our arms around it before we have any discussion with anybody. I think that is very important. Councilor Cote said I think this is a volatile situation. Councilor Bowie said I understand it is a volatile situation, but I think that we as Councilors need to have the time to, right, I've got no problem with the public coming to listen to our discussions and hear what we are talking about and everything. They can talk to us afterwards and can address their concerns about what they heard, and then before we do anything and before we even set the tax rate, it will be a regular item on the agenda for discussion. Depending upon what Council feels, coming out of that discussion, if Council feels that we need to have a public hearing, we can try to have a public hearing before we vote, but we have to keep in mind that we are very pushed for time, because we have to set the tax rate before the end of August.

Councilor Crafts said what time on August 11. Councilor Bowie said if we could do 6:30 PM that would be good. Councilor Pomelow said thank you for your consideration. Mr. Eldridge said any questions on that. I'll try to get you some information ahead of time, but if I don't it's because the whole process is very involved. I don't want to overwhelm you with the technicalities of it. Even when Bill starts talking to me about it there are times when I make him slow down and I've been doing this for awhile. Councilor Bowie said we should all come rested so our eyes don't glass over. Will you contact Gina tomorrow and let her know about this workshop.

Mr. Eldridge said on Route 9, I know you've been following that with Mr. Upham. I told the geologist that we are not going to contract with him to do all the wells, but that we would like him to go up and stick a post in the ground where he thinks the best place to drill would be, so he is

meeting with Ryan tomorrow. From that point, the people we got well drilling quotes from Ryan will meet with and go with the low bidder. We've already received some. We just have to make sure that we are all in line with what needs to be done and then Mr. Upham's well will be drilled. We've been contacted by a few other people, so Ryan's dealing with that.

Mr. Eldridge said on another note, Dale and I met with Senator Nutting and Representative Carey dealing with the State. I did hear, Dale, from Mr. Carey. Instead of getting the Deputy Commissioner, he got the Commissioner. We all know what that looks like. We are trying a different avenue, but it is not looking favorable. We have not given up yet.

Councilor Bowie said you mentioned you have several different directions to go in. Any idea what those are? Councilor Crafts said Senator Nutting suggested that our attorney look at some history of settlements with different towns to see how much the State participated in similar situations, which has obviously happened. Steve was going to looking into that, because if you've got a history of 50% or 75% and then all of a sudden they only give us 10%, then we've got a real good argument. Mr. Eldridge said he is doing that. Councilor Crafts said Senator Nutting and I are willing to put a bill in the legislature that would allow us to sue the State, because you actually have to have approval from the legislature to sue them. Councilor Bowie said do you think that's going to go well. Mr. Eldridge said probably not. Councilor Bowie said but we appreciate that. Mr. Eldridge said we are working on it; it's a work in progress, as usual.

Mr. Eldridge said I got something from AVCOG today announcing another Federal bill coming out where we may be able to find some funding, along with looking for money for a standpipe, so I sent that off to Paul Adams. We think this is something we need to pursue. Councilor Bowie said can we, also, communicate that to the commissioners, so that they are into it, because I would like to push that. If there is Federal money out there, I don't want anybody to waste any time trying to go after it. If we have an opportunity to get something written and get it in there to benefit our community, then I think we should do that, especially in this instance. I don't care if we have to be the lead even. Mr. Eldridge said that's fine.

Mr. Eldridge said some of you may have seen the ad in Sunday's paper, Ora Madden from the Sewer Department is retiring, so we're looking for a Sewer Clerk. Ora has put in over 20 some odd years with the community. We are all sad, but she'll have time to spend with her husband while their both good and healthy. It will be a hard transition. We've already been receiving applications and resumes and that closes next Friday. We will start the interview process. The goal is to get somebody onboard, either early or mid September, so we can train them with Ora here, so we won't have to bring Trio in if this person doesn't have Trio software experience.

Mr. Eldridge said last week, Mike, Twila, Bill Stockmeyer the School's Bond Attorney, and myself finalized and signed off on all the documentation for their \$350,000 bond. That went fairly smooth.

Mr. Eldridge said most communities statewide have been working without a Time Warner Franchise Agreement. That's something we need to finish up. The State had a template, so Roger and I are looking at that. We had scheduled a meeting with Mike Edgecomb, the Vice President of Time Warner here in Maine, who deals with all the governmental stuff, but he had an emergency and couldn't do it, so now we have a meeting on August 16 to see if we can get this franchise agreement behind us. It's been quite a few years.

Mr. Eldridge said we had some Charter amendments we were looking at before and we put that aside through the budget process. Roger's question and mine is, do we want to go back and start addressing those so that we can get them on the November ballot should there be any changes. I think when we made the first eleven changes, we had like twenty some odd, but we didn't want to do them all at once and overwhelm the public. Is this something that you want me to bring back to the agenda and start looking at?

Councilor Larochelle said my recommendation is to move forward with this tax stuff first, because I think that is going to be pretty overwhelming. Councilor Bowie said I agree with Fern. Councilor Larochelle said there's a lot of stuff that will start flowing out of that and if we have to get this done by the end of August, which to me is pretty short notice for everything that we would have to go through. Mr. Eldridge said okay, we'll get to that first. Councilor Larochelle said that's my opinion. Mr. Eldridge said we've got plenty on our plate, believe me, so we'll put that in the background for awhile.

Mr. Eldridge said the Town needs to look at adopting a policy for town owned property. We have an application that people fill out, but there really is no policy behind it. We had a couple come in on Monday to ask to use the new Gazebo at MTM to get married, even though it is not complete. I went up and looked and it's pretty safe, so we signed off on it, but we probably should have some kind of policy for people using town owned property. If that's okay I'll start looking for some templates and have Roger take a look at it. Councilor Bowie said is that the Gazebo the Seabees are working on. Mr. Eldridge said yes, it's almost done. Councilor Bowie said they are doing a great job. I commend the Navy guys up there, because they do a great job and do a lot of work for us. We really appreciate it. Mr. Eldridge said Mark been very good about getting them to the MTM building and doing projects for us and now this. One of them happens to be a local resident so he has really advocated for Lisbon, which is good for us. It will be beautiful when it is all done.

MARIJUANA DISPENSARY MORATORIUM

Mr. Eldridge said the marijuana dispensary; I'll bring you up-to-date. We did have someone who has been approved by the State, Snales is their last name, and they were approved to do something in some of the counties. The way I understand it is that the State would like to have 12 different dispensaries throughout the State. They will all be State regulated. They have to go through a very thorough process to get that. We did have this couple look at Lisbon. They were looking at the File Busters facility on Route 196. They have been working with Mike Cote. They just have to follow our local ordinances. The packets they gave us went through the State's security issues, but from what I read this morning, Lisbon was not mentioned, they are looking at Auburn, so maybe something has changed. This was two weeks ago that they came in to talk with Mike. I'm not sure if they have moved forward with looking at Lisbon or not.

Mr. Eldridge said the question is, do you want to put a moratorium, which you can do, on this. It would give you an opportunity to draft an ordinance if you want to keep it from coming here, allow it, or whatever you want to do, but Roger's recommendation is to vote to put a moratorium on it and then draft something; that's what a lot of communities are doing. Councilor Bowie said I would be in favor of doing that. Councilor Crafts said I'm with you. Councilor Lunt said we need to specify what zones are appropriate for it, rather than, you know, if we have it at all, but that's why we need to have a moratorium so we can decide that, rather than just put it anywhere. Councilor Bowie said I'm in favor of that, but I don't know about the rest of Council.

VOTE (2010-127A) Councilor Crafts, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to put a moratorium on medical marijuana distribution facilities within the Town of Lisbon for the maximum time limit.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Donald Fellows said don't you need a time limit. Mr. Eldridge said yes, I think the maximum is 60 days or six months, I don't know, I'll have to talk to Roger. Councilor Crafts said let's just say the maximum and then you will have it. Councilor Bowie said good point Mr. Fellows, thank you. So, we will put the maximum time limit on that moratorium. Councilor Pomelow said agreed.

Order passed - Vote 6-0.

AUDIT COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr. Eldridge said on another note the auditors are in the building. They will be here all this week. They have another person doing the school. They should have most of their information by the end of the week. The Finance Department's getting busy. Everything looks okay so far.

Councilor Bowie said when is the next Audit Committee meeting. Mr. Eldridge said Kathy Tyson wanted to do something in October. Councilor Bowie said I thought she was supposed to meet with the audit committee in August. Mr. Eldridge said I'll have to check with her. Councilor Bowie said they were supposed to meet with us just after they finished all their fieldwork and everything.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION-NONERESIGNATION PLANNING BOARDREGULAR MEMBER

Councilor Bowie said just so we all understand this, Mr. Kamke can no longer participate as a full-time member, he's got other obligations, and Mr. Fellows, who happens to be in the audience, is currently an alternate member and basically, both have agreed to swap positions. The way to do this is that they each have to resign their positions and then we appoint them.

VOTE (2010-128) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to accept Gerald Kamke's resignation on the Planning Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Councilor Lunt said I just wanted to say I've worked with Mr. Kamke on the Planning Board and he is a great guy on the Planning Board. I think he really did a good job for this town. He'll be missed. Councilor Larochelle said I'm glad he's going to stay on as an alternate. Councilor Lunt said I agree. It's sad he can't be there as much as he was. We'll miss him. Councilor Bowie said yes, we will.

Order passed - Vote 6-0.

RESIGNATION PLANNING BOARDASSOCIATE MEMBER

VOTE (2010-129) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to accept Donald Fellows' resignation on the Planning Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Order passed - Vote 6-0.

PLANNING BOARDALTERNATE MEMBER [FILLING TERM TO 2014]

VOTE (2010-130) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Lunt moved to appoint Gerald Kamke an alternate member on the Planning Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Order passed - Vote 6-0.

PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEMBER [FILLING TERM TO 2015]

VOTE (2010-131) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Crafts moved to appoint Donald Fellows a regular member on the Planning Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Order passed – Vote 6-0.

COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Crafts said I went down to the Concert in the Park Sunday night. It was awesome. I was very impressed with the turn out. Ross Cunningham is doing an awesome job promoting it. I think there were at least 150 people there. Mr. Eldridge said they counted about 350. Councilor Crafts said I was really impressed, there were people playing volleyball, kids playing basketball, and a bunch of parents with their kids on the swings in the playground while the concert was going on. It was really awesome. Rick Graham is quite the talented musician. He was up there stroking on his guitar, playing the harmonica, tapping his foot all at the same time. He has a great voice. Quite impressive. I really enjoyed it. Next weekend you should stop by if you've got a minute. They're doing a great job. That's really very successful.

Councilor Larochelle said I stopped over to see Dale. It's amazing how reminiscent that parking lot is from when you were a kids playing kickball in the springtime when the water would run down and you made dams, it was just a mud-fest, to what it looks like today, which is something quite unique. I think the nice setting and it's a beautiful park, in the sense, where there's something for everybody. There were people down below playing with their kids and playing ball, but the people in town that wanted to go could hang out up by the monument and just kind of do their thing, but still kind of get the atmosphere without actually getting involved. I think there was a little bit of atmosphere for everybody. Hopefully, the neighborhood around it appreciates it. I'm sure it is quite a change from their regular activities on a Sunday evening, but you could see a lot of local neighborhood people there. I think if you enjoy it, it's a blessing, if not, hopefully they can bear with us and make it all work.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

VOTE (2010-132) Councilor Pomelow, seconded by Councilor Lunt moved to go into executive session at 8:00 PM per 1 MRSA Section 405 (6) (c). **Order passed – Vote 6-0.** The Council Secretary was dismissed. The Council came out of executive session at 8:10 PM.

ADJOURNMENT

VOTE (2010-133) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Dale moved to adjourn at 8:11 PM. **Order passed - Vote 6-0.**

Twila D. Lycette, Council Secretary
Town Clerk, Lifetime CCM/MMC

These Council meeting minutes were transcribed by Beth French and edited by Twila Lycette.