



**TOWN COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
AUGUST 17, 2010**

Michael Bowie, Chair District 2 2012
Gina Mason, Vice Chair District 1 2010
Fern Larochele, 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 Vice-Chairman, Gina Mason, called the meeting to order and led the pledge of allegiance to the flag at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL. Members present were Councilors Mason, Larochele, Cote, Pomelow and Lunt. Councilors Bowie and Crafts were excused. Also present were Stephen Eldridge, Town Manager; Pat Dow, Assessor; Jessica Maloy, Finance Director; and approximately six citizens in the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING

VICTUALER'S LICENSE FOR
KELLY GOKEY D/B/A T & A VARIETY, INC.

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments. The Chairman closed the Public Hearing

VICTUALER'S LICENSE FOR
PAULINE MCKINNEY D/B/A POLLY'S DOGS

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments. The Chairman closed the Public Hearing.

PAWNSHOP LICENSE FOR
DAN MILLER D/B/A DOUBLE DIAMOND PAWN

The Chairman opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The Chairman closed the public hearing.

CONSENT AGENDA

VOTE (2010-134) Councilor Pomelow, seconded by Councilor Cote moved to approve a Victualer's License for Kelly Gokey d/b/a T & A Variety, Inc., a Victualer's License for Pauline McKinney d/b/a Polly's Dogs, a Pawnshop License for Dan Miller d/b/a Double Diamond Pawn, and the Minutes of July 20, 2010. **Order passed - Vote 5-0.**

COUNCIL ORDERS, RESOLUTIONS, & ORDINANCES

2009-2010 CARRY FORWARDS & TRANSFERS

VOTE (2010-135) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Lunt moved to approve the following list of 2009-2010 Carry Forwards and Transfers:

Order passed - Vote 5-0.

2009-2010 Transfers			
<u>Dept/Div</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Proposed Transfer To</u>	<u>Proposed Transfer From</u>
01-100	Elected Officials	221.50	
01-105	Town Manager	3,798.26	
01-120	Legal	31,398.78	
01-125	Retirement		(17,395.60)
01-130	Social Security		(8,473.40)
01-135	Technology		(3,458.86)
01-140	Town Buildings	15,715.78	
01-145	Assessing	12,858.81	
01-147	Planning Board	5,422.63	
01-160	Tax Collector		(14,588.35)
02-200	Police		(38,727.03)
02-205	Fire	16,429.14	
03-305	Public Works		(52,806.49)
03-306	Winter Public Works	31,439.55	
03-310	Solid Waste		(36,119.96)
03-315	Hydrant Rental	384.14	
04-400	Parks Department	300.50	
08-800	Abatements	53,600.60	
		<u>171,569.69</u>	<u>-171569.69</u>

2009-2010 Carry Forwards

<u>Dept/Div</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Proposed Carry Forwards</u>
R04-4150	Park Revenue	2,629.50
01-140	Town Buildings	8,500.00
01-145	Assessing	4,000.00
01-150	Economic Development	11,945.16
01-160	Town Clerk	10,016.00
02-200	Police	16,830.34
02-205	Fire	70,692.24
03-300	Town Engineer	299,648.41
03-310	Solid Waste	3,400.00
04-400	Parks Department	18,471.77
04-405	Recreation Department	19,862.14
05-500	General Assistance	4,661.59
10-100	Bond Issues	420,834.99
		<u>891,492.14</u>

Mr. Eldridge said Jessica would address this, that this is what we do every year after the auditors have been in.

Mrs. Maloy said we had a revenue shortfall this year with the main area being in State Revenue Sharing, which you know about. This was largely offset with the excise tax revenue. Investment interest was down. We have not received funding from the State for General Assistance yet. There

is one revenue carry forward request for the amount by which Beaver Park revenue exceeds its budgeted amount. This amount is turned into the Beaver Park Admissions Fund. You will see that at the top of your carry forward request sheet. For the most part, your carry forwards are limited to grants, capital projects, equipment, and outstanding encumbrances. We are looking to carry forward the following amounts as noted on your spreadsheet. (See list above)

Mrs. Maloy said we have \$2,629.50 in the Beaver Park Admissions Fund. We have \$8,500 in the Town Buildings line for an outstanding encumbrance for the energy efficiency matching grants. We have an Assessing carry forward of \$4,000 for the work being done by Bill Van Tuinen. Economic Development has \$11,945.16 from the Thanksgiving, Flag, Moxie, and Revitalization accounts. The Town Clerk is looking at \$10,016 for purchasing voting machines. The Police Department has \$16,830.34 for grant programs and hire reimbursements. Within the Fire Department, we have \$70,692.24 in the capital reserve program. Under Town Engineer, we have \$299,648.41 related to the 2010 bond issue for the Route 9, Upland, and Androscoggin River Trail. Solid Waste we have \$3,400. The Parks Department has \$18,471.77 from the wreath account, the wood lot, and admissions. Under the Recreation Department, we are looking at \$19,862.14 that's related to the grant programs and new programs run under the Recreation Department. General Assistance, we are looking at \$4,661.59 from the heating assistance and the giving tree program. Under Bond Issues, we have \$420,834.99 and that's in relation to the 2009 bond.

Councilor Larochelle said why the different accounts for Park Revenue versus the Parks Department. Mrs. Maloy said the Park Revenue is what is brought in at the Park when people go visit the Park and that's what we carry forward and it gets turned into the admissions fund under the expense line. Councilor Larochelle said I thought that's what you said about the 400 line Parks Department that part of that was admissions. Mrs. Maloy said part of it is and it's made up of last year's revenue so it gets carried forward into the expense line.

Councilor Pomelow said what is the \$3,400 for Solid Waste. Mrs. Maloy said that goes towards the retirement of Roger Goyette.

Councilor Lunt said the 2009 bond issue; what project was that for? Mrs. Maloy said it's for the 2009 bond for water improvements.

Mrs. Maloy said moving along with the transfers. We have some overdrafts this year; the largest ones being under Abatements, Public Works' Winter Account, and Legal. The total amount we are requesting to transfer is \$171,569.69. We are transferring that amount from the following lines in departments as noted (see list above). We are looking at taking \$17,395.60 from the retirement account, \$8,473.40 from Social Security, \$3,458.86 from Technology, \$14,588.35 from Tax Collector, \$38,727.03 from the Police Department, \$52,806.49 from Public Works, and \$36,119.96 from Solid Waste.

Councilor Larochelle said that's pretty much to balance the budget for the auditors to make sure everything comes out to zero. Mr. Eldridge said and we roll how much into surplus. Mrs. Maloy said around \$346,000.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

US DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 2010 COPS GRANT APPLICATION

Mr. Eldridge said unfortunately Chief Brooks had a family commitment so he could not be here. But he did respond to the questions that we had regarding the funding if we were to have to lay people off. The response we got from the COPS grant people was that the award is for a 2-year period and if the town gets into a financial distress situation where we have to lay people off, we

need to make sure we maintain documentation of what is causing the layoff, get it approved, and then no payback would be required.

Mr. Eldridge said if within that 3-year period, two years into it we need to lay somebody off, we don't get penalized for that, we just have to reimburse the last year. If its during the 4th year and the town retains that position and is into a situation where we have to have layoffs, the we will have to apply for a retention exemption from the COPS office. Again, financial information has to be provided we are in a financial distress situation, the COPS grant request gets approved, and there will be no financial penalty, but we may be told that we cannot apply for this grant for a period of 3-years. We don't get punished financially. In that case, it is sort of a win for us. Fern and I were talking earlier, that if we got into a situation where we had to lay somebody off, would we lay them off and also that particular officer, and then maybe lose two people, which is something we didn't think about. Councilor Larochelle said it's still one more than we had before.

Councilor Cote said I don't think adding a police officer and equipment with the school teachers on the street sends a very good message to the town, no matter how or what way we do it. I think we sent a clear message last year that we were going to cut, and then we turn around and add a position, that's not where we want to be. Councilor Lunt said I don't like the idea of binding our hands. It seems like we have to go to them for approval, file all the paperwork, then what if they say no, we don't approve, we don't think that's enough of a hardship, now what do we do at that point.

Councilor Larochelle said, one thing I do know, is that if the school had an opportunity to get teachers on a grant free, they would grab them fast. Anything you can get with the stimulus package, to me, when I look at the stimulus packages over the United States, its out there, its going to be given to somebody, so its kind of crazy not to take the opportunity when the money is out there free. Reading through some of the information and guidelines, because I had asked Steve for a little more information, and also the Chief, and financially nowhere along the line would they actually hold our hands. Worse case scenario, if we were just to say we can no longer keep this person, there actually wouldn't be any financial bind to us. The biggest penalty we would have for actually not keeping an officer for the three years or the 4th would be the idea that we couldn't actually apply for another Federal Grant through the COPS Program for three years; that's pretty much the penalty. The idea of actually getting a free service for the Town of Lisbon for three years is hard to give up. The hardest thing is the application approval. Its kind of like fly-fishing on the Androscoggin, we're just one out of so many people trying to get that grant. To me the idea of getting something free for a while is definitely ideal. If come the 4th year we can't actually afford it, and we put in the hardship paperwork, if we don't get approved, then we just can't re-apply for three years, which is pretty much the downfall. There's no money commitment, payback, or anything like that. Again, with the stimulus stuff out there, you are kind of crazy not to try to take advantage of it, because if you don't take it there's someone else that's going to.

Councilor Lunt said it's not really free money, because of that 4th year. You have to be careful. It's like the free for 90 days kind of thing at the store, but you still have to pay some day. Councilor Larochelle said but if that 4th year comes and you can't pay for it, it basically goes away and there's no actual monetary penalty. Councilor Lunt said I don't trust the Feds though. We've had trouble with the Federal Government before and they're pretty mean when they have to be.

Councilor Pomelow said is there a possibility of having to pay money back. Mr. Eldridge said, no, there is no financial penalty. It says here that you do not get penalized financially. There's no payback required. The only penalty you have is that you won't be eligible to re-apply for the grant for three years, that's the only downfall. One way I'm looking at it is, you're getting somebody at 25% of the cost for 4 years. All you are ponying up out of the four year period is 25%; that's a pretty good deal.

Councilor Larochelle said the way I look at it is, if in another three years we can't afford it, we don't carry it on. Not saying that's the way the program was designed, but it's hard to say what things are going to be like in four years.

Councilor Mason said I agree that somebody we will get the grant. It's evident, there's grants, people get them. I feel that the message we are sending out is that we had a hardship, we've cut back, cut back teachers, and different things. People don't always understand how these things work, so to take somebody on even knowing that it is paid for and all that, and then possibly we can lose out, I think, while the economy is still so sketchy is just difficult when we just don't know what's going to happen on the other end; that's my opinion.

Councilor Pomelow said what was the clarification on the question we asked about the union being involved? Mr. Eldridge said there is no language in the contract dealing with grant employees. Councilor Mason said we've applied for this before haven't we? Mr. Eldridge said I think we have. Councilor Mason said do you know how many times we've gotten it, who that officer was, not that it matters. Mr. Eldridge said I don't know off hand, I think it was prior to me coming here, and that person is still here as far as I know. Councilor Larochelle said can I answer that? Last time we actually thought about applying for it was for two police officers and we decided not to go for it, because we didn't really know all of the details. That is kind of where we are now and now we're down to one.

Mr. Eldridge said this specific grant was for towns or cities who applied last year and they didn't have enough funding to even get anywhere close to the numbers. This specific grant was for those towns that did not receive it last year. It gave those communities another chance to get in on the grant. Still, there is no guarantee that we are going to get this. There are still quite a few communities applying for it.

Councilor Mason said do we have to vote on this tonight. I wasn't here last time, so I'm sorry. Mr. Eldridge said we voted on it last time and nobody really understood what they were voting on, I guess they didn't realize it was a personnel addition. Mike wanted to bring it back, make sure everybody understood what they were voting on, and understood that it was adding a position to the Police department that would be funded for 3-years with this grant, and that in the 4th year we would have to put that person on the payroll. This is where the question was raised regarding contract language and what happens if we cannot afford to keep that person; this is the answer to that. If we could show that there's a hardship and we are laying people off, then we can eliminate that position with no financial penalty, but we would not be able to apply for the grant for 3-years.

Mr. Eldridge said I don't want to put it off. The application was submitted, but we did not have an opportunity to vote on it prior to the deadline to get the application in. If you are not going to approve this, then you need to vote against it and say we choose not to apply for this, so we can write to the COPS people to tell them that Council does not want to apply for this grant.

VOTE (2010-136) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to accept and move forward with the COPS grant.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Michelle Swatsworth-Turmelle said I have two questions. One is, and it's unfortunate that the Chief couldn't be here, because he's probably the one who could answer it, is that going to free up budget money within the Police Department budget for overtime and part-time hours since you now have a full-time person coming in. Mr. Eldridge said no. We had budgeted pretty tightly for just the staff that we have. We are down one police officer as it stands. All we are doing is filling that. This person would probably have to come in as a patrol officer at the bottom of the ladder. We would probably move somebody up to fill a detective position, because we are very shorthanded right now

on that; we're down to one detective and we used to have three. It would probably just move a person up.

Councilor Larochelle said I did ask the same question; are we going have something to pay back over the next 3-years; I agree there was no straightforward commitment that we would, but to me, another person coming on, somehow you should be able to make that work; that's how I'm thinking about it budget-wise. The other part that's really important to find out is, even if we sent in some lame letter saying that we can't afford it and they refuse us, there is still no financial penalty. Basically, all it does is go from a 1-year to a 3-year re-application penalty, if it's approved it's a 1-year slap on the wrist and if they said the letter wasn't consistent or didn't meet the criteria, then it's 3-years. There's still no financial reimbursement required.

Ms. Swatsworth-Turmelle said I caught that part, but I also caught that the language said you had to submit financial documentation supporting that as well, which concerns me. You have to back up our accounting and financial records for whatever the reason is that we give for needing to lay people off. There was specific language to it, but that part requires you to submit your financial records. That's a little concerning that you can't just send a letter; it's not actually just a letter, you're sending proof from your town's financial records to say why we can't afford this person. That part of the language rather alarms me. I guess from a personal standpoint as a taxpayer, if this position is paid for by 3-year grant, then I would expect to see a savings on our end somewhere.

Councilor Pomelow said I'll add another comment. I'm assuming that the figure we have here is for 3-years worth of wages and benefits totaling \$186,024, so if you break that down it's \$62,000 a year. That's not, in my opinion, accounting for any wage increases. I mean, we just looked at that, so when we're looking at the budget for fiscal year 2014-2015, we could be looking at a much higher rate, because this figure here doesn't account for next year's pay increase, the following year's, the third year's, and the 4th year's pay increase, when we assume that total cost. We could be talking close to \$70,000. Ms. Swatsworth-Turmelle said does that include benefits. Councilor Pomelow said it says wages and benefits.

Order failed – Vote 1-4. (Opposed: Lunt, Cote, Mason, Pomelow)

Councilor Lunt moved to not accept the grant and to write a withdrawal letter of request. No second noted. Councilor Mason said that was done with the motion already voted.

MARIJUANA DISPENSARY MORATORIUMS

Mr. Eldridge said according to State law, Council needs to adopt an ordinance prohibiting marijuana dispensary facilities for 180 days, until you have had an opportunity to discuss whether you prefer to regulate this under town law. The folks that were interested had called and said that they were going to attend, but this afternoon they called to say that they would not be attending, that at this time they did not have a site they were interested in, in Lisbon, but that they were still looking. If Council passes the ordinance, then it will be 180 days, but what they decide to do from that point on, I don't know. I'm not discouraging them from coming; I want to welcome all businesses. Chief Brooks and I talked today and he has no concerns about security, because what they have to do is pretty intense and expensive to maintain. At this time, I recommend you have me put this back on the agenda and schedule a public hearing, because it is an ordinance.

Councilor Cote said I think this is something we need to review closely. Councilor Mason said I agree. Councilor Cote said we may be missing the boat. Mr. Eldridge said if you have questions tonight, Roger Therriault will be here for the union discussion, so you can ask him questions on this as well tonight.

Councilor Mason said I think you will find other towns and cities have had the same types of problems, so to speak, because nobody knows how it will work, how it will be dispensed, and whether it will be safe. I guess we just need to move forward with what Steve has mentioned, discuss it further, and as Roger said, we may be missing the boat. It may be something that is lucrative to our town and helpful. Councilor Cote said, also, with the way everything is going in this country right now, I wonder if weed won't be legalized in the future and we may be a forerunner of it. Councilor Mason said you never know.

Councilor Mason said I will entertain a motion that we move forward with this moratorium, ask questions, bring it to a public hearing, and institute it as an ordinance.

VOTE (2010-137) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to place the marijuana dispensary moratorium ordinance on the agenda for a first reading and to set a public hearing. **Order passed - Vote 5-0.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Councilor Pomelow said could I ask that the folks looking to do this come and provide an educational session either to the Council, on tape, or at a public hearing so that we are as informed as we can be, because I think there are a lot of unknowns. We may be taking a stab in the dark here. I think the more information we have prior to getting to our final session the better. Mr. Eldridge said they provided the Code Enforcement Officer with a packet and I assumed that they will bring something tonight, because they did ask how many Councilors we had and what they should bring. I'm not sure why they chose not to make it, but I'll make sure they can be here to answer any questions.

TAX COMMITMENT

Mr. Eldridge said Bill Van Tuinen, Pat, and everybody had an opportunity to discuss at a workshop last week where we are in the land revaluation process, what happened with that based on land sales being very few, then looking at both land and building sales, and where we are in the process. He spoke to Pat and his first recommendation was to take the values of our real estate and personal property and bring it up to 80% of value based on the numbers we currently have on the books, not using the new building and new land schedules. That information won't be bad when we move forward with the new list and measure, we can still implement it, it will still be good data. This will give Pat more of an opportunity to validate his records, which we have had a lot of that going on where things aren't quite as they seem in the records, so that way it's more accurate and fewer mistakes will be made.

Mr. Eldridge said I know during that process last Tuesday he talked about a three-month extension so he could probably finish it up, but we need to commit taxes, with only two tax collections, and based on what we need our cash flow to be to operate, we are going to recommend and Pat probably will move forward with it, is to increase the values to 80% of our value, which will shift everything up. That will bring the tax rate down, somewhere between \$20 and \$21 per \$1,000. It does create a bit of a shift. You still are going to see a little bit of an increase in what people pay, just for the fact that we have losses in our Homestead Exemption, which has gone from \$13,000 to \$8,000 and we've lost revenue over the years, we're down to \$2.6 million. We were at \$2.8 million last year. You've seen the reduction in the Homestead Exemption and our expenses have gone up. It won't be substantial, but I gave you some examples. If it was at \$21.50 at 80%, you're looking at somebody with a \$100,000 home, at 80%, that would be \$97,500. If you back out the Homestead, you are looking at a tax around \$1,924, so you can see a bit of an increase.

Mr. Eldridge said these numbers; again, we don't have all of our numbers yet. We're still doing our Veterans' numbers and some clean-up on personal property. We should be prepared to commit taxes on time at the end of this month, which is next week. I think that makes perfect sense, what Bill recommended. My recommendation, like Bill and Pat had said, is that we continue to move forward and budget for our list and measure. We would put people on board next summer, move forward with that, and get the valuation done and up-to-date, so that we can be at 100% and give our residents an opportunity to ask questions about their properties, if they don't quite agree.

Councilor Cote said I personally don't have a warm and fuzzy feeling about any of this data. We've got a lot of property in town that's already valued at much higher than what they are actually worth. Moving it to 80% is just going to increase that ratio even further. I understand the situation we're in, but it sure doesn't seem like this is the proper way to do it. Mr. Eldridge said this is the recommendation from people who are experts in this field and from our own Assessor. I think it's the right thing to do. You're not rocking the boat like a revaluation where you are shifting values from one house that's different to another where it goes up and down. You're basically staying the same. Everybody is being increased the same percentage. We're getting up to 80%, which is where we should be, above 70%. I don't think it will be exactly 80%. It is a step in the right direction to get a revaluation and everything up and running.

Councilor Lunt said I have a question for you, Steve, would we be putting out our taxes at the end of the month. Mr. Eldridge said, yes, we'll be on time. Councilor Lunt said excellent.

Councilor Larochelle said the way that taxes work is pretty interesting. We had a workshop the other night and the more you think you understand the more confusing it gets. Going back to what we did the other night; one of the biggest reasons we've been pushing for the reval is, because the valuation for the town is so low, it's at 56%. Legally, we're supposed to be at least at 70%, supposedly, I'm not sure about legally, but by the State. Moving it to 80% at this time would be an injustice, if you don't move forward over the next two years and actually go out and visit every home and try to balance it off.

Councilor Larochelle said our ultimate goal is to make sure it is fair and equal for everybody. By doing this, at least it's meeting our requirements with the State and trying to get a little more Homestead for the homeowners. It's a step in the right direction. We're getting the information. The downfall is, that any other way that we do it, we haven't got enough information to make it fair for everybody either. To me, unless you visit every home, it's not going to be fair. I think that's what we need to do over the next couple of years. I think this is an important first step to bring it up to 80%. Bringing everybody up equally means the tax rate drops equally. It's going to be different for some people. One thing that I mentioned to Steve before is, that regardless of what we do this year, people's taxes are going to go up whether we do this 80% or not; the biggest reason is that the State is actually giving back less money for the Homestead so that means you're going to pay more.

Councilor Larochelle said the town voted this year for a couple of bonds, which increased our debt, which we have to pay more for. No matter what we do, your tax bill is going to be higher. There's nothing we can do about that at this point besides trying to make it fair.

Councilor Larochelle said what I would asked, even with personal property and everything else, is that once everyone gets their tax bills, if you don't understand it, please ask questions. There is an explanation on how all of this works; I'm not saying it's going to be easy to understand, but there is an explanation. Hopefully, we will move forward and do it in a fair way without abusing anybody. I'm not sure that that's easily done, but if there was an easy way it would have been done a long time ago.

Councilor Mason said I think for the past 20-years there hasn't been any work done on this. It's difficult to change, but it is something that needs to be done. To Roger's point, those people who feel they have overvalued property have the right to come in and ask for an abatement. It's up to

the citizen who does have a problem to come in and ask. As Fern said, it may not seem totally fair, but as a town we've got to adjust it somehow. It's either raise taxes on the other end, or raise it across the board. I understand everybody's point, but it's something that's been lax and something that hasn't been done for a long time. We're trying to play catch-up right now.

Councilor Pomelow said I'd like to ask a question just to see if I understand this correctly. In 2009-2010, you have a home value of \$100,000. With your Homestead Exemption, your taxable amount is \$92,000; is that correct? So, coming forward to 2010-2011, that same \$100,000 house is now being valued at \$130,000 and with the Homestead Exemption it will be worth \$122,000, right?

Mr. Eldridge said, yes, that's correct. Councilor Pomelow said so your taxes would go from \$2,365 on \$25.50 per \$1,000 to \$21.50 per \$1,000 and a tax value of \$2,623. So you are looking at an increase of about \$258.00. Mr. Eldridge said if it comes in at \$21.50, as I said, we have not finished gathering all of the Revenue numbers, Tree Growth, Veteran's Exemptions, and things like that. He's still waiting on some questions he had on Personal Property for some of the bigger operations here in town. He's validating those. Everything will be done by the end of next week so we can commit. Pat was hoping to get down to 20% and we may, I don't know, but our goal is to get it as low as we can and meet our commitments.

Mr. Eldridge said, like Fern was saying, this year you saw a 2% increase in our operating budget, most of it based on health care increases as well as bond debt. You saw a decrease in Revenue Sharing. We were approximately \$200,000 short this year; we had predicted we would get \$1,000,000 this year, which was \$200,000 less than we thought we would get. Unfortunately, it's even worse. We've only budgeted \$750,000 for the upcoming year. We hope to meet that. Revenue is a shot sometimes, especially with State government. We have a Revenue shortfall and we have an increase on the Expense side.

Dorothy Fitzgerald said putting the valuation up 80% across the board, I can see a lot of inequities here, some properties have decreased in value. Homeowners just haven't been able to keep them up. We've had a few new subdivisions, since our last revaluation in 1988. I don't know how those homes were valued. In one particular division, I'm thinking the home prices are very high, \$250,000 to up to \$300,000. I don't know how those are assessed without looking at the assessing card and not scrutinizing every one. How were those assessed? What percentage of the value. Putting it up 80% across the board doesn't seem right to me. Some homeowners have improved their properties considerably and, as I said, some property values have decreased. I just see a lot of inequities here, a lot of dissention.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said I'm on the Assessment Review Board and I'm really considering resigning, because this is not going to be fun. We're going to see a lot more people not being able to pay their taxes and there are quite a few as it is. I had a really hard time coming up with mine this past fiscal year and I'm expecting an even harder time this next fiscal year. I know I'm not alone. Any comments from you people?

Councilor Larochelle said the biggest thing is that, unfortunately, we have to move forward with some aspect of it. I realize your concern. As we spoke the other night, if we were to stop right now I do believe it wouldn't be fair and equitable to everybody. Moving forward, the information we have over the next two years, visiting every home, and revaluing every home is going to be a long process. In the short term, I don't think the information we've got for house sales in the last short period of time that we were doing assessments would actually work well for the other options that we have. The only really good way of doing it is to do a total revaluation of the town. Unfortunately, as everybody knows, we've tried multiple times and it gets voted down every time, because it is very costly, \$3-400,000. I think this is the best opportunity to meet our requirements. One good thing about getting into 80% is that people are going to get more of their Homestead Exemption, even though the State cut it back, there are some different ratios there.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said, but it won't be this year; this coming fiscal year will we see the Homestead Exemption increase? Councilor Larochelle said I couldn't give you the answer. I would assume that there are a lot of numbers that go along with that. Every time I think I know what I'm talking about I get proven differently. Mr. Eldridge said the State has reduced the Homestead Exemption from \$13,000 to \$10,000 this year. At 80%, the homeowner gets \$8,000 off the cost of the value of their home. They're gaining a bit there. Last year at 56%, they only got \$7,250, so the homeowner's gaining a little bit. At 80%, we're probably going to get a bit extra back. Councilor Larochelle said the State's taking more back than they're going to receive. It's still not going to be quite fair, because the State is still cutting back what they've given out. Even if we went to 100%, it may not be a fair swap.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said I don't recall what the tax rate was this past fiscal year. Mr. Eldridge said \$25.50 and this year we're estimating \$20 to \$21.50. Mrs. Fitzgerald said so the tax rate will go down a little bit, but not too much. Mr. Eldridge said not until we have a real handle on what we have out there for properties and what their values are; that's something we are going to have to continue to work on. Pat has been out in the field just to try to get accurate information on some of the cards we have. Some of the cards are very incomplete, so he is already in the process of doing some of the list and measure, just because he's trying to get enough data to factor. He can't do the 4,000 to 5,000 homes by himself. What we budgeted this past year, we had hoped to bring on part-time people for just three months and pay them so much per lot. We wouldn't have to pay them benefits and have to do a lot of that. They go out with their clipboards, ask all the questions, take the measurements, record the style of the house, does it have a deck, does it have a garage, and get the answers to all these questions. If the homeowner is home you'll get accurate numbers on how many bathrooms there are. That's a very time consuming job and one person can't do it.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said how about the commercial properties. We've lost Knight Celotex. Did we lose tax income from that? Are we starting to get back tax income from the new company that's bought it. Mr. Eldridge said the new company that bought it has paid their taxes to date. We're not going to lose any value on the property itself, but we did lose personal property. They've moved a lot of equipment out of there in the last year. Pat's already been in the building to document what they have. We know what's been taken out and we know what they have. We are losing some personal property value there.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said the Titus filling station was torn down, so we lost some tax revenue there, but I see new construction going on there, so hopefully we'll be getting some. Mr. Eldridge said we won't be getting that until next year. Mrs. Fitzgerald said the Worumbo Mill, we're losing some tax revenue from that. Are there any other substantial businesses that we've lost tax revenue from. Mr. Eldridge said not that we know of at this point. We have some questions out there to some companies and we haven't got answers yet. We will have them before tax commitment. We very well could lose.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said how about the TIFFs. Do their taxes increase every year until it comes up to their full value? Mr. Eldridge said, yes, that shifts every year. Mrs. Fitzgerald said what percentage are we on with those. Mr. Eldridge said I'd have to look; they're all different.

Councilor Lunt said just to address some of the concerns, I think, the weakness about just doing the 80% is that we're not fixing the equity problems that there are out there, but the strength is that we are not creating any new problems. There aren't going to be new disputes, such as you've changed the value of my house, but not my neighbor's. Mr. Eldridge said, yes, I think that's what Mr. Van Tuinen felt that that was one of the reasons why it is best to do it this way. Councilor Lunt said we need hearings to give people a chance to ask questions. Mr. Eldridge said, and that buys us time as well, which I think is necessary for the citizens.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said there's others that are going to say, well, my property was already valued at 80% and now your increasing it again. Councilor Lunt said, as Gina said, the best solution is to go

to the Assessor and say my house is in really bad shape, why am I overvalued, it's not worth the \$100,000 you're saying it is. Show him proof and try to argue for a reduction. Mrs. Fitzgerald said I'm thinking of some of the newer ones in some of the newest really nice subdivisions. Councilor Lunt said if you paid \$300,000 for it, it's hard to argue that it's worth \$200,000.

Councilor Larochelle said one other thing that I think is important before you go forward with this is, 80% isn't just a magic number out of a hat. It was a goal that we were looking for. The work that has already been done by the people we hired and by our own Tax Assessor, with the real estate that's been sold and the properties and the land, it's actually backed up by these numbers. Statewide we can actually prove that 80% is a legitimate number and where we need to be above that 56%. Hopefully, it doesn't sound like we are just picking a number and going with it. We have data to back up that number. When we go to the State to commit our taxes, we have ways of showing how we came up with that 80%.

Mr. Eldridge said it's legitimate and is actually lower than what he thought we would do. Councilor Pomelow said at one point we had talked about getting closer to 100%. Councilor Lunt said with falling real estate values you don't want to overestimate and charge 100%, which a year from now could be 110%. Councilor Mason said the only fair way, as several have said, is to go to each individual home. We didn't have the money and time to do that. It seems unfortunate, I know, but we are doing the best we can to fix years worth of not fixing things.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said I didn't miss a town meeting when they were asking for money for a revaluation. I am aware of this. Councilor Mason said you well know there's been several times we've tried and it's just one of those things, it's there, and we have to take care of it.

Councilor Larochelle said one of the good things, there's a lot of stuff coming out, with all that's going into the computer. The downfall about a card is, if you bought a \$300,000 home, years ago Jerry would have put the information down on the card, and if that house was disabused for 10 years, the roof is leaking, the windows are cracked, there was really no way to revisit that until someone went out, because a card never adapted by itself. The new computer system that we will have will automatically do that over a period of time, so if you buy a \$100,000 home, live in it for 50 years, and never get a permit to fix anything, or never change the windows, it will automatically adjust down so the house is devaluating, if I'm correct. The software system is going to be a bit friendlier to make some of those adjustments. It's kind of like buying a brand new car. When you get your first insurance bill you don't mind paying the high insurance bill, because it's a brand new car, but if you never called the insurance company, five-years later you could still be paying the insurance company to cover that brand new car. Some things, you have to make sure, get adjusted as time goes on. Now, that we have the software in place, I think, it will be easier to make those changes. Hopefully, 10-years from now they will be able to do this more easily. Mrs. Fitzgerald said you buy a house for \$80,000, do a lot of interior renovations, and nobody peeks in your windows and sees them, then all of a sudden it's worth maybe \$180,000 and nobody knows it.

Councilor Cote said the one thing that gives me a burning sensation is that we spent money to, supposedly, reevaluate properties and that all hasn't seemed to do a lot of good for us. It was like money spent for nothing, at this point. I just don't like the smell of this at all. Councilor Larochelle said I think, Roger, that when I just mentioned validating the 80%, that's where those numbers came from, from the money we spent doing that, that homework. That's what we got for the money we spent is to be able to go to the State and validate the 80% as being legit. Councilor Cote said you could have done that, according to Mr. Van Tuinen last week, without even doing any of that. Councilor Larochelle said you still have to have some validation behind it. Councilor Lunt said I think that information would be used towards what we are going to do next year, the list and measure. Councilor Cote said we were told at the workshop that we could have gone to the State without doing any of this. Now, we're further into the situation, we're at tax time, and basically, he's been spending the past three months for nothing. I have a little bit of heartburn when we

represent people, it's the people's money, and I'm not real happy about spending it the way that we're spending it.

Mr. Eldridge said, Roger, we could have spent \$300,000. For \$8,000 you got somebody to come in here and do your land evaluations, set up your land schedule, and at the same time, because of the way it worked in the marketplace we did not have any land-only sales, so he had to also do a building schedule based on the sales of homes. You got quite a bang for your buck for \$8,000 and that data is still going to be valid. The schedule is all in the system, so the next step is to get your list and measure done to make sure you're accurate and you'll be at 100%. I think that was money well spent. \$8,000 is a far cry from \$300,000, even if it took half of that, you got a heck of a deal.

Councilor Mason said it was a professional assessment from an outside source. It was somebody else coming in and assessing what we have, so it's very unbiased. I guess it wasn't exactly what we should have done. We know that full value would be the best thing to do, but as Steve said, it is putting into place the information compiled, into the computer system, but there's no good situation here, whatever we do, the taxes are going up.

BID FOR 1995 JEEP

Mr. Eldridge said the Fire Department took the 1995 Jeep off the road. We put it out to bid to the public. We had two people bid. One was Theresa Akladis with a high bid of \$525 and Dwayne Conant at \$169.69. It wouldn't take a sticker and the floor is rotted out.

Councilor Cote said what is going on with these bids. You've got the same person bidding \$445 and \$525. Mr. Eldridge said we don't know what was going on, but at the end of the day her final offer was \$525 and she was the high bidder.

VOTE (2010-139) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to award the 1995 Jeep bid to Therese Akladis for \$525.00.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

Order passed - Vote 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. FINANCE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mrs. Maloy said being the first month of the new fiscal year, there is not a whole lot to report. We're still working on getting the data for July into Trio and trying to wrap up year ends with the auditors. At this point, I really have no projections or data for where we'll be at the end of this fiscal year 2011.

B. NOMINATION PAPERS FOR THE NOVEMBER ELECTION

Mrs. Lycette said the following positions need to be filled in November: Councilor At Large, Councilor District 1, Councilor District 2, Budget Advisory Board At Large, Budget Advisory Board District 1, Budget Advisory Board District 2, two positions on the School Committee and one on the Water Commission.

Mrs. Lycette said papers are available now and need to be filed at the Town Clerk's office on or before September 20 at 4:30 PM. Currently we have the following papers circulating for George

Caron running for the School Committee, Traci Austin running for the School Committee, Gina Mason running for Councilor in District 1, Fern Larochelle running for Councilor At Large, and Bill Bauer running for the Water Commission.

C. MAINE PACE EFFICIENCY MAINE

Mr. Eldridge said this is another Federal program. You have all the documentation. This is an energy efficiency loan program run by Efficiency Maine, which is part of the Public Utilities Commission. In order for each town to get involved in this we have to do an ordinance to say that we are willing to approve this. The nice part about this is that we have nothing to do with it afterwards. It is a 3rd party agency to the PUC. They do all the paperwork, administer the grant, and all the loan money. It's a real good program. It's good for the public if you are qualified to do energy improvements on your home. I will bring that back to you for a public hearing at our next meeting. Just look it over.

Councilor Mason said is it low income or elderly. Mr. Eldridge said it is based on income, that's part of it. Councilor Pomelow said on the very last page it talks about the municipality adopting an education and outreach program. My question would be that you said we would have no other responsibility other than adopting the ordinance. Mr. Eldridge said the outreach programs comes under our Community Director. Councilor Mason said so we should just read it. Mr. Eldridge said read it and come back with any questions that you might have. I think it will help a lot of the citizens here.

D. TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT

Mr. Eldridge said it didn't get on the agenda, but at the last minute we finally got all three bids on the well drilling on Route 9. Affordable Well Drilling's bid was \$5,200. Temple Well Drilling's bid was \$8,900. C & R Well Drilling's bid was \$5,925. My recommendation is to go with Affordable Well Drilling for \$5,200.

Councilor Cote said how soon will this be taking place. Mr. Eldridge said I don't know. We will call them tomorrow and get them out there. They've all been out to the sites. We told them we wanted to act as quickly as possible. We were lucky they got everything in for tonight.

Councilor Mason said all of these are apples to apples. Mr. Eldridge said, yes, they're all the same. Ryan met them out at the site and went through it with them all. Councilor Larochelle said there is quite a difference. Councilor Mason said, yes, there is, that's why I questioned that, because we've dealt with others before and a lot less expensive than this.

Councilor Pomelow said so we are going to vote on drilling that one well on the Upham property. Mr. Eldridge said, no, if you agree with this, they will be the person doing all the wells.

Councilor Pomelow said there was still a question unanswered about closing off those other wells. I thought that we were going to be discussing that again. Mr. Eldridge said I remember that, but I don't know if we have all the answers yet. Councilor Pomelow said it was my understanding that we couldn't drill a well without closing off the other ones at the same time, because of the potential for cross-contamination. Councilor Cote said we also had to wait for an answer on who pays for this. Mr. Eldridge said I have the answer for that, you are. You as a Council have the authority to go into the Undesignated Fund balance by Charter for emergency purposes.

Councilor Cote said the thing is, Gina brings forth a good point. If we're going to be punching a new well, and those other wells have to be taken care of, we don't want to be cross contaminating a new well. Mr. Eldridge said I will check with them. I know Ryan and I talked about that, but I didn't get an answer from him. I can find out. I'm sure if there's a threat of that and that needs to be done, they will take care of it, that's part of it. It may cost us a little more, I don't know what

needs to be done, or if they just fill it in with gravel. Councilor Mason said I think somebody said concrete. Mr. Eldridge said one of Mr. Upham's wells is a dug well. Councilor Pomelow said two or more of them needed to be capped off. One of them I thought was as much as 440 feet deep. I thought we agreed that we weren't paying for that, that's not our responsibility. Councilor Cote said I don't know. I do know that this man needs water up there. Councilor Pomelow said agreed. Mr. Eldridge said we can find out. It's just a simple question to Ryan if that is something that is part of this. Roger (Therriault), maybe you can answer this since you have been dealing with contaminated water more so than most of us. Are we required by law to cap off the wells that are contaminated?

Mr. Therriault said I believe you are. If a well is abandoned it has to be filled or grout put in it. You need to make sure that water can't be drawn from it. There are several reasons why you need to do that. From our perspective, if it is a contaminated well and you are drawing water from another well, it can draw from the contaminated well. You want to seal those off.

Councilor Mason said part of the situation was that they had tried to drill a well. Councilor Pomelow said there were two or more wells that were not properly capped off when they were originally abandoned. There's the well that we will be replacing, the contaminated one, that I would say yes, we are responsible for closing that one off properly, but there are other wells on the same site, two or more of them, because I think we have a total of five wells on the same site. There are additional ones that haven't been properly closed off and the question came up whether the town assumes the responsibility to close off those other wells, and I say no.

Councilor Mason said from what I understand they were in the drilling process, one didn't work and they had to drill again. Those were never taken care of before this problem came about. Mr. Therriault said those should be the homeowner's responsibility, however, we'll have to work something out, because it's obviously to our advantage in terms of providing a new well, that it not be contaminated by the old ones. I don't know how expensive it is to do that, but we can find out. Mr. Eldridge said we can drill it and we are going to have to test the water in Mr. Upham's well anyway. We don't know if it is going to be contaminated or not. I know from the dug well, there was a very high concentration. The next one, the artesian well, was quite a bit different, so we are hoping wherever they put the stake that it will be nonexistent.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said when Mr. Upham built his new home he had a well drilled. The existing old farmhouse, when his sister retired and moved back to Lisbon Falls, they drilled a well that did not produce anything. The well driller moved a few feet away and drilled a new well at approximately the same depth, quite deep, 200 or more feet deep. That well only produced ½ to 1 ½ gallons per minute and some seeped from the first well to the second. I don't know how you are going to take care of those, but there is a good dug well on the old property. There's another old dug well to the left of the old homestead and I don't know how that is. Anyway, I spoke with Mrs. Upham the other day and I asked her how things were going and she said, well, we've got two stakes in the ground about 500 feet from the house. She said I don't know how they're planning to get it up to the house. She said, are they planning to put in a pump to get it up to the house.

Councilor Larochelle said I think that is part of the process. Mr. Eldridge said, yes, I know it is. Councilor Cote said a well is useless without a pump. Councilor Mason said our requirement is to get them water, so I'm assuming that what's in this price, is the requirement to get them water to their home. Mrs. Fitzgerald said, at this point, I wouldn't assume anything. I would want to find out. Mr. Eldridge said it's in writing.

VOTE (2010-139A) Councilor Cote, seconded by Councilor Lunt moved to award the Route 9 well drilling bid to Affordable Well Drilling for \$5,200. **Order passed - Vote 5-0.**

Mr. Eldridge said AVCOG came out last week and we met with Transportation Planner Joan Walton and Janet Cummings. We did a walkability study in the Falls. MDOT approved \$10,000; \$5,000 for

us and \$5,000 for another community. We are looking at Lisbon Village on September 23 at 9 AM. It will be a three or four hour event; looking at sidewalks and how to approve the area. I walked through there with them. It will be interesting to see what we come up with.

Mr. Eldridge said I met with Craig Zurhost of Western Maine Transportation. We talked about offering a Saturday service. Lewiston and Auburn are interested in doing that. Our numbers of people using the bus has gone up. If people are interested in Saturday service, please call my office and let me know, so we can get an idea of how much interest there is.

Mr. Eldridge said I will be away on August 18 and 19th attending the annual Maine Town and City Managers Meeting. I will be back in the office on Friday. Hopefully, in the next couple of weeks the boiler that is on order will be replaced at the Public Works garage. The insulation work will be started at the same time. We are also looking at windows at MTM. We have a young architect working on some plans for how we could improve the windows there. We have about \$40,000 to spend on replacement windows there. We are hoping to get that done before the winter.

Mr. Eldridge said there's going to be an open house at the Campus Street School on August 29. It is the last Concert in the Park evening. If anyone is interested in a tour of the old school, this will be your last opportunity before the restoration project.

Mr. Eldridge said we have been overwhelmed with applications for the Sewer Clerk position. It closed on Friday. We had close to 50 applicants. We started reviewing those today. It's an interesting process. We hope to start interviewing next week.

Councilor Mason said I have a question that doesn't really pertain to any of this, but the High School, has anyone talked to anyone. Mr. Eldridge said they're on a pretty tight schedule. I found that the project was bid and the contractor hired his own contractors, which was unfortunate, because we have a lot of local contractors that could have used the work. I think that should have been part of the stipulation when it was put out to bid, that local contractors be used. Councilor Mason said I pointed that out early on. Mr. Eldridge said, yes, you did. Councilor Mason said what I'm saying is are they getting ready. Mr. Eldridge said it sure doesn't look like they are going to be ready. They were just pouring the footing for the addition last week. I can't imagine they are going to get the addition done that quickly.

Councilor Larochelle said the portables are leaving. The only place they were pouring might have been for the new entryway into the main office. Mr. Eldridge said they are doing a lot of digging down at the far end of the building. Councilor Larochelle said what had to happen is, to put a new entry where they wanted it, they had to divert all of the groundwater away from that area. What you are seeing is the contractor putting in underground piping and drainage from where the main entrance is going to be. They had to do that before they cut the hole and put the doorway in. I've kept up with it a little. When you go by there at 6 AM in the morning, there are people working there. I think they know the deadline. I asked the other day about the windows, because I was told that the windows would be really close, but somebody who works at the school said they were stacked in the gymnasium already. I think it's going to happen in big packages. Once they have all the insulation, the exterior trim goes up in big segments, and the windows probably will slide in. I think it is all designed so that it all wraps up pretty neatly. They have been working on the inside. I believe they have a local contractor that is working on the inside. It's amazing. It really looks like a big project for the money they had. It's going to be a big improvement whatever they do. You can see for the first time in many years that they are fixing something. Mr. Eldridge said people outside of Lisbon are saying what's going on at the school, because they see a lot of activity. It's good.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Richard Main, Libby Street, said not having been on the Budget Advisory Board for a year or so, some duties apparently have changed for the Advisory Board. It used to be that prior to any transfers and carryovers that the Advisory Board always made a recommendation to the office regarding that. I don't when that change took place. I think, with appropriations involving sums of money are made by the Council that that used to be something that the Advisory Board was asked about, also. I noticed that the Chair of the Budget Advisory Board is not here, but when did it change? What happened, I missed something.

Mr. Eldridge said since I've been here we haven't brought any transfers and carryovers to the Advisory Board. We didn't last year. Mr. Main said it was in the Charter. Councilor Lunt said, yes, it is. Mr. Eldridge said, well, we didn't do it. I'm sorry.

Mr. Main said even the wells. It's a protection for the Council to have a second set of eyes looking at things. I thought maybe it was me, getting old.

Councilor Larochelle said the first year I was on the Council, I think you were sitting on the Board then, and for some reason I thought we didn't do it last year. It seemed like it was a formality we went through the last couple of years, but I'm not sure when that changed or didn't change. It would be something to look into. I agree, it's always good to have a second set of eyes looking at what we are doing. Mr. Main said I just guess that it's in the Charter and the duties of the Advisory Board probably should be done. Mr. Eldridge said I'll check the Charter.

Dorothy Fitzgerald said if Mr. Main is correct does that mean that all of these transfers and carryovers would have to go to the Advisory Board. Are they illegal? Would they all have to be redone? Mr. Eldridge said I'll have to check the Charter and check with our legal counsel.

Mrs. Fitzgerald said the Lewiston and Brunswick newspapers are advertising a meeting tomorrow night in Topsham. MDOT is looking at the Route 196 corridor from Lewiston to Topsham at 6 PM at the Topsham Town Office. I was wondering if anyone from Lisbon was going. Mr. Eldridge you said you are not going to be in town. Mr. Eldridge said our Town Engineer is involved that project. He plans on being there. We've already started contact with MDOT, probably 2 weeks ago. We're supplying them with the Transportation Study that the University of Vermont did several years ago. We're pretty active in that.

Mrs. Swatsworth-Turmelle said I have a question that goes back to the marijuana dispensary. You had talked about scheduling a public hearing. Do you know when you will hold that? Mr. Eldridge said probably at the next meeting. Mrs. Swatsworth-Turmelle said I have one question and it's going to take some research to answer. I would like to pose it out there to the Chief of Police. I would like some data he can actually draw on. I will research it myself. One of the concerns I have is that my husband used to work near a methadone clinic in Westbrook. There is a documented increase in crime within that area. My concern is, and I realize it is not an apples to apples comparison by any means in relation to the drugs, but I do have a concern since we are trying to increase and drive people to the town, what effect would this have in our community. If it increases our crime, that to me is more substantial than any loss of revenue we might see financially and that's where my concern is. I realize that it's very new, so there may not be a lot of raw data out there, but I would like to know on the ones that are now currently open, if they've seen an increase in crime within those communities. I would really like to know what those numbers are; that's why I'd like to ask it now, so that he can research that and make that part of the presentation.

Mr. Eldridge said Chief Brooks did mention something about that today. He said that he did not think there was, that people would just be coming in, picking it up, and leaving. He wasn't too concerned. Mr. Eldridge said I will see if there's any numbers for you. Councilor Mason said I

think that is what other towns and cities have struggled with, the crime aspect. It's like anything that could possibly be related. I think that would be one of the issues. Councilor Lunt said I think we'll want to get the Planning Board involved, too, along with the whole public hearing thing to see what people in town are feeling; would it make sense. Councilor Mason said talk to other towns and cities that are considering it and find out what the problems may be, or if there are none. Councilor Cote said I think we can relate it to when we started up with the State liquor stores and now they're doing it at the grocery stores. Probably at the beginning there's going to be a big thing to have, but ultimately it would probably be legalized and taken care of in the same way as the liquor stores.

Councilor Larochelle said, right now, the whole process is being done very cautiously, so that we can make sure that nothing happens almost automatically. It's like the windmill ordinance that we put in, I mean, without having any guidance at all it's really tough to restrict it or allow it. I think we'll deal with this, it allows us to have the ability to really control it.

Mrs. Swatsworth-Turmelle said, right, because we don't want all the work we've done with Revitalization or anything else to plummet, because when somebody Googles this town, again, it's going to be one of the first five things on Google that's going to come up, so I just want to be cautious and careful with that. You would be surprised when somebody Googles your town the things that will pop up. If you would go in every three months and Google our town I think you would be surprised at what you would see based on what is out there in the news and what's been publicized within that three month time-frame. You can Google some of the local residents and see what's popped up over the last few years. It's just one thing you have to be cautious of, but I'm more concerned from a community aspect of maintaining where we are and trying to continue to be better. I'm just concerned dealing with methadone patients myself and the case management that I do. I realize that it's a different schedule drug and not apples to apples, but it is a concern that I do have, whether it becomes legal or not, I'm more concerned with this.

Councilor Mason said those are the issues we'll address and if we don't have the answers to those questions at the public hearing, I'm sure Chief Brooks can get them.

APPOINTMENTS - NONE

COUNCILOR COMMUNICATIONS

Councilor Mason said I've heard that the Concerts in the Park have been really good. They've had a great attendance. There's a lot of videos online. They've had some good bands and it's really been an asset to our town. The gazebo is looking great. I'm really happy and I know Ross and Rosie are. Mr. Eldridge said Ross has worked very hard and Rosie, too.

Councilor Larochelle said going back to the taxes and the reassessment of the town. When I first came on to the Town Council that was one of the first things we were talking about. It is amazing how it's just talked about for years and years and nothing happens. We're trying to make something happen now and, unfortunately, I agree with Roger, it's not going to be a perfect solution at first. Hopefully, we will have the support over the next couple of years to make it happen. I know I was one of the people who didn't support it this year. Hopefully, we can put the right plan in place and make it happen, because we have to. It's going to be a long term process to make sure it's fair.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Vice-Chairman called for a five-minute recess at 8:30 PM. There were no objections noted. The Council came back into regular session at 8:35 PM.

VOTE (2010-140) Councilor Cote, seconded by Councilor Larochelle moved to go into executive session per 1 MRSA Section 405 (6) (C) Economic Development at 8:35 PM. **Order passed - Vote 5-0.** The Council Secretary was dismissed. The Council came out of executive session at 8:55 PM.

ADJOURNMENT

VOTE (2010-141) Councilor Larochelle, seconded by Councilor Pomelow moved to adjourn at 8:55 PM. **Order passed - Vote 5-0.**

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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