

**ST. GEORGE SELECT BOARD & ASSESSORS**  
**St. George Town Office**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**June 5, 2023**

The Select Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Present were Steve Cartwright, Rick Erb, Wendy Carr, Jane Conrad, Chair Van Thompson, Randy Elwell, Irene Ames, Conservation Committee Chair Ken Oelberger, Joss Coggeshall, Carl Danielson, and Annette Nagel attended.

Via Zoom: Present were Loreen Meyer and Adele Welch.

**REGULAR SESSION**

**Quorum**

A quorum was present.

**Public Comment**

**Joss Coggeshall**

It is nice to see some new faces. My name is Josh Cogger from Horse Point Rd. I'd like to thank you for putting the sign up on Route 131 coming into Port Clyde; that does slow the traffic down. Other towns are very happy with them also. Also, thanks for taking care of the drainage coming into the Monhegan Boat parking lot so it doesn't flood across the road there. I think he's going to have to blast that and I'm not sure that's going to be an easy project. I'm happy to hear the Port Clyde project is going on. I live there and it's really nice to have more public access there. The only public access was the landing, which was forty feet wide or so. I like that project. Thanks for the job you are doing.

**Adjustments to the Agenda**

Discussion of the Town's position on the conveyance of a newly created parcel less than the minimum lot size was moved to the beginning of the meeting.

## **Discussion of the Town's position on the conveyance of a newly created parcel less than the minimum lot size**

### **Erb**

It is on the agenda tonight and the issue has been discussed for a couple of months. The parcel on Barbers Point Rd. was divided into two and a parcel was sold, and that created a non-conforming lot. The town's position was that our ordinance does not allow that to happen. There has been some discussion with an attorney who's here today about whether it is applicable. She can make that case, if she wishes to the Board. The other alternative, which I thought perhaps we were moving in the direction of, but perhaps not, was to enter into what I would refer to as a consent agreement. I have dealt with them in other towns where I've worked, and basically it is where there is a violation of a land use ordinance, but it is agreed by all parties, for various reasons, and potentially with certain actions taken, that the town will basically adjudicate the violation itself, and allow it to continue. My experience, as I have told a few people, is mostly with extremely minor setback violations, particularly where a home was built three owners ago and wasn't picked up on until a mortgage survey was done for a new buyer. The town that I worked for at the time had some compassion for the new owner who was pretty much an innocent victim of all this, and we were able to adjudicate it. They would enter into a consent agreement, basically pleading guilty, paying whatever costs the town incurred, which are generally pretty minor. This is not an identical situation to that. Consent agreements are a tool that some municipalities use for typically minor land use violations. It may not be appropriate here, but I thought perhaps that's what we might be discussing. We do have people here representing the buyer and seller, I think, or at least the seller. I would invite them to speak to the Board and answer any questions you have and maybe we can decide if there's something that we can or should do.

### **Elwell**

Is there already a house there?

### **Erb**

No, this is a totally different situation.

### **Conrad**

The situation is that without approaching the town about whether they could have a variance to the rules that exist, the sellers created a lot that's smaller than is permitted, and they're now asking for permission to do it after the fact. The sellers then sold it to people across the street who wanted to use it, I think, for two parking spots for their house.

### **Erb**

They can speak for themselves. What I had heard initially was that it was protection against any chance of building across the street.

**Conrad**

To me, it's almost irrelevant what the purpose of it is because the rules are the rules. We have two different minimum lot size ordinances. It doesn't meet either one. If they had come to the town initially and asked if they could do it, they would have been told they couldn't do it. We can't just allow people to go ahead and do things and then ask for permission after the fact when people who follow the procedure would be denied. We can't set a precedent of doing this and procedurally, this is very unusual. The Select Board isn't usually doing things like this. It would be the Board of Appeals hearing an appeal, because they didn't like what Terry had said to them.

**Erb**

The opinion we have from our own town legal counsel is that there are no grounds to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Now perhaps, if the town were to require that the sale of the lot be rescinded, that could potentially be appealed to the Board of Appeals. I question whether it would be successful, but it could probably be appealed, at least. There may be another alternative the attorney who's here tonight may wish to address.

**Conrad**

I don't think that it is for us to tell them to rescind the sale. I would make a motion, which we could then talk about, that we decline to exempt this non-conforming lot from the town's ordinances on minimum lot size.

**Elwell**

I agree with you. If we do it for one, are we going to have to do it for everyone?

**Carr**

What are the lot sizes?

**Conrad**

The minimum lot size ordinance we have generally is one acre, and the Shoreland Zone is 50,000 square feet, and this new lot is 12,500 square feet. If we were <got to make up the law?> responsible for making up the law, it would be different. This might be a totally innocuous thing, but that's not the position we're in.

**Thompson**

No. Ordinances are laid out. My understanding is our attorney has also said that this is the case. What do I hear from the parties involved?

**Lauren Hall**

My name is Lauren Hall and I'm here on behalf of the Cottons. I'm an attorney at Strout and Payson. We don't have a full survey. We have a site sketch that was done by Don Richards, a surveyor, and it's

my understanding that this lot falls into the Shoreland Zoning area. The Shoreland Zoning does establish a minimum lot size per dwelling area, but the buyers, and I don't want to speak on behalf of the buyers, because Jesse Ryder can do that, but the buyers never had any intention to build on this lot. The surveyor and everybody were under the impression that there was no minimum lot size for a lot that was never intended to be built upon.

**Jesse Ryder**

I would completely agree that procedurally this is strange. But the reason is that there hasn't been an application for a building permit. The reason there has been no application for a building permit is that it hasn't gone to an appealable process as they're not the buyers. My clients are Sarah and Everett Allen, and they own a lot across from 31 Barbers Point Rd. The reason this has never gone before any board, or had any appeal is because they're not going to apply for a building permit. So, by virtue of just a lot existing, that's not a violation. Now, if they elected to build on it without a permit, well, then that's obviously a huge problem, but that's not the intent of my clients. I do think perhaps a consent agreement reflecting exactly that, stating that the town recognizes there has been this violation of the ordinance, however, my clients will sign, and I imagine the Cottons would sign as well. It could also state that there will be no improvements in terms of building anything that would require a building permit on this lot. The purpose of it is really to allow for my clients to be able to move cars within their own property, that's really the plan.

**Thompson**

I understand the purpose but you're defining it as a "lot".

**Jesse**

How about a parcel? That's fair.

**Carr**

What about a future buyer? It seems to me that whatever happens has to be recorded in the Registry of Deeds so there's an agreement that can be maintained in perpetuity, because otherwise the next set of buyers are going to benefit from the Board not enforcing the ordinance.

**Lauren Hall**

We even suggested at one point, in speaking with Terry, an asterisk on the tax map or something that says, "non buildable lot". I've seen that in other towns, but yes, something recorded in the registry would certainly not be problematic.

**Conrad**

It's in violation. You all know that it does not meet the minimum. You've said that in your letter that you knew that it didn't.

**Lauren Hall**

Going by the Shoreland Zone, there's no minimum lot size for a lot with no building.

**Conrad**

That's your interpretation of the ordinance because the smallest lot size is one that says residence, but the only place that I've seen anything about this, which isn't directly on point to this, is a state regulation about the state's Shoreland Zone that says even undeveloped lots are not exempt from the state's Shoreland Zone minimum lot size.

**Lauren Hall**

I'm not sure I agree with that. What I looked at was minimum lot size and it says per dwelling unit in the State Shoreland Zoning Ordinance.

**Conrad**

So, you think that even though there's a minimum lot size, if you are not going to build on it, you can make it any size you want. Is that your position?

**Lauren Hall**

I don't think there is a minimum lot size if there's no dwelling unit.

**Conrad**

Well, since we're not aware of any interpretation where that has been the case, having asked Michael Jordan who serves on the Planning Board, and our attorney as well. Our attorney has said, in his opinion, the minimum lot size of an acre applies.

**Thompson**

He's suggesting, without any guidance from the others, that our minimum lot size applies, if I have interpreted correctly.

**Conrad**

That was what I read his opinion to be, that he thinks the minimum lot size applies, but to me, there is nothing that says you can create smaller lots if you're not going to develop them.

**Lauren Hall**

I think it depends on how you interpret that language from the Shoreland Zone.

**Conrad**

Right. I feel we should rely on the advice of the town's counsel, and we should not be exempting a property where a lot has been created that doesn't meet the town's applicable ordinances because it wouldn't be fair for people who come to us ahead of time and ask for permission to have variances, if we

let you go ahead and do it and then after the fact request a consent decree.

**Cartwright**

What if the sellers simply allowed a right of way or allowed parking on that land? Wouldn't that solve the problem rather than selling a substandard lot?

**Lauren Hall**

That's an alternative that we talked about as a backup.

**Conrad**

Like Wendy said, they certainly have other options, easements that run with the land and other things. My concern primarily is setting a precedent.

**Cartwright**

It would also ensure that there is never a structure on it.

**Conrad**

Do we know that this is buildable lot? I don't think ...

**Lauren Hall**

It is certainly not buildable....

**Cartwright**

It wouldn't be buildable in any case.

**Thompson**

We have a motion on the floor.

**Elwell**

If they're going to use it to park overflow cars, are they going to put gravel in there?

**Conrad**

They already have. The only reason I know is that I live on that street.

**Elwell**

Other people have had to come to the Planning Board to put in gravel because of shoulders.

**Conrad**

Well, we would just be making a finding of how we interpret the ordinance, and then it is up to them to go back to the drawing board.

**Lauren Hall**

Does the town want or have a copy of the sketch signed by the surveyor; is that of use to anybody?

**Erb**

We already distributed it to them.

A motion was made by Conrad, seconded by Elwell, to decline to exempt the non-conforming lot across the street from 31 Barters Point Rd. from the town's ordinances on minimum lot size, and by a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

**Conflict of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest.

**Minutes**

Cartwright moved to approve the May 22, 2023 Select Board Meeting Minutes, as amended, seconded by Conrad, and by a 3-0 vote, the motion carried (Thompson and Elwell did not attend the meeting and abstained).

**Warrant****Thompson**

I saw nothing in particular that was of concern. I was intrigued by the \$4,900 welding bill.

**Erb**

The temporary replacement float that we agreed to install did require a fair amount of welding work to attach it to the float.

**Town Manager Report****Erb**

If you recall, we abated some property taxes where there was a storage shed that we had on the wrong property and you voted to abate it and sign it, and we did miss signing one abatement certificate but already voted on it.

We do have a request for your next meeting, which will be on June 26, 2023. It is from David Taylor of the Shellfish Committee. I just want to let you know that is on the agenda. As you recall, there has been a lot of discussion between the aquaculture people and the shellfish people. I will advise the aquaculture people as well, that this will be on the agenda.

**Thompson**

Is he going to supply information ahead of time?

**Erb**

I've asked him for information. I don't think I have enough to share with you yet. I wanted to let you know that we opened paving bids and Performance Pavement in Owls Head was the low bid. If you're interested (inaudible). They are the low bid and I suspect that we will be awarding it to them.

I have had a fair amount of conversation with our town attorney over the last week, some of it on the issue that you just took up. We wondered if the Board has any interest in meeting with the town attorney. It's fairly common for them to come in once a year to go over matters and answer questions. We have two new Select Board members, and both happen to be attorneys themselves. Are you interested? I think it would be helpful. There will be a fee. He won't charge for travel time, but it'll be his hourly fee.

**Conrad**

Would we call it a workshop, and not a regular meeting? That would make more sense.

**Thompson**

We have enough to cover at most meetings, given the discussions that might ensue.

**Erb**

Often, we go for Thursday evenings when that's the case.

**Thompson**

Okay. Let's plan for that.

**Erb**

One other thing that was on the payables warrant was a bill from Jim Kalloch for the repairs on the Kinney Woods Road from the May Day downpour and we're hopeful that will be reimbursed through FEMA.



## **Report on Recent Supreme Court Ruling on the Sale of Tax Acquired Property**

**Irene Ames**

One of the properties has been paid off.

**Erb**

There has been a lot of activity regarding tax acquired property and a Supreme Court decision about something that has been questioned in Maine for some time. Are the municipalities allowed to retain all of the funds when a piece of tax acquired property is sold or are they only entitled to back taxes and whatever costs are associated? Maine, like several states, would allow the municipality to retain the entire amount. The Supreme Court unanimously ruled against that and so now we are waiting to see what the State of Maine will do. The legislature already had a bill that would have eliminated the practice of municipalities keeping the entire amount, but they have not acted on it yet, to my knowledge. At the end of last week, they had not. They are running out of days in the legislative session. It will not surprise me if they leave without acting on it. If you saw what the Maine Municipal Association put out, they suggested either holding off on the sale of properties or going into escrow. We were sort of right in the middle of dealing with this. We have proposals from five real estate agencies. We've put out a request for proposals. Those are the ones who responded. Van and I will be reviewing those, and they will come back before the entire board. I don't see any reason why we wouldn't move ahead with that. I guess the question is, do we wait?

**Thompson**

Are they still interested?

**Cartwright**

I don't see that we would get in any legal trouble as long as we kept those funds in escrow. There is not a liability there if we follow MMA's advice.

**Erb**

I think that's true.

**Cartwright**

It would be hard to see what the problem would be.

**Erb**

As Irene has said, we've actually seen a little activity in the last few weeks and some are being paid off. That is really all we want.

**Irene Ames**

Two have been paid off and there is one that a family member is inquiring about. There are several pieces of land that are landlocked, and it doesn't make sense to pay the tax if it's landlocked and try to get a right of way through two pieces of property.

**Cartwright**

You would spend more than you would purchasing another piece of land.

**Irene Ames**

There are a couple of those on there.

**Thompson**

Should we act on anything, or should we wait until we review the real estate agents?

**Erb**

I think we should wait for the meeting on June 26<sup>th</sup>. We will review it and provide some recommendations and let the Board discuss it.

**Committee Reports Including the Take-up of Vacancies and Appointments to Committees: Board liaisons will make contact with committee chairs. Appointments to be made prior to July 1st**

**Planning Board – Carr**

**Carr**

I have some information about the members of the Planning Board. Kate Hewlett's term is up, and she will not be appointed again. She has served for fifteen years. Anne Cox recommended that Richard Moskovitz be moved up from alternate to full member. Also, there's been two recommendations for Elaine Taylor, also known as Dolly, to take Richard's spot as alternate one. I think both of those things are fine.

**Thompson**

Okay, we will act on that on June 26th.

**Carr**

At the last Planning Board meeting, a number of applications were granted. I don't think I'm going to go over all of them. The St. George School's application was considered complete, and they've met the standards.

**Cartwright**

Is that for the MakerSpace building?

**Carr**

It is. The Smith pier application was accepted as complete to replace the walkway in the pier. The goat enclosure at the Craignair is going to have a site visit. I think that application might be withdrawn but we will see. The Band of Buoy Tree/house application was considered complete, and the project was approved. There is a building project at Cooks Cove on Horse Point Rd., and the application was found to be complete. The building is going to be moved to the most practical extent because apparently, on a regular high tide, the water is up to the first floor, so they're going to do what they can for it. There was a preapplication meeting on Gavin McClain's property. This is for seasonal rental cabins on the upper portion of Atwoods Quarry. The applicant wanted to have a driveway instead of a road, but everyone reminded the applicant that it needs to be a road for emergency access. It can't just be a skinny driveway. There's going to be a site visit there on June 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Cemetery Committee – Carr****Carr**

I found out that the Chair is Joyce Davies. I have talked to her, but she said she's the Chair in name only. I also talked to John Falla. They have not met as far as I can see in three years. They have a full complement of members, but no one knows what is left of their term. No one has any idea. I looked on the town website.

**Conrad**

Richard Bates sent us a link to a document with all committee members and the terms. I don't believe they're all accurate.

**Carr**

Did it have a Cemetery Committee because the Cemetery Committee does not appear on anything.

**Elwell**

That group came later.

**Carr**

This relates to the tax acquired properties. Rick, I don't know if you know anything about this because apparently it dates back to two town managers ago. For Clark Hill Cemetery, there was a project for the town to take over the parcel of the cemetery itself. That was part of a larger parcel that was on the tax acquired list. Apparently, years ago Gartley and Dorsky were supposed to determine what portion of the lot was the cemetery. I'm not sure if they were contracted.

**Erb**

There was interest in squaring off the parcel.

**Elwell**

A year ago, Jerry Hall was looking into that.

**Erb**

I believe that when that parcel is finally resolved, one way or the other, we will resolve the cemetery boundary.

**Carr**

Apparently, that's the only hot topic they're facing right now. I told them that I would bring it up and go back to them.

**Erb**

Tell him that it has not been forgotten.

**Carr**

Very good. There's my report.

## **Board of Appeals – Conrad**

**Conrad**

Since one of the committees to which I'm liaison to has also not met in several years, I think it might make sense to remind the committees that they're all supposed to have an organizational meeting once a year, and if they can dispose of all the business they have at that meeting, it is fine, and then we could keep our records up to date about who's serving them, what their terms are, minutes of one meeting a year, so the public would know what's happening.

I would suggest that I go ahead and nominate people for vacancies on the Board of Appeals tonight because you never know when you're going to have an appeal. Since I went off the Board of Appeals, and one of the regular members died, we need to act as far as the Board of Appeals goes, the sooner the better, because you just never know. I spoke to Steve Miller, who's the Chairman, and his term - if Richard Bate's list is accurate, is up at the end of June, so I would renominate Steve Miller. Bill Reinhart and Richard Cohen are continuing their terms. I would nominate Evy Blum, who is currently an alternate, to move up to a regular member position. I spoke to John Hoff, a retired lawyer who did health care policy work in Washington DC for most of his career and is willing to serve. I think it's very helpful to have a lawyer on the Board of Appeals and he would be the only one. The alternates who are appointed for one-year terms would be Sandra Roak, who's currently an alternate, and Jenny Maltais who's a real estate paralegal, another person with relevant experience. So those would be the nominations that I would make for the Board of Appeals.

A motion was made by Conrad, seconded by Elwell, to renominate Steve Miller for Chair, Evy Blum and John Hoff as Regular Members, and Sandra Roak and Jenny Maltais as Alternate Members, and by a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

### **Comprehensive Plan Committee - Conrad**

#### **Conrad**

They haven't met, as far as I know, in the five years since we last submitted an updated plan to the town in May 2018. I have spoken to people who technically on paper, have active terms, and also to some people about whether they'd be interested in serving, with the thought that it would be good to have a diverse representation of people from the fishing community, somebody with a young family that would be nice or business owners, and so forth.

#### **Elwell**

Talk to Crystal Weaver. She lives up by Atwoods Quarry Road. She has a couple of young boys. She actually might be interested. She's with Ben Vale in the Rec Department.

#### **Conrad**

If anybody wants to send me suggestions, I have a list of people. I have Amy Morey as the Chair on paper. She's willing to continue, and so I am hoping to make nominations at the next meeting.

#### **Thompson**

Did the town vote on the Comprehensive Plan Committee back in 2018?

#### **Conrad**

Yes, it was adopted then and when we did that process, the town had a consultant, which was Noel Mussen. We submitted the proposed plan to the state, and they made some suggested changes so that we were in compliance. It went back and forth, and it was ultimately approved in May of 2018.

#### **Thompson**

I am following up on that because I am new to this process. I didn't realize that is actually an ordinance for the town, so I'm anxious to redo it.

#### **Conrad**

The May 2018 plan was just an update. It wasn't really a total review of the plan; we were just updating information that was already in the plan. Under state law, a comprehensive plan is effective for twelve years.

#### **Thompson**

Unless it is modified.

**Conrad**

Right, but the way I looked at it is the plan that we first mapped out, was adopted in May 2013, and was a process that went on for a couple of years before that. I figure if we get a committee together soon, then we have two years to really survey the community about priorities and think about all the issues with a goal of getting it before the voters two years from now.

**Elwell**

You update it with the dynamics of the town. We have sea level rise now and a lot of different issues.

**Conrad**

And the housing issue. I expect most of us took the survey that we had in 2011. A lot has changed and with things like Survey Monkey, maybe we'll get more responses this time. There's a lot to do there.

**Elwell**

I will see Crystal tomorrow at work. I'll talk to her about it.

**Harbor Committee - Elwell**

**Elwell**

The Harbor Committee hasn't met. I do have to get ahold of Ryan about the different terms; most everybody has another couple of years to go.

**Conrad**

Well, the Harbor Committee did meet since we were here last. You weren't there. So, I attended. I think Rick plans to talk about those issues later.

**Elwell**

Oh, that's right. I had to go to Belfast.

**Budget Committee - Thompson**

**Thompson**

We are looking for one person as Jerry Hall has now stepped down.

**Conservation Committee - Cartwright**

**Cartwright**

Ken is here. There's good and bad news. I sent around a list of the people who would be reappointed. Do you have that?

**Oelberger**

I didn't bring it with me, but basically, we have a full complement of people. Two people who completed the three-year terms signed up for another three-year term. Everybody else that had a one-year term, both the alternates and the associates, signed up for another year.

**Cartwright**

So, nobody is going off.

**Thompson**

We will reappoint them when we do it on June 26th.

**Cartwright**

I went down the Fort Point Trail today and was impressed with the work on it. It's mucky after the rains and I stepped carefully so I wouldn't fall. I wanted to go down and see the graffiti and the vandalism down at Fort Point and it was very disturbing. I think we've got a problem if we have people writing "nigger" on rocks and trees and putting swastikas on things, and this is not the first incident because someone put swastikas on Harts Neck Road which we removed near where I live. I don't think we should take this lightly.

**Erb**

No, we don't. I can tell you what we've done so far. We had been told that happened, at least about the swastika.

**Cartwright**

People have some idea, even if they're young people, what they're doing, and I think they have some idea what it signifies. That is not a trend we want to see in our town or anywhere.

**Erb**

We photographed what was there and were sort of torn because we wanted it to be removed as quickly as possible. So that's what we did. We took photographs. I did reach out to Sheriff Polky to let him know what had happened and asked his advice on how to move on from here. He said that they are required to prepare reports on an annual basis, or more often, on those types of incidents in the town and agreed that photographing it was a good idea. He said where they have run into such heinous graffiti, they have done surveillance, even in a spot such as the trail that we talked about. He and I will stay in touch but that was his response.

**Conrad**

Is this on the state part of the property?

**Elwell**

Yes, it's on the rocks on the shore and on the tree.

**Cartwright**

Right on the historic site.

**Conrad**

I wonder if we should notify the Attorney General's office because they monitor hate crime activity.

**Cartwright**

That is a good idea. It is state property.

**Elwell**

It is a good idea. They didn't paint that stuff down there but down on Snows Point Rd., towards Hoggy's Corner, they painted on rocks down there. It wasn't the swastikas, but it was the same paint.

**Cartwright**

Years ago when it happened at the Roaring Spout, I worked hard to help clean that up.

**Elwell**

Quite a while ago on the back of the sheds at the school, we painted over it.

**Cartwright**

Unfortunately, when it's on natural things like trees and rocks, it's not easy to remove.

**Oelberger**

Scott and I went out the day after we discovered it and got some graffiti remover from Spears. It was only a partial job. We had wire brushes. We tried to wire brush it off. We haven't removed it from the trees yet because we didn't want to disturb the trees. The advice we had was to use some latex paint to cover it over, so we still need to go do that. Regarding Roaring Spout, we can get some of it off but there's still an outline of what was there previously. Steve said they used some other paint to just blend it into the natural color of the rocks to finish it off.

**Cartwright**

It is not ideal. You could still tell that it had been defaced.

**Thompson**

I put up an arrow for Roaring Spout because people were walking up the road rather than going down the path. I put up a painted white arrow and fastened it to the tree that the sign is on and sure enough, it's gone.



**Erb**

We've lost a lot of street and road signs.

**Cartwright**

I had to work hard to get down there as you pointed out. It is harder to get down there than ever.

**Oelberger**

We had a big, "closed" sign there as well, and they ignored it.

**Cartwright**

On the plus side, the trail looks great, and the bridge looks really nice. It is going to be a beautiful trail. I see they rerouted it in some places.

**Oelberger**

That was always the intention. The trail designer we worked with almost two years ago now came up with a route that would be better and easier to comply with for UA requirements for (Inaudible).

**Cartwright**

It's still going to be a nice natural looking trail and you can enjoy nature as you go down there. I think it is very pretty.

**Oelberger**

I think the other thing to mention is the town recently signed an MOU with the state to do the state side of the property to complete the trail beyond the town property, around the perimeter of the state property, and we just got a modification to our grant for an additional \$45,000 to do the State part of the property.

**Affordable Housing Committee- Cartwright**

**Cartwright**

There is nothing to report yet but probably soon.

**Resiliency Committee – Thompson**

**Thompson**

Several of us, along with members from the Resiliency Committee, were at the workshop that was at the Samoset today and learned quite a bit. I purloined our copy of the "Maine Community Resilience Workbook. It was a very nice conference. It certainly gave us a lot of potential for things moving forward.

**Cartwright**

It was basically about sea level rise. That was the primary problem. There were different speakers and vendors in the sense of engineering companies. We already have Sebago Technics but there were other outfits like that. Suzy was there. Who else was there?

**Thompson**

Besides you, Suzy, Ann Rogers and I were there.

**Port Clyde Landing Project (10 Cold Storage Road)****Erb**

Today we had a Zoom meeting between Noel Mussen, Greg Johnston, the engineer, and CPM, so you have a little bit of information to report. I think people have been wondering about the date for steel delivery. It looks like that will be sometime between June 19th and the 26th. We need to make some approvals on things like lighting and the hydraulic lift that's going in. I want to ask the Board tonight if that is something you would like to refer to the Harbor Committee? It seems like they would be the obvious ones.

**Elwell**

I agree. Most commercial fishermen use them every day to know what the (Inaudible) was and what they need. We talked about that with the Harbor Committee and also about using lights with down shielding because they were lighting up the whole neighborhood and all the houses close by.

**Conrad**

Where are they talking about putting lighting? Is it right near the construction?

**Erb**

They are talking about permanent street lighting for the parking lot area.

**Conrad**

Will the Harbor Committee be presenting a proposal of these kinds of things, such as where the lighting is going to be and the long-term parking spots that the Board will be approving?

**Elwell**

Where the parking spaces will be is already in the plan. The lighting is already there. It's just a matter of deciding what the lighting is going to be.

**Thompson**

The Planning Board has already gone through that also.

**Elwell**

It has already been approved. It is just a matter of the particulars.

**Cartwright**

I think it is really important that lighting be shaded or pointed down because I live across from the harbor and there are really intense lights that shine right in my window.

**Elwell**

At one of the Harbor Committee meetings, when this first started, they began discussing this down shielding because of all the nearby neighbors.

**Cartwright**

Some of these newfangled lights are pretty bright.

**Thompson**

It's called a cargo light. It is well covered and directed down.

**Erb**

One other thing. The float that we talked about, when discussing the welding bill, is scheduled to be put back in place around June 15<sup>th</sup>.

**Conrad**

In Port Clyde, as they requested at that public hearing?

**Erb**

Yes. We have the price from CPM for the walkway. It's around \$26,000. It has railings on both sides and jersey barriers. It meets OSHA standards. It's not going to be an inexpensive job, but people did seem to believe that this was a priority, so that is the plan to move ahead.

**Conrad**

Can you just remind everybody who will be using that walkway, what the purpose of it is?

**Thompson**

It's a public landing.

**Erb**

For anyone who uses that large float.

**Thompson**

Is that part of the cost of the Cold Storage Load Project?

**Erb**

Yes, as it is public property being impacted during construction.

**Thompson**

It is used by a number of individuals, including those on Hupper Island, as well as businesses.

**Cartwright**

Like Chief Justice John Roberts.

**Conrad**

It's interesting to know that number because soon we'll be talking about the parking number.

**Thompson**

Does that come out of the Cold Storage Harbor Project?

**Erb**

CPM will be starting on the side of the project further away from where that walkway is. It will probably take about four weeks, possibly more, before they will be there. In the meantime, we will avoid putting up fencing on that part of the project for as long as we can, because that will preserve access and preserve parking. It will be fenced because the construction site needs to be separated from where people can get access to it, but we will hold off as long as we can. The Harbor Committee did meet last Thursday, and they recommended that the Town acquire parking spaces. As everybody knows, we've been talking with Andy Barstow in Vinalhaven and Monhegan Boat Line. There was a lot of discussion, but in the end, they did not make a recommendation to the Select Board on the number of spaces or the exact location of them.

**Conrad**

There was a lot of discussion. It was over an hour during which they considered the different options of leasing spots near what has been a kayak store, versus some less expensive spots up the hill. Ultimately, I think, because it's our responsibility to ensure public safety, they deferred the decision to us as to what we would want to lease and the cost of it. They even talked about recommending a price cap, but since that's the responsibility of the Select Board, I think they decided not to do that.

**Erb**

This is an aerial photo of the area where the kayak business was previously. The two rows nearest the center are potentially available to us. When I've talked with Andy Barstow, he thought that there were

seven spaces in the center and six up above that. It's either seven or eight in that center row. He was going to measure it off to see what the real number was.

**Cartwright**

What kind of signage do you envision for that?

**Erb**

I think it would be important to limit the number of hours that people can stay there.

**Conrad**

Basically, something like visitor hours. Two-hour parking would cover people going to a restaurant but are there people that come and go out on their own boat that park there and might want to be gone for three hours? I don't know.

**Erb**

I've heard anywhere from two hours to four hours.

**Cartwright**

No overnight parking.

**Elwell**

The spaces that are being lost cannot be used by the general public anyway because businesses use them for their employees.

**Conrad**

Historically, I have often parked down there on that jetty.

**Elwell**

When you can get a spot. To be honest, I don't think we should lease spaces at all. There isn't a business down there that doesn't already have its own parking, and the spaces that we are taking away, most of the time, can't be used by the general public. Andy Bastow parks his employees down there. Allen Island parks its employees down there. I've gone down there and actually just parked at Andy's and walked to the store because there's no place to park. That's my opinion. I don't believe we should lease spots from anybody.

**Conrad**

I do think we should lease spaces. The town makes available to the general public fourteen spots now that we're going to be losing and it's our responsibility to ensure public safety and that stretch of the road owned by the town is going to be more dangerous and congested. To the extent that we can lease

parking spots that are near the kayak store and have signage to prevent people from being down there and turning around, I think we're better off.

**Elwell**

The walkway thing has kind of got to me. I agree with the float but if I come in with my boat, and there's two people using that for commercial use and shouldn't be.

**Thompson**

As part of this project, we have said we are not going to impact the businesses.

**Thompson**

I would suggest that we make sure that these remain public parking. That would be the idea of why setting a limit becomes important. I think that is part of maintaining business down there. We've said we would do that and build it into the project.

**Cartwright**

There's definitely no perfect solution. We are just trying to alleviate things a little bit.

**Erb**

To refresh people's memory the cost per spot in the photo that you see there is \$1500 for the season. The season has already started and will run until October. The per month fee for the upper lot, which is off Glenmere Rd., is \$125 per month.

**Cartwright**

It is far from the water.

**Erb**

It is but it is not a bad walk.

**Conrad**

The problem we have is that we would have almost no control over how they're going to make it clear where people are parking up there. We've talked about island workers and that we don't want them taking these spots up and encouraging them to pay to park in that higher lot. It's going to be much harder to monitor and I think if all the spots that we decide to lease, if we do that, are in one place then we just need one set of signs to communicate to the public about this, versus having six here and six there. I know we have people here who are members of the Harbor Committee if anybody wants to weigh in, or members of the public.

**Carl Danielson**

I'm the new Alternate and I think the Harbor Committee gave a motion and it was conveyed to the Select Board, and they have to make a decision.

**Conrad**

The recommendation being that we lease spaces without saying where or how many.

**Carr**

How many spaces are available again?

**Thompson**

Either 13 or 14.

**Cartwright**

What is the total cost for the whole thing?

**Conrad**

\$1500 times 13 or 14.

**Cartwright**

We're going to spend \$26,000 on a ramp; that was the point. We're talking about a major project. How long is this project expected to go on?

**Erb**

It is scheduled to be done in June.

**Carr**

It's not going to be done in June.

**Thompson**

I don't think we can look at it relative to that aspect. Let's address this summer to start.

**Carr**

You're going to create expectations.

A motion was made by Cartwright, seconded by Conrad, to purchase thirteen or fourteen parking spaces from Monhegan Boat Line for the public, as close to the waterfront as possible, and by a 4-1 vote, the motion carried.

**Conrad**

I would make a motion that a subcommittee of Rick, and whomever he chooses, be in charge of sign language. We don't all need to decide the wording on the signs. We all agree that it will say "short term parking".

**Thompson**

We can merely direct Rick. We do not need a formal motion.

**Conrad**

The signs are up to you. I do feel like the sooner those signs are up, on the town website and the public knows, the better because the steel will be delivered on June 19<sup>th</sup>, and we need people to be aware of the situation and only park where they are supposed to park.

**Cartwright**

It also is a gesture that shows we're trying to help which hopefully won't be lost to the public.

**Conrad**

Before we moved on, the family that owns Thompson Island and conveyed the jetty to the town, gave it to us. The deed says we have to make available two spots for them, to be able to always park to get out to their island. Ryan said he's in touch with them.

**Elwell**

The original plan was to let them park on the hill, right above the site.

**Conrad**

That would be beyond the construction zone. I think that it's important for him to have that communication and agreement from them that those two spots are going to be acceptable to them because if we have to designate two of the ones we're leasing, we need to know that.

**Thompson**

That's informational for them until this is worked out.

**Conrad**

Right. I just wanted everybody to be aware of that because it was news to me that there were spots that we are required to make available to them.



## **Communications**

### **Cartwright**

Before we get on to Makerspace, I think I should bring up this letter about parking in Port Clyde. I have a handwritten letter from Scott Dalrymple, who owns two cottages on Marshall Point Rd., Stony Crest and HateToQuitIt. He lives in Brunswick, at least in the wintertime, and has charters and cottage rentals. He said several sections of the lighthouse fence have been blown down and others need to be repaired. After working on the lighthouse parking expansion and adding ten spaces his concerns are traffic, noise, congestion, dust, paving stormwater runoff, and additional impervious surfaces, He is also concerned about the cutting down of trees, resulting in the loss of windbreak. The rock barrier on the ocean side in front of cottages has washed out so he requests additional rock be added to help mitigate wash over. Several spits are now very susceptible. He is talking about the road and damage to property, and I guess expressing his opposition to a bigger parking lot.

### **Thompson**

We will be discussing that in the future so let's make sure we are aware of that and put it in the notes.

## **St. George MSU CTE/Makerspace Project - Signing Warrant for Town Referendum Vote**

### **Thompson**

We have the signing of the warrant for the town referendum vote.

### **Erb**

I will give you the schedule.

### **Thompson**

In essence, we're looking at this in terms of saying that the referendum would be on August 8th if everything goes correctly, is that right?

### **Erb**

That's correct.

### **Thompson**

And that's what we would be voting on?

### **Erb**

It is to authorize the expenditure since the project budget change; they need to revote on that, so that's what you have here. I have two things to sign tonight. One is for the referendum vote on August 8th, but

before that, there has to be a public hearing and that will be on June 21st. I have notices for you to sign for both of those. We've been working with Mike Felton.

**Thompson**

If there is no more discussion on that, we will go ahead and sign it.

**Thompson**

Is it \$3 million?

**Elwell**

\$3.8 million and the longer it takes, the more prices go up. Ann Matlack is working on a grant from the feds.

**Update on transfer of ambulance assets to the Town**

**Erb**

I've been meeting with Tim Polky and John Falla and have a new revised graph to share with them. I'm quite certain that by your meeting at the end of June, we should have this resolved.

**Oelberger**

I was hoping it might be tonight and that's why it was on the agenda, but it didn't quite make it.

**Executive Session**

Chair Thompson moved that we enter into executive session to discuss legal advice regarding real estate and potential litigation in executive session as allowed under Title 1 Section 405, 6c of the Maine Revised Statutes:

“Discussion or consideration of the condition, acquisition, or the use of real or personal property permanently attached to real property or interests therein or disposition of publicly held property or economic development only if premature disclosures of the information would prejudice the competitive bargaining position of the body or agency.”

The Board voted to enter an Executive Session regarding the Old Woods Farm property.

The Board voted to end the Executive Session and the public meeting was re-opened for the purpose of adjourning.

## **Adjournment**

A motion was made by Conrad, seconded by Elwell, to adjourn the Select Board meeting, and by a unanimous roll call vote, the motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Taylor  
Recording Secretary  
Town of St. George, Maine