

ST. GEORGE SELECT BOARD & ASSESSORS
MEETING MINUTES
St. George Town Office
Monday, April 2, 2018

The Select Board meeting was called to order at 7 p.m. Members present were: Richard Bates, Chair; Randy Elwell, Jerry Hall, Wayne Sawyer, and Tammy Willey. Also present: Tim Polky, Elizabeth Curtis, Scott Vaitones, Mike Felton, Cassie Kilbride, Dan Morris, Nick Lapham, Ben Norton, Wendy Carr, Dave Schmanska, Bill Mroz, and Evy Blum.

PUBLIC HEARING:

-Dockside Seafood, LLC d/b/a The Dip Net Restaurant - Application for a Victualer's License.
Chairperson Bates declared the Public Hearing open at 7 p.m. There being no public comments, Chairperson Bates declared the Public Hearing closed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: (nonverbatim and edited) Nick Lapham, Tenants Harbor, commented: I want to talk on the Cold Storage proposal/ballot. I first want to acknowledge the efforts of the Harbor Committee. I know that they have been working at this a long time, and I didn't say this the other night. I really think they did a great job in terms of putting together a specific package for the infrastructure and engineering. I still have some questions and concerns.

1. This seems to me like a project that - and I understand where it is an opportunity, very limited public access to the water, all of that. But the benefits of this. I see the benefits of this going to a very small group of people, where the majority of taxpayers are paying. I am not clear about that and what is the benefit to the whole community. I get the ripple effect of hotels, restaurants, and all that, but I am still not convinced of that - what the benefit is to the other members of the community?

2. I still have some questions about what happens if this ever requires more money and how are the annual operating and maintenance expenses going to be covered.

- Is that going to be something that is going to have to be put in the annual budgets once this project is completed?
- Is there any intention, any plan for generating some sort of revenues that would go to offset whatever annual costs there are for maintaining the property?
- What would happen if this ballot measure didn't pass? What is the plan, then?
- Is there any plan to develop any buildings on this site which would require bathroom and septic facilities and is that all provided for?
- It has just occurred to me in meeting earlier today, that at least for me, it might have been more helpful if aside from the plot plan that had there been some kind of artist or architectural rendition of what this would look like. Because it is really hard to grasp just looking at a plot plan. Those are my questions and concerns.

Chairperson Bates thanked Mr. Lapham and reminded everyone this was an opportunity for public comment and this agenda item would be discussed later on in the meeting. Chair Bates said between now and the time the public had an opportunity to vote, there would be a lot more discussions.

Lapham: Is this definitely going to be on the May ballot and is there any consideration for putting it on the November ballot?

Chairperson Bates said the Select Board would be discussing that issue tonight and did the Board have any comments for Nick at this stage? Selectperson Sawyer recommended holding comments until later.

REGULAR SESSION:

- Adjustments to Agenda: The following agenda items were moved from New Business to Regular Session:

FY'19 School Budget Presentation
10 Cold Storage Road Public Hearing Review

- FY'19 School Budget PowerPoint Presentation: Superintendent Mike Felton, Scott Vaitones and Cassie Kilbride introduced themselves. Mr. Vaitones will be retiring as Business Manager, effective June 30, 2018. Ms. Kilbride is currently the bookkeeper/payroll specialist and will assume the position of Business Manager, effective July 1, 2018. Mr. Felton thanked Mr. Vaitones for all his work over the past three to four years. Mr. Felton said the school was very fortunate that Ms. Kilbride could step in and assume the role of Business Manager. He felt this would be a strong and smooth transition for the school.

Mr. Felton described the St. George School as a community school dedicated to the success of every single student and to the vitality of the town of St. George. Mr. Felton said they prepared the budget thinking three to five years ahead, making sure that regardless of a decrease in revenues from the state or unexpected increased expenditures, the school would be in the best position to protect taxpayers and also to protect the programs for the students.

Mr. Felton stated school expenditures were up slightly at 2.8% or \$150,000; however, the amount of funding they are asking the town for has dropped approximately \$47,000 or 1%. He stressed the School Board was in the middle of their budget workshops, and he and Vaitones were still making changes to the figures but the end result was looking good. Felton explained expenditures were up but the assessment was down because the school's revenues were up. The three primary sources of revenue:

1. State reimbursement for Special Education costs – anticipated amount is \$196,000. This is an increase from last year. The state is now funding more of Special Education costs, especially for St. George, as the town is considered a minimum receiver with a high tax base and is paying more for each student who receives special education services.

2. Last year the state passed the budget late and the school found out they were getting \$51,000 more than they had anticipated. There were certain items the money could be used for. The plan is to use this money next year to offset the tax increase.

3. In the proposed budget, \$150,000 will be taken out of fund balance. He said they are very cautious when they use fund balance, not wanting to deplete it and have built in a contingency fund.

Anticipated school expenditures for the coming year:

- Funding for a school wide Behavior Interventionist. The school has students who required intensive support for severe, behavioral, social, emotional needs. Currently this work is done by Christine Miller, Mike Felton, and the classroom teachers.
- Alternative education or behavioral day treatment program for students who have severe needs. The school does have students who are in out of district placements, receiving services. Out of district placements can cost \$50,000 to \$150,000. The school does not like to send students away and it would be more cost effective, if done internally.
- An additional \$81,000 was built into the budget for the facility and the grounds. The building has not been adequately maintained over the last several years. The exterior gym wall has severe water damage and needs work. The playground is 15-20 years old and is showing signs of wear and tear. Gutter and drain work above the gym wall needs attention. The fence in the lower field behind the school is falling down, the basketball ball fence needs replacement and there are other needed repairs. The goal is to build the money into the budget and each year reinvest it into the facility.
- Proposal to create a Special Education reserve account. The reason is, the school has to provide services to a student if the student's IEP requires it, regardless of the cost.
- Create a capital reserve account for larger items. For example, paving around the school parking lots will have to be done.
- Funding request for a new bus and bus driver. Next year, there will be 25 students at Oceanside, 10 students at Medomak Valley H.S., 12 students at Lincoln Academy, and 32 students at Camden Rockport High School. As student population continues to grow, Felton felt a van or small bus would not have the capacity to handle the anticipated number of students. He said if one bus breaks down, they have to delay school because they do not have enough to do the high school runs and St. George runs at the same time.

Mr. Felton said that the St. George School is investing more in student instruction than the average school in Maine, according to a 2015-16 report.

Budget Article 1, Instruction: This is the regular education money spent at St. George School and all the high school tuition. The school board renegotiated and signed a new contract for St. George students that is basically the same agreement they have with every other high school which is the lower of two amounts set by the state.

This year, the school budgeted about \$14,000 per student but that number dropped to \$10,000 for every student. That was a \$4,000 savings for every student who attended RSU #13. Next year because of the new contract, the school would be budgeting \$190,000 less for high school tuition. Per pupil expenditures at the St. George School are about the same.

The budget includes a full-time French teacher, an Early Elementary Special Ed/Interventionist to work with K-4 and K-5 students and increasing the music teacher's position to 60%. Mr. Felton said Math Camp will have more staff this year because of students' and parents' interest in the program.

Chairperson Bates asked if all the high schools would be charged the same amount. Felton said the tuition would be calculated by the same state formula, and St. George would pay the lower of the two numbers. Bates asked about the \$192,000 drop in high school costs. Vaitones said there would be fewer students (25) next year at Oceanside than this current year (40-45). Selectperson Willey asked if the Gifted and Talented Program was being eliminated. Felton said they created a position called S.T.E.A.M. The teacher's budget would be split between the G/T program and the S.T.E.A.M. program.

-10 Cold Storage Road Public Hearing Review: (nonverbatim and edited) Selectperson Elwell said Dan Morris and the Harbor Committee did an excellent job presenting the information at the Public Hearing, Thursday night. Chairperson Bates introduced Dan Morris who spoke on the issue.

Morris: There was no questions that we had put in a lot of time and effort into this and it is difficult because when you go to those meetings, you listen to people's comments and issues that we have heard many times more than once. We have tried to formulate over the course of a long period of time, some sort of response to the comments. It was not always easy because, like everybody here, they are a member of the community who volunteered to try to put together a plan that they thought would make sense to the community and at the same time, hope that 10 Cold Storage Road would be used to its maximum extent, if it can be built. At the same time, not have a negative impact on congestion and on safety and all the other issues that surround the greater Port Clyde area in the summertime.

We felt like most of the issues that had been brought up were summertime issues. Summertime congestion and safety and traffic flow. It would probably amount to a time of high use for the facility as well. So, we have tried to strike a balance.

The balance that we struck, was we felt that the facility is worth doing. On the one hand, you wish the facility to be utilized to its maximum extent by a lot of people but on the other hand, we should be careful what we wish for because if it results in chaos between Factory Road and 10 Cold Storage Road, we are going to have address those issues, as well. So, on the one hand it is speculation to say that this project will blow up congestion and turn the place into chaos. I do believe that is just speculation at this point. We probably won't know for sure for several years into the project's use as to what we are going to be faced with down there.

Some of the things that we built into the project should mitigate some of those issues but until you know how much use it is going to get, you don't really know what you've planned will work and keep everybody safe and keep congestion to a minimum. I don't know how you can avoid congestion there, at all. It is a much bigger problem than what this project entails.

On balance, we haven't met as a committee to talk over what was said at the Public Hearing to formulate a committee-wide response. Just me, thinking out loud, we don't feel like the project should be held hostage to the larger issues that we all face down there. We don't think that would fair. We think that the project is too important to that area and to the community, as a whole, to hold it hostage to larger issues that the project may or may not exacerbate. We are not going to know for several years.

The other issue is the business plan. Bill Mroz spoke well to that the other night. It would be great to go into a plan like this with a business plan that could confidently predict that the project will generate x-number of thousands of dollars of revenue for the town or for area businesses. We have shown an interest with our consultant to try to develop some sort of economic impact numbers for projects like this in other towns, but that information is very hard to come by. Unfortunately, we haven't had a lot of success in getting those types of numbers.

I think you look at these other towns anecdotally and you say Rockport has a beautiful facility, Wiscasset has a beautiful facility and personally you see a lot of people recreational and commercial users at both of those facilities. You have to believe that those towns both made substantial investments in those facilities. They saw a need within their harbors and responded to that. I think that is pretty much what we are recommending St. George do. The fact of the matter is, this type of water front, they are not making any more of it and we have lost access just in the harbor of Port Clyde in the last five or six years. I have overused the term, but it is a once in a lifetime opportunity for the town to gain some control over some access. In considering that the town has only had 183' of it in 125 miles, considering how important our oceanfront is to this town – a lot of the economic vitality of this town depends heavily on our waterfront, whether it is guys like me lobster-fishing or people trying to catch a mackerel by boat or off the dock, people just taking in the view.

If we didn't have that seasonal influx of people enjoy what the town has to offer, many of the businesses in town would not be here. You can ask and almost all of them will say that in the wintertime they are either not open or it would be a losing money proposition. The only way these businesses are profitable is by catering to the summer people that come. I think this project will encourage that. What does that mean from an economic impact? I have to believe it is positive but to frame it in a certain number, I don't have that. I don't know that it is available.

Chairperson Bates: To Dan's point about these municipal projects, it seems to me that some municipal projects are easier to do a cost benefit analysis than others. In other coastal towns where they have invested in their dock and harbor area, some of it is intangible. I know it would be nice to have a hard business plan, but I feel that is a hard thing to do because you cannot anticipate what the water-based uses are going to be but given the way the town has always depended on those in the past, I think you could say that is going to continue that way.

Mroz: Dan and I have been at this for three years, and a business plan, an economic development discussion is a circular item because you keep coming back to how would we use it. A true business plan means that we need to generate \$208,000 per year for 20 years. We have been down the path of full recreational in our discussions to full commercial. The practical point is you are setting the fundamental basis for the future to be able to do those things but generating a business plan that we brought before the town or that anyone brought before the town, to make it revenue neutral or create an excess of revenue over expenses, is not going to happen before May or before November because it is fundamental infrastructure that is being built for the town for the future and not something that is being, I don't believe, for revenue generation, currently.

Offsetting revenues, those things will come along but we couldn't build a business plan that generated enough revenue to cover that cost. We can come up with some offsetting revenues and will over time but not a couple hundred thousand dollars a year.

Morris: I have said this before, in a perfect world, as a Harbor Committee, we would like this facility to generate at least enough revenue to cover its maintenance and annual expenses. Maybe even create a reserve fund for future maintenance because these facilities tend to go along and deteriorate gradually, and then all of a sudden, you need five or six floats, or you need different things that happen to wharfs. This wharf has been built with a very long-life span in mind. That is not to say it won't require some maintenance, here or there. Just pilings alone, wooden pilings that you would use for the face of the dock are going to wear out if boats lay up against them. You never know how long things like that will last. We do have some experience with that at the co-op. You can replace five or six pilings every year. A lot of times we tend not to do that and then all of a sudden, we need ten or fifteen which from a contractor's point of view makes much more sense. It would be great if this project required very little annual town expenditures.

Chairperson Bates: I thought one of the plans to black top the whole thing was to minimize the expenses on the surface, itself. By spending more to finish it properly, that was one of the steps.

Norton: I would guess from experience down there, probably one of our biggest maintenance and upkeep costs will be keeping floats together, no matter how good we build them. It is a problem everywhere. Looking forward in years, that will probably be an issue down there – unforeseen weather

forecasts, whatever it may be. We will do the best we can to protect it and haul them out. As far as the actual unit, itself, we should get a long, long time out of that the way they are proposing building that.

Selectperson Elwell: Trying to answer Nick's question on how it benefits the whole town. I thought that was a good question the other night. I live on the north end of town and grew up in town. One of the things, I have had a boat since I was little, and always had to go to Thomaston to put it in the water to come to Port Clyde because there is no place to park. Hopefully with this facility, if I want to go out and go around the islands, I can go to Port Clyde, launch my boat and be able to park, like other people in town. Or maybe if people want to go get something to eat in Port Clyde, they can sit down and enjoy the harbor. That is what I see. I don't feel people will look at our public landing online and say we are going to Port Clyde; but it is a facility when they get here. I know when the boys were little, a lot of the wharfs got bought up and you are no longer allowed on them, you can't go mackerel fishing. It limits an area when a family can go mackerel fishing. The Old Cold Storage used to be another place, but you can no longer go there.

I think this will benefit a lot of families in town for the ability to put their boats in on that end of town to picnic, launch their boat, fish, or just enjoy the waterfront. I know some of the fishermen in Wheeler's Bay and some from Spruce Head that were actually using Port Clyde landing. In talking with some of the fishermen, they have wharfs they are at right now, but if there is a nice facility and they don't have to give a percentage to a wharf, you would actually see them come into Port Clyde. I think it will benefit all the way around. I hope that answers your question. For me, that is how I feel how it benefits the whole town. It would be nice to put one in in Tenants Harbor, but this happened to come up and it is going to better our waterfront.

Schmanska: I will try to touch on a couple of the questions that you had, as well. When I think of this project, I don't necessarily think of somebody coming from Massachusetts to use it. I think more of the person who lives on the Dennison Road who doesn't have access to the ocean in any way, shape or form. I live on the Ridge Road, land bound, but I own a boat, so I can get out and I can go places. I look at the family on Dennison Road or Ridge Road that is not fortunate enough to have a boat or have a wharf of their own and water front of their own. This is something that is tangible forever for those folks.

To the question about a building on it. The way the flood plain is set, is set at that property. The only place that could have a building is very, very limited; it is up on the hill, so whatever would be there, if there was anything, would be a very small place. Consequently, any maintenance fees would be very, very minor because it would be a terribly small building.

To the costs and usage – right now we have three commercial users. They all pay a fee. They are currently allowing the town more monies that we were receiving from the tax. I don't see that changing as well. Commercial users. There is no question. They know that. There is not a commercial wharf that doesn't have a return on the commercial use. I understand those concerns but right now we really can't quantify the use. We are making money right now, relative to what it was before.

Buildings and businesses and owners change. Should we should stop helping a commercial enterprise because one person owns it? I don't think so. That business employees a lot of people, improves the buildings, and that will continue, and we want to help those people, whoever they are and whatever they own.

I just see this as a win-win situation if we can get it off the ground. It is a huge benefit to the town and will continue to be with little to no maintenance. There are some unanswered questions, but I don't think any of those unanswered questions, at this point, are huge enough for us to stop the process.

You asked what it might look like. That depends almost entirely on how we divvy it up in terms of use. Is it going to be 1/3 recreation, 2/3 commercial? We don't know yet. There was an idea talking about getting some students from a landscaping schools to brainstorm and ask them what would they do with property? It is a good idea and it is a possibility. We had some initial drawings brought up but withdrew them so not to give people the wrong impression. There are just some questions that we cannot answer with a finite answer and I apologize for that.

Chairperson Bates asked the Harbor Committee if Noel Musson could put his power point presentation on the town website. Musson's company had worked on similar projects and their plans included drawings. The committee will discuss this with Musson, tomorrow.

Selectperson Elwell said there is a fee-base for fishermen who want to use the wharf now, but because of its condition, they cannot put traps on it or back large trucks down. Elwell said the fee is based on the co-op's annual fishermen fee base. Once the facility is done, if voted in, fees might be restructured.

Schmanska said Aquaculture had become a major factor. There were a lot of tradition harvesters of the ocean in town looking to diversify. Shrimping used to be a good fill-in for fishermen in the off season and they no longer have that. A lot of the fishermen have been looking into scalloping, oysters, rockweed, kelp farming, etc. The commercial entities where they work now, don't want more clutter, etc., on their property. He said fishermen will always need a place to harvest from the ocean and speculates that in the future there will be less and less wharfs available. This project would lock in an area where people could take something out of the ocean forever, and that does not exist in this town, right now.

Selectperson Hall agreed there were a lot of possibilities and having a commercial, working waterfront landing area where people could work out of could be really important for the future.

Mroz said St. George was a beautiful place and a destination that people like to come to. It is a vibrant area and if the town wants to continue to be vibrant and attract people and families, buy property, and have a vibrant school, the town should pay attention to that. He said when the town bought the property, the conversation was - to make certain that the town's heritage be maintained, which is a working waterfront, a fishing community.

Lapham: You do not have to apologize for anything. I think the Harbor Committee did a really good job. I am not necessarily, personally against this. I can see the value but as presented as a \$2.6 million on top of \$800,000 without any (of what I just learned in the last 2 ½ days), I think some of my questions where kind of automatic. Again, who benefits? I think that is a valid question for the taxpayers to know. This is \$3.6 million that the town is putting in and I asked one of you in an email. As a private citizen, would you invest in a \$3.6 million project without having more idea than what I had before I came into the meeting the other night. Hearing what I have heard, I am not here to try to stop the project.

The other question I do have is, why does it have to be on the ballot in May when you know that there are going to be far fewer people voting than there would be in November. I don't know that for a fact but generally as a rule, spring elections have lower turnouts. I just think this should get as wide an opportunity for voters to make their voices known on a significant financial issue.

Chairperson Bates thought traditionally these types of issues come up to vote at town meeting. Polky said the town had always tried to put the large issues at the annual town meeting, when the town does its business. He said whether you get more people out in May or in November, it depended on what was on the ballot. He thought that \$2.64 million dollars might bring the St. George voters out, and the town has had a good history of getting voters out. Mr. Polky said, "You try to put all your major business on the annual town meeting where people expect to set the budget for the year."

Schmanska said they had talked about having a special town meeting just for this project but felt it would be better to put it on the May ballot for a number of reasons. If the town waited until November, the grant process would have to start over, including filing for all the grants.

Norton said if passed, the Town Administration would probably be handling about 90% of the operations and issues surrounding 10 Cold Storage Road.

Selectperson Hall felt this should be on the May ballot and not delayed for another six months.

Chairperson Bates felt there were a lot of good questions and ideas which came out of the Public Hearing. He said the Harbor Committee would be meeting with Musson on Tuesday to work on publicity and publicity ideas. Chairperson Bates suggestion circulating information via Constant Contact and newspapers.

Lapham: I still have concern that as presented right now and what comes across on the ballot, if I didn't come to the meeting or taken an interest, or ask questions, and just saw this on the ballot, I would probably say no. I don't have any information. I have no information on which to make an informed decision other than I get this is a once in a lifetime, and all of that it has a hard time in my mind standing on its own and I don't think that is fair to the taxpayers.

Chairperson Bates said it was up to the Select Board and the Harbor Committee to try to make sure that everyone in the town got notification and more information about this project.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

-Planning Board: The Planning Board met on March 27 at 7 p.m. The application at 678 Wallston Road, to move the cottage to a new foundation, then renovate and expand it, was deemed complete and satisfying the Shoreland Zoning Ordinance sections 12.C.1.c.i and 12.C.2, was approved.

Chair Bates said at the last Planning Board meeting, Chair Cox summarized Attorney William Kelly's response regarding the town's cable ordinance which had been submitted to him for review. Attorney Bill Kelly said what was being proposed in the revised ordinances was in conflict with two state statutes. The Planning Board was familiar with one, but there was a second one associated with development projects – wind farm projects. Attorney Kelly strongly cautioned the Planning Board to go back and revise these ordinances because as they were presently written, they would be in direct conflict with the two state statutes. Attorney Kelly's response was quite detailed and offered his suggestions. Chair Bates said they would try to set up a date and time for Bill Kelly to come and explain his responses, the law, and then open it up to the public for questioning.

Chair Bates said Attorney Kelly's recommendation was that these ordinance revisions were not ready to be put on a May ballot. It may be possible to get them ready for the June 12 vote. Carr said she was not sure how that would benefit (having Attorney Kelly discuss this). Chair Bates thought the benefit was that the town should not be creating ordinances for the voters, who may potentially approve the ordinances, which are illegal. Chair Bates said, "If the attorney who is advising us is saying these ordinances are in direct conflict with the state laws, it would be wrong of the Select Board to put these forward."

Carr said they were probably at a position that they need to put a petition in which has an alternate draft ordinance. Chairperson Bates said a petition could go in and be put out to the voters. Chairperson Bates stressed that if the Select Board was going to recommend revisions to the ordinances, they were going to recommend revisions that are legal. Selectperson Elwell did not think the Select Board should pass illegal ordinances, only to lose in court, because you have gone against state law.

Carr said she had not seen the latest iteration or the attorney's letter. "But the challenge doesn't happen like that. If there is going to be challenge. If we felt strongly about protecting our town, then maybe we would want to see the legal challenge through. If it is that important to protect the town, maybe we are right. Why do we immediately say, it's illegal, we are wrong. Those ordinances deserve to be challenged including the one that says no law with respect to windfarms can be enacted. That one could be challenged by the town."

Selectperson Hall said, "The Home Rule provision by which towns can pass ordinances and make charters and such, is a privilege granted by the state, which I suspect you know. So, the state can say, no you can't do this." Hall said if you put together a petition and the town judges to be illegal, the Select Board does not have to carry it forward. Hall said, "You should get the information, see what Attorney Kelly says, you should see whether or not the proposed revision meets your needs. Don't necessarily jump to conclusions."

Carr said she felt their draft ordinance was very different than the Planning Board's and thought theirs would pass muster.

Chairperson Bates summarized the discussion: The Planning Board would try to set up a date and time for Attorney Kelly to come to St. George and present his recommendations. Bates recommended Carr and the public attend this meeting. If Carr and others were not satisfied with Attorney Kelly's recommendations, they could file a petition to propose an ordinance. If the petition was deemed illegal, the Select Board could deny it, and it would not be on the ballot. Carr's suggestion that their ordinance was different from the Planning Board's would be explored. By the end of April, this could be a moot point, as the PUC would be reviewing the issue of the rate charge which could affect the Aqua Ventus project.

-Harbor Committee: Selectperson Elwell said he had given his report on the 10 Cold Storage Road Public Hearing earlier in the meeting.

- Minutes: The Select Board minutes of April 2, 2018 were amended as follows:
Page 2, under Solid Waste, line 2, correct to read: Selectperson Willey as **she** was...

Page 2, under Warrant Articles, line 6, delete words interest rate and change to read: ...that the **payment** was higher in...

Page 3, second full paragraph, line 3, remove the comma after the word definitively

Page 3, paragraph 4, line 4, change to read: ...Chairperson Bates said the **specifics of the** wording...

Page 3, under Trust Fund Proposals, paragraph 1, line 2, change to read: and the **type of proposal** they were offering.

Page 3, under Trust Fund Proposals, paragraph 1, line 4, correct spelling to The **First**

Page 4, line 1, delete the sentence: **They would offer reporting by trust fund.**

On a motion by Selectperson Sawyer, seconded by Elwell, it was voted 5-0 to approve the minutes of March 26, 2018, as amended.

- **Communications:** A letter was received from Josiah Wilson on Friday, March 30 regarding the Harbor Committee. Chairperson Bates said he had contacted Mr. Wilson about the issues he raised. Wilson was concerned that the Select Board, Bates in particular, did not speak up in favor of what the Harbor Committee had done. Bates told Wilson that he did not think it was appropriate for him to speak up at the meeting but assured him that he was 100% behind what the Harbor Committee was doing. Chair Bates said by the end of the hour conversation, he felt they had come to an understanding.

- **Warrant:** The warrant for the week of April 2, 2018 was reviewed and signed. The total expenses were \$25,236.82 and included five sets of personnel equipment for the Fire Department for \$9,025.00. Chair Bates asked about the payment to Hannah Nelsbach. Curtis said this was a permit fee refund.

TOWN MANAGER'S REPORT:

- **Update on 38 Main St.** – Klapfish Store: Mr. Polky said the town now does the landscaping and lawn mowing at 38 Main St. Mr. Jarrett worked on the yard and cut down an apple tree by the corner of the building. Mr. Polky said she and a lot of others had complained to him about the removal of the tree. Klapfish would like to have the town replace it. She has talked with Hedgerow who would replace a tree and do all the ground work for \$800. Polky told her this request would need to come before the Select Board. Bates said the tree was adversely affecting the structure, but the building did look exposed after its removal. Selectperson Willey thought the removal of the tree opened up the window area for her displays and thought that might improve her retail business. Willey thought the area looked nice and much better.

After the discussion, Selectperson Sawyer made a motion to spend \$800 to replant an apple tree at 38 Main St, Tenants Harbor. Hearing no second, the motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Polky will talk with Ms. Klapfish regarding the Board's decision and would discuss economical alternatives.

- **Conservation Commission** will meet on Thursday, April 5 at 4 p.m. Mr. Polky said he received a call from ReVision. Brian explained there were legal issues in the PPA that prohibited the power to the solar panels being turned on before April 9. So, Mr. Polky will turn the power off Tuesday morning.

- **Elected Officials Workshop:** Mr. Polky has a list of dates and locations for these workshops.

- **Burn Building:** Selectperson Willey asked for an update on the burn building. Polky said they received final approval so the engineer could now put it out to bid. The St. George Volunteer Firefighter and Ambulance Association received a building loan for \$385,000 which has been deposited into a bank account. Polky said they were hoping to get the bids awarded by June.

- **Jersey Road:** Selectperson Willey asked Mr. Polky if the Jersey Road decision had been completed. Polky said it had not because the parties were not in agreement. He felt the best way to handle the issue was for the town to split up the property four ways, forget the right of way, each party get one portion of property, and whatever a party had for frontage, was what they would get. Polky said he did not think there would be a right to way because the parties could not agree. Polky said he would be sending his draft to Bernstein Shur for review.

- **Tax Acquired Property:** Mr. Polky said this issue would be placed on an upcoming agenda, but he first needed to contact Attorney Bragg's office for guidance.

OLD BUSINESS:

- Catering Permit Application: Ms. Curtis received a change of date request on the Maine Music Academy Scholarship fundraiser. The new date is May 19. The time is still 5:30 p.m. – 11 p.m. at the Wiley's Corner Grange. Curtis said because this was a change of date, the applicant needed to file new paperwork with the town.

On a motion by Selectperson Elwell, seconded by Hall, it was voted 5-0 to approve the new application date of May 19 for the Maine Music Academy scholarship fundraiser to be held at Wiley's Corner Grange.

- Dockside Seafood, LLC d/b/a The Dip Net Restaurant: A Public Hearing was held at 7 p.m. on April 2, 2018 at the St. George Town Office. There were no objections.

On a motion by Selectperson Elwell, seconded by Willey, it was voted 5-0 to approve the Dockside Seafood, LLC d/b/a The Dip Net Restaurant victualer's license.

NEW BUSINESS:

- Warrant Articles: The Select Board reviewed the following. ORDER - Of the Select Board of the Town of St. George for Referendum Vote Pursuant to 30-A M.R.S.A. Section 2528. Referendum questions by Order of the Municipal Officers. "If a particular article to be voted on by Secret Ballot requires an appropriation of money by the municipality, the article, when printed in the warrant and on the ballot, must be accompanied by a recommendation of the Municipal Officers." Curtis explained that the Order was the Select Board ordering the clerk to place the referendum onto the warrant. "The St. George Select Board hereby orders that the following questions be placed on a referendum ballot to be submitted to the voters on May 14, 2018," and then the exact wording be placed on the warrant.

A motion was made by Selectperson Sawyer, seconded by Elwell, for the Select Board to order the town clerk to place the referendum question on the May 14, 2018 ballot and in the warrant.

Chairperson Bates said in previous discussions of 10 Cold Storage Road project, the Board did not give a recommendation of support one way or the other. The Budget Committee has recommended it. The Select Board, by law, must say whether it recommends or does not recommend the article.

On a motion by Selectperson Elwell, seconded by Sawyer, it was voted 4-1, that the Select Board recommend the town raise and appropriate a \$2,640,000 bond for 10 Cold Storage Road.

On a motion by Selectperson Sawyer, seconded by Hall, it was voted 5-0 to extend the Select Board meeting beyond 9 p.m.

- First Advisors Agreement: Curtis circulated the agreement from the First Advisors. Chairperson Bates noted the agreement did not include a reference to the town's Trust Fund Investment Policy. Curtis said they were aware of that. She said the form was a boiler plate type of agreement to be tailored to the town's needs. Selectperson Hall had numerous recommendations for the agreement and would forward those to Curtis. Chairperson Bates recommended that the Select Board not object to the disclosure by First Advisors since being a municipality, all the information is public. Hall asked if the Select Board would vote the proxies? Curtis will ask First Advisors how other municipalities handle that.

- Rank Choice Tutorial: Chairperson Bates said the rank choice voting issue was before a Superior Court judge and a decision may be made by the end of the week. Chairperson Bates recommended postponing this item until next week as it may be a non-issue. If it is an issue, he thought the Friends of St. George might be able to offer tutorials at the library. Cherie Yattaw also has information on rank choice voting.

- Planning Board Request for an Economic Analysis: In Attorney Kelly's letter to the Planning Board, it stated that the town may want to understand the economic burden to water-based industries about anything new in the ocean, and Curtis added, "It was to better understand the economic impact of offshore energies schemes on a St. George water-based economy." Chair Bates said on Tuesday, the Planning Board agreed to send the issue to the Select Board for discussion. Curtis thought the Planning Board did not want to take on this project because it affected a larger area than just St. George. Chairperson Bates agreed it would have a ripple effect and if anything was to be done, it should be done on a regional or statewide analysis. Chair Bates thought the Select Board should talk with Attorney Kelly to better understand this. Selectperson Hall thought the Select Board should not do anything until the PUC made their decision. Chairperson Bates recommended postponing this item.

At 9:10 p.m., on a motion by Selectperson Sawyer, seconded by Willey, it was voted 5-0 to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Marguerite R. Wilson
Select Board Recording Secretary