

SPECIAL TOWN MEETING WARRANT FOR THE TOWN OF UNITY
Tuesday, April 2, 2016 @ 6:00 PM
Unity Fire Department

Town Officials Present: Selectman Penny Picard Sampson, Selectman Emily Newell, Selectman Tony Avila, Town Clerk Samantha Mank

18:01:51 Samantha Mank: Greetings. In the name of the State of Maine, you are hereby required to notify and warn the Inhabitants of the Town of Unity, in said county and state, qualified by law to vote in town affairs, to meet at the Unity Fire Station of said Town on Tuesday, the 26th day of April, 2016, at 6:00 PM, then and there to act upon articles set out below, to wit. The first Article is to elect a Moderator to preside at this meeting. Do I have a nomination for Moderator?

18:02:18 Resident: I nominate Don Newell.

18:02:23 Samantha Mank: Moved and seconded. Moved and seconded. Any other nominations? Any questions? Can I have the ballot?

18:02:32 Donald Newell: I, Don Newell, do swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States and of this State so long as I shall continue as a citizen thereof, so help me God. I, Don Newell, do swear that I will faithfully discharge to the best of my abilities the duties incumbent upon me as Moderator of this Special Town Meeting for the Town of Unity according to the Constitution of the State of Maine so help me God.

18:03:23 Donald Newell: Article 2, to see if the Town will vote to approve the Maine Moderator's Manual 6th Edition as the rules of procedure for the meeting. Moved and seconded. Thank you very much. Any discussion? All in favor, aye? Opposed, no? Motion carries.

18:03:48 Donald Newell: Article 3, to see what sum, if any, the Tow will vote to raise and appropriate for General Assistance for the ensuing year. Budget Committee recommends \$3,700.00, as well as the Selectmen. Chair awaits a motion. Moved and seconded. The floor is open for discussion. Do the Selectmen want to explain why this is here in the Special Town Meeting?

18:04:15 Penny Picard Sampson: Because we forgot to include it in the other town meeting.

18:04:23 Jolene Tupper: Now what should happen if for some unknown reason it should need to go more than this \$3,203.50?

18:04:43 Donald Newell: Selectmen, can you respond to that question?

18:04:45 Penny Picard Sampson: Right, so last year we expended \$3,200 in change, which was \$111.00 over expended. So we increased the amount this year to give us a little more buffer although we're not expecting much. We also get 70% back from the State.

18:05:09 Jolene Tupper: Because people never know what is going to happen.

18:05:14 Penny Picard Sampson: It should be more than enough to cover us.

18:05:19 Donald Newell: And the fact that the Town is required to take care of General Assistance anyway, even if they have to over expend, which they did last year. So the fact that that number was a little low, it wouldn't stop the Town from doing what they're required to do. Further discussion?

18:05:38 Resident: What specifically is the money used for?

18:05:41 Penny Picard Sampson: I can answer that. People that are in need come in and apply for General Assistance. They can use it for heating oil, food, electricity, it has to be something that they need that without there would be, you know, circumstances, bad circumstances. Especially when you have children in the home. They do have to qualify for it. There are certain guidelines. If they don't meet the guidelines, as General Assistance administrator you can always do like a waiver, if there is an emergency situation. Those are relatively rare. I'm getting better at saying no.

18:06:38 Donald Newell: So the Town expenditures were approximately \$10,000 this past year for General Assistance?

18:06:47 Penny Picard Sampson: No.

18:06:47 Donald Newell: Of the Town money? The State reimbursed \$70 of that.

18:06:53 Penny Picard Sampson: That 70% goes back in the general.

18:06:58 Donald Newell: So even though you're raising \$3,700.00, you're only intending to spend 30% of that, about \$1,000.

18:07:08 Penny Picard Sampson: Right.

18:07:09 Clem Blakney: So if you're getting better at saying no, why can't we keep it at the same letter. Because you're improving on that no bit.

18:07:17 Penny Picard Sampson: Right. There were more people coming in as the Town grows. Some weeks I'd have three or four, and then some weeks you have nothing. It's a little added buffer so you don't over expend. And I know we can't over expend but...

18:07:44 Donald Newell: It seems like you're doing a pretty good job. You're holding steady with what I've seen. We're all familiar with these numbers. They've haven't changed much over the years. Further conversation on the subject?

18:07:55 David Smith: I need a whole bunch of people to move vehicles because we can't the fire trucks out. Everybody that parked over here, these are the bays here, and everybody over here is fine. The four lines of vehicles over here are fine. But we're completely blocked in here.

18:08:22 Donald Newell: The meeting is adjourned until those cars are moved.

18:11:40 Donald Newell: This meeting is called back to order. Thank you all for moving those vehicles. We're on Article 3. The Article is to raise and appropriate \$3,700.00 for General Assistance for the ensuing year. Any further discussion?

18:11:55 Todd Converse: The Town budget is like any other budget. You see the thing that's \$10.00 a month on your credit card, and you pay \$10.00 a month. Even with small change that next one and the next one adds up to a lot of money. So if we did get by last year on \$3,200.00 and Penny is getting better

at deciding whether or not it happens, why wouldn't we stay at that \$3,200.00? If it doesn't work we still would have to take care of those people? [Correct] Instead of automatically throwing in a raise, why don't we keep it where it was?

18:12:40 Donald Newell: In order to test the theory, you move to amend the figure to a figure? [Yes] So what figure do you want to amend it, \$3,700.00 to \$3,203.50?

18:12:53 Todd Converse. To what it was last year and that doesn't increase the taxes this year or next year.

18:12:56 Donald Newell: Alright, we have a motion on the floor to amend Article 3 by decreasing the amount to raise from \$3,700.00 to \$3,203.50. Do we have a second? Moved and seconded. Further discussion on the motion to amend? Hearing none will call for the vote on the amendment. Does everybody understand it? Okay. All in favor, aye? Opposed, no? You guys are not very vocal here. You have these cards for a reason. I want to be sure I've got the vote right so those that are in favor of the right amendment to reduce the amount raise your green cards. Those opposed? Motion carries. So we're back to the main motion as amended. Any further discussion on it? Seeing no hands will call for the vote. All in favor, aye? Opposed, no? Motion carries. Thank you very much. I would remind you that we don't have mikes in this room so if someone raises a question to the front, I need to repeat it so everybody can hear what's going on here. Todd did a good job, I think. Could you hear Todd? When he was talking. Anyone who is speaking, if you could turn you head a bit and try to speak loudly so everyone can hear you. If you can't then I'll repeat.

18:14:17 Donald Newell: Article 4, to see what sum, if any, the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for The Comprehensive Plan for the ensuing year. Budget Committee and Selectmen recommend \$3,326.98. The Chair waits a motion. Moved and seconded. The floor is open for discussion.

18:14:41 Emily Newell: That amount is being carried.

18:14:45 Donald Newell: That amount is being carried. So we're not raising and appropriating. We're carrying, \$3,300.00, I wondered why the number wasn't specific. So there is no effect on taxes because that's going to automatically carry over and stay in that account. Further questions?

18:15:04 ____ Booth: Is there any reason to expect that this year we'll be spending more than \$990.00, which we spent last year and, if not, why not reduce that amount say to \$1,000.00.

18:15:20 Penny Picard Sampson: A few years ago at a Town Meeting we vote d to raise \$20,000 for the Comprehensive Plan. As the years go by it whittles into that fund. It has already been raised. This is the leftover money, which we do plan on using here soon. As soon as we get through the roads. [For....] To finish up the Comprehensive Plan.

18:15:53 Chris Rossignol: I'd like to make a motion to amend. I'd like to see the funds reallocated for the completion of the Comprehensive Plan along with the Land Use Ordinance by an independent neutral party for completion for the Town to vote on the completed Land Use Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan.

18:16:26 Donald Newell: I'm thinking. Well I'm thinking about whether the motion is in order. There are two parts. One is the motion would call for the funds that have already been approved by the Town to be dedicated to something other than what they were approved for working, which is working on the Land Use Ordinance. Two, to redirect them to some outside body. I guess you all understand what I'm thinking. I'm going to approve the motion. It's acceptable. You can vote how you wish on it. So we

have a motion to amend. I'd like first saying that the \$3,326.98 left over in that account for the Comprehensive Plan work would be reallocated to an independent third party to finish the Comprehensive Plan and write the Land Use Ordinance.

18:17:51 Chris Rossignol: The Committee already created the Land Use Ordinance.

18:17:58 Donald Newell: So there's your motion to amend and we have a second on that. Moved and seconded. The floor is open for discussion. Can you speak to your motion more, Chris?

18:18:13 Kevin Spigel: Why?

18:18:20 Chris Rossignol: The Committees are both stalled. It's just sitting on a desk somewhere. It's time to complete it.

18:18:27 Resident: Who would complete the work?

18:18:38 Chris Rossignol: An independent outside firm.

18:18:46 Alicia McCormick: It seems to me that by adding in the piece about an independent contractor is more policy than budget. All we're doing here is deciding whether or not we're going to commit these funds and carry these funds for the Comprehensive Plan, so to specify how we will use those funds is more policy than budget in my opinion. I'm not sure...

18:19:07 Donald Newell: What you're saying is...you can tell me not to talk because I'm used to doing that and I'm just trying to clarify. The Selectmen can help us here because my understanding of the roll of Selectmen is they get to decide who and how this is going to be done. You're right. You don't need to have an action of the Town Meeting to tell the Selectmen how they're going to do their business. It's a suggestion. One could look at it that way. That's why I was stopping, gee, you're getting in here pretty deep and trying to dictate how the Selectmen run the Town. That's my concern.

18:19:53 Sue Nason: It was my understanding that's what you're planning on doing with this money anyway. Correct? Isn't that what was discussed:

18:19:58 Penny Picard Sampson: We're looking at sending it to KVCOG to have it melded together so we can get it over with. We're already a member of KVCOG. I'm sure there will be an additional amount that we have to pay them for their professional services. I really don't know why that wouldn't be a problem.

18:20:25 Sherry Powell-Wilson: I'd like to know, with the Land Use Ordinance, would it be the one that we worked on for 2-1/2 years? Not the current one.

18:20:49 Penny Picard Sampson: The one that you had been working on, yes. That's my thought anyway.

18:20:49 Donald Newell: Is anyone on the Committee going to speak to this? I'm hamstrung here. If I have to nominate somebody else to take my position so I can speak to this, we can get some clarity on this.

18:21:05 John McIntire: Having sat on both Committees and my understanding of the whole affair is that the Land Use Ordinance follows the Comp Plan. The Comp Plan is an overall idea of how we want

the Town to look. The Land Use Ordinance should reflect how we're going to get there. From looking at the two documents, it's going to be a real stretch to pull them together.

18:21:36 Resident. Why?

18:21:39 John McIntire: Because there were some pretty different ideas expressed in both parties. I'm not saying...I don't think that we need to amend this thing to say that. I think the Selectmen going to KVCOG makes a lot of sense. That's all. Did I cover most of that?

18:22:13 Donald Newell: Thank you very much.

18:22:19 Jolene Tupper: Now I do understand better than what I did before because I couldn't hear everything. I didn't fully understand what the man back there had said. John kind of clarified part of it for me but the question I have is what you're talking about, the two plans, is that for like in-town Unity, out-of-town Unity?

18:22:51 Tony Avila: The whole town.

18:22:56 Donald Newell: David, can I have you be Deputy Moderator for a minute? May I speak? [Sure] Mr. Moderator, backing up a little bit, we interviewed KVCOG and other plans and we decided, the Town decided they wanted a new Comprehensive Plan. And the reason that the Committee recommended to the Selectmen that we not use KVCOG was that we read a number of their Land Use, their Comprehensive Plans that they had created for town and they were woefully similar. Meaning they were very much boilerplate and we felt that the Town of Unity was not boilerplate, it's not like every other town, and it would be wonderful if we had the citizens of Unity create the plan rather than have it be dictated by somebody from away and be a lot like every other town. That was a decision made back then. The plan has been developed to a larger extent and will take a bit of time to wrap it up. And all of the processes that were required by the State rule on comprehensive planning were followed so that it is a town plan. Not just a small subgroup plan, not just special interest plan. It's the people of Unity have a chance to weigh in upon it. In the end we got slowed down because people joined the Committee at the eleventh hour without having gone through the whole background, and were going back to test all of the things done along the way. Effectively the Committee was stalled. We couldn't make forward progress because we were looking backwards. I understand it all and it's okay but I just want you to know why it isn't done and why KVCOG was not a good choice, and why I don't think it's a good choice now. It should be the Town of Unity's plan. I think that having the funds go to writing the Land Use Ordinance is an inappropriate or wasteful use of the money. The Land Use Ordinance, as John pointed out, falls from the Plan. Once you create your plan, you write a Land use Ordinance that is consistent with the Plan that carries out the plan. The problem with the new draft that was done by a secondary committee that it is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in many many regards. I can tell you that it is inconsistent and very unlikely that that would be approved by the State as our Comprehensive Plan, or as consistent with our Comprehensive Plan. I take that back, the State doesn't approve that. It would just need to be modified so that it is consistent with the plan. I don't think that it's a good idea. Thank you very much I'm done.

18:26:21 Emily Newell: I'll stand up so you can hear me. I have a couple of different thoughts here. Okay, I'll talk about one. A big problem we had with the Comp Plan discussions is getting education out there for people understand what it means. We have our current Land Use Ordinance, which is complicated. You can understand it if you put enough time into it but it's complicated, and then we have a new version of the Land Use Ordinance that's also complicated, and we also have the Comp Plan and a new Comp Plan, and it's all very complicated. And so to try to get together see how one might change

our life in Unity, especially when you already assume that you disagree with the person who is talking. So that was challenging. But I haven't really given up hope on us. I think that as a community we can have a discussion together and that we don't need a third party to tell us how to write it. What I think a third party could do though is show us how they're all different. Is for somebody to do a study on it. You know, we'll get it and say take a piece of land, okay, if it was this version or that version, you could or couldn't do this, will help us all learn it better so that we could have a discussion about what we think is best for our community. So while I'm not against hiring KVCOG to do that kind of thing, you know, critical assessment, of words are written. I don't want them to tell us how we should finish it.

18:28:02 Tony Avila: Like you stated, some people joined the group afterwards and stuff, which kind of, you know, you guys continued on this road and then people joined in, like John said, it went in a different direction. My biggest concern here is the 50% of this town that doesn't agree with what's going on gets represented. What Chris is saying is if we paid an outside source, they could take both documents and work them together and intertwine. But if you believe that it could be done, that the other 50% in town would be listened to, I don't have an issue doing it that way. Fifty percent of the people don't agree with the Comp Plan, 50 do. It's not fair. They still pay same amount of tax in town and they should be listened to, they should have a voice in this community. As long as it gets done and gets done correctly. We should look at any source of doing it.

18:29:16 Charlie Schaeffer: I've heard a lot of comments about spending a lot of money here on this. You might get a product that you really don't like from the people who don't really understand the climate here in Unity. My sense of Chris's amendment is that of a sense of frustration that it hasn't been done, and we've highlighted some of the reasons. My question is do you see a light at the end of the tunnel where you think this might be able to be accomplished without having outside sources to do it?

18:29:45 Donald Newell: I do. I think that the most recent development activity on Main Street with the convenience store was very enlightening for a lot of people about how the Comprehensive Plan and the resulting Land Use Ordinance works or how it wouldn't work if we don't have some teeth to it. I think a lot of people that totally get this whole process better understand that we do need to have some regulations in order to have some control over what goes where in our community. I think we can come together and have 100 percent of the people involved in the conversation. In the end it's going to be the majority and so if everybody participates, will have a vote on this and will [inaudible].

18:30:34 Melissa _____: Mr. Selectman, I'm a little confused on where your 50% comes from because a lot of us in this room have attended a number of meetings and we have voted and given our thoughts and our opinions, we've done surveys, we have committed whole days to this Comprehensive Plan, and it doesn't feel to me like a 50/50 split. I guess what I want to know is there an end in sight because it feels like it's been going on for so long that the longer we go on the more stir-up there is and the less cohesion there is. It feels to me like we should be very near point where it's thrown out to us as a group, you know, here it is. And let us vote thumbs up or thumbs down on it. Is there a timeline in frame, in your mind with regard to finishing?

18:31:50 Emily Newell: If I could answer that. It depends on who will sit around the table and who will offer to do the work with me. I can't do it alone. If I had a perfect world, give me three months and you'd have a product.

18:32:09 Penny Picard Sampson: But you still need to marry up the Land Use and the Comp Plan. Correct?

18:32:18 Emily Newell: Are you saying that you recommend that we do? Because we don't have to. The Comp Plan comes first.

18:32:25 Penny Picard Sampson: But what's the point of having a Land Use Ordinance if we don't need one if it's the Comp Plan that's important?

18:32:31 Emily Newell: You still need a Land Use Ordinance but it has to conform to the Comp Plan.

18:32:34 Penny Picard Sampson: So that right now that's the problem. They're not conforming. They're of opposite places so we need to find where we can marry them together and that's what's not happening. It's been weeks, months since anybody has worked on it. It's kind of sitting there dead in the water. Poor Emily, she's like the last man standing on the Comp Plan. So at some point we somebody that is going to take these two documents, put them together, look maybe see what we're missing or what still needs to be done. Give us a recommendation. They are not writing it for us. They are giving us a recommendation. This is their specialty. These people do this for work. We don't. So my recommendation is we get both things, get it to KVCOG, have them look at it and see what they can marry up and say, here, maybe this will work, and then we can look at it from there. But if we wait for people to join these again I think we're just going to be sitting here spinning wheels for months on end.

18:33:53 Susan Nason: I think I agree with Penny on that. There is no way that you're going to both meet, whether it's 50/50 or 70...whatever it is. I mean, townspeople are townspeople. If you have two different sides of a coin, you need somebody to come in that doesn't have a vested interest and they can say, okay, this is what this says, and this is what this says. This is what you could do and give your ideas that way because it's obviously not going to work the way that it is. It's been dead in the water for... I've heard nothing since the last meeting, which was here. That was in June of last year. Am I correct, Penny, in understanding that it would be safe to assume that the current and new and improved Land Use Ordinance is in direct opposition to the Comp Plan? Is that what I'm hearing?

18:34:38 Penny Picard Sampson: I'm guess I'm not the person to answer that.

18:35:15 Sue Nason: Could somebody answer that? It sounds like maybe that's where the 50/50 is coming from, that we've got a Land Use that is in direct opposition or doesn't compute with the Comp Plan because I would say this, if the Comp Plan, if two different groups dedicated time to making it, I don't think the Comp Plan should take over the Land Use and be. I think the Land Use people put a lot of time in and their words should be heard to. Sorry but that's how I feel.

18:35:37 Tony Avila: It should be a 50/50 split. The problem is, like Don said, there wasn't too many involvement in the beginning so it's not that Committee's fault because people got involved towards the end. That should be said.

18:35:55 Kevin Spigel: Can we come back to the motion at hand?

18:35:59 Donald Newell: You can move the previous question.

18:36:03 Kevin Spigel: Yeah, move the previous question and move forward. We don't need to discuss who is not doing what on the Comp Plan right now.

18:36:09 Donald Newell: So if you want to continue to talk on this you have the right by how you vote because it takes a two-thirds vote to move the previous question and limit debate. So I have a motion do we have a second? Moved and seconded to limit debate. Everybody knows what that means? We stop talking and we vote. All in favor in limiting debate raise your green cards please? And those opposed? It's pretty clear. The motion carries and we are going to the vote. So the vote is to accept the amendment which will advise the Selectmen, for lack of a better term, that they will dedicate those funds to an outside

agency to complete the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Ordinance. Everybody clear on that? All in favor of the amendment raise your green cards? Let me count, raise them up high so I can see. Okay, twenty one. And those opposed? Twenty five. The motion fails. We're back to the original motion as read. Further discussion on it?

18:37:50 Jolene Tupper: Can a person abstain if they feel that they don't know enough about on how they vote?

18:38:08 Donald Newell: Absolutely.

18:38:15 Jolene Tupper: I understand parts of it. I don't feel enough about it. I'd like to come to meetings. I really would but in some ways physically I can't.

18:38:25 Donald Newell: So yes you can stay out of a vote like that if you don't really know one way or the other.

18:38:31 Jackie: Can we call for a vote on the original Article and ... [inaudible]?

18:38:36 Donald Newell: We have a motion to move the previous question on the main motion. Moved and seconded. So we're voting on the main motion as read. Any questions about that? All in favor raise your green cards. Those opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

18:38:54 David Smith: We just voted to move the question, right?

18:39:00 Donald Newell: Yep. Thank you, David. So the first vote is two-thirds vote to move the previous question so those in favor of moving the previous question? And those opposed? The motion carries. Now the motion to accept the motion as originally read please raise your green cards. And those opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, David.

18:39:40 Donald Newell: Article 5, to see what sum, if any, the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for The Constable for the ensuing year. The Budget Committee and Selectmen recommend \$1,552.17. The Chair awaits a motion. Moved and seconded. The floor is open for discussion. Seeing no hands will call for the vote. All in favor, aye? Opposed, no? Motion carries.

18:40:18 Donald Newell: Article 6, to see what sum, if any, the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for The Small Community Septic Replacement for the ensuing year. Budget Committee and Selectmen recommend \$12,272.41. Moved.

18:40:44 Dennis Jones: What is it?

18:40:44 Andy Reid: What I thought it was was something to do with the lake but it doesn't have anything to do with the lake. The Lake Association has a fund fund that someone...[inaudible] that specifically put it to if anybody replaces a now malfunctioning septic system on the lake, they are subject to a grant of \$500 to help them out.

18:41:12 Dennis Jones: Is that what this is?

18:41:17 Samantha Mank: No. This is given by the State. This is the money that is left and has not yet been expended. Although the State grant we have is the best thing for good transparency to bring it before the Town and say we would like to put it back on the Warrant and continue to be able to use it should we

need to. There's an application process that goes with it. I have it at the Town Office. If you have trouble with a septic, like it's kind of what Andy said except it's not limited to the lake.

18:41:45 Dennis Jones: Is it for low income?

18:41:48 Emily Newell: That's part of it.

18:41:51 Donald Newell: Do you have to prove hardship?

18:41:54 Emily Newell: It can be that or it can be environmental issues. There's a variety of things there.

18:42:03 Donald Newell: Okay, so in the Town Minutes can we get a little more information the next time you need on.....

18:42:10 Samantha Mank: I'll give it to Jean to put out on the website.

18:42:13 Emily Newell: It's on the Maine.gov website but I didn't fully download it, the whole thing on the website.

18:42:22 [John McIntire's wife]: Did I understand that the grant has already been received so we're not going to be raising it but we're going to be carrying it?

18:42:31 Samantha Mank: Right. All of those raise and appropriates are really carry.

18:42:44 Donald Newell: Seeing no further hands I sense that we're ready to vote. All in favor, aye? Opposed, no? Motion carries.

18:42:59 Donald Newell: Next, Article 7, to see what sum, if any, the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for The Septic Disposal Contract for the ensuing year. The Budget Committee and the Selectmen recommend that we carry over \$1,050.00. Moved and seconded. Thank you very much. The floor is open for discussion.

18:42:59 Charlie Schaefer: I see where we spent zero last year. I assume that we didn't have a contract last year? What did we do with our sludge last year? Why do we need a contract now?

18:43:34 Donald Newell: Andy, what happened? You're the sludge guy.

18:43:41 Andy Reed: I think years ago each town had to have a place where someone would accept our sewage. Period. I think a lot of them now take it to the district in Waterville and pay to have it disposed of. Each town, at one time, the State mandated that each town had a place, I think Gary Parsons at one time...

18:44:07 Donald Newell: Right. He did it for many years.

18:44:15 Andy Reed: And then they were thinking about doing it up in Plymouth. Nothing has happened. I didn't know that we didn't spend it last year but, the thing is, it's probably to meet State law. If we have to find a place but I think, when we had ours done, I know it went to Waterville.

18:44:30 Dennis Jones: One of the problems is the tanks. Ninety nine percent of the time they take it to Waterville. It's not up to the taxpayers. It should be up to the person.

18:44:42 Donald Newell: As Andy said, it was a State rule that we had to have a site back years ago but we haven't used it for a number of years.

18:44:52 Dennis Jones: Gary hasn't asked for no money.

18:44:58 Donald Newell: The rules got a little tighter on where you could dump this stuff and so Gary and others who were getting it, not any more. So those funds...

18:45:04 Penny Picard Sampson: So we should probably at this point find out if we actually still need to have it. If 99% of everything is going to Waterville or getting turned into compost at Hawkridge, then we might not even have to have this anymore but I think that we should probably look to see what State law is at this point.

18:45:32 Donald Newell: So in answer to your question, it isn't going to make a whole lot of difference whether you approve the Article or deny it. The money is going to sit in the coffers of the Town of Unity. You can do what you wish. I think, personally, as a moderator, I think we might as well just approve it. It isn't going anywhere unless legally we're required to do something for someone. You can use your own judgment on that. Any other questions? Then we'll call for the vote.

18:46:09 David Smith: If a company is pumping a tank needs a place to dump, aren't the lagoons available for that? [No] We can't use them for that?

18:46:19 Kevin Spigel: No, don't dump there.

18:46:26 Donald Newell: You can't even get by the gate. That's highly protected. That's one of the reasons that things that were dumped in there, if we ever have to clean that sludge out it cost us a lot of money. There were heavy metals dumped in there years and years ago and, so, in order to secure that that's why the fence and great security. No dumping in the lagoons. The way to do that is tip the handle on your flush. Any other questions. Seeing none will call for the vote. All in favor of the Article as read say aye? Opposed, no? Motion carries.

18:47:07 Donald Newell: Article 8, to see if the voters will authorize the Town to borrow \$750,000.00, or some lesser amount by issuing general obligation bonds of the Town, which may be callable bonds, the proceeds to be used to finance road repaving and related improvements within the Town, otherwise known as the "Project"), and further to authorize the municipal officers to do any and all things and execute any and all loan resolutions, contracts and documents as necessary or convenient to issue the bonds and to accomplish the Project. Moved and seconded. The floor is open for discussion.

18:48:10 Resident: They voted a million and a half at the other town meeting. Is this the same money or just more money?

18:48:15 Emily Newell: This would be more money. This would cause your taxes to go up.

18:48:22 Resident: And the other one won't?

18:48:25 Emily Newell: Right.

18:48:28 Kevin Spigel: So as I understand, the million and a half was earmarked for certain road projects in the town. True? [Yes] So the additional monies that are requested were going to go for new roads that came to light that are in near of repair now?

18:48:40 Emily Newell: It's not new info that they more need repair but, yes, the additional money would go to get even more roads up to a repaired status.

18:48:50 Kevin Spigel: So would it be possible to shelf those additional roads until next year, which they can be budgeted for, and follow the traditional order of things and not result in taxes going up?

18:49:05 Emily Newell: If you want to do these next year, we'll have to appropriate more money and make your taxes go up anyway because next year's construction budget is already dedicated to pay off that \$1.5 million loan. We don't have construction funds for the next 6-1/2 years unless we borrow more or [inaudible] whatever, however much we want, at next year's Town Meeting. So to do it now, the idea behind doing it now is first the low interest rates and the low asphalt rates. That's why we have put the option in front of you.

18:49:37 Resident: I was looking at the projected inflation rate over the next couple of years and it's lower than the rate of interest on this loan. We save money by taking this loan now rather than spending money in a 1-1/2 years, or whenever we end up deciding to approve it. Also, given the rates of asphalt right now, it's never going to be cheaper to do the roads than it is now. We also save the money again in not paying for car repairs for not driving on crappy roads for the next couple of years. So it seems like a fundamental principle of good business that you buy when the price is low. The prices are lower than they've been in a long time, and lower than it's likely to be for a while. It seems like the fiscally conservative thing to do to approve it now because otherwise we're just going to end up eating it the later on and paying more.

18:50:21 Resident: I don't object to it but I'm a little curious as to why this wasn't lumped together at the Town Meeting with the million and a half.

18:50:30 Donald Newell: The cap in the Article. They capped it at 1.5 million so the voters didn't have the authority to go above that. The voters asked the Selectmen to bring it back at a special town meeting to allow that and that's what they're doing now.

18:50:44 Sue Nason: Where's the paper at the budget thing where it's broke down what your taxes were going to go up. My concern is that these are going to raise taxes for x amount of years, but that's not taking into consideration the school budget is going to go up, this is going to go up, everything else is still going up and we have this for x amount of years as well.

18:51:22 Emily Newell: I can answer that too. I can tell you how much taxes are already going up because of the school. [Emily setting a projector up]

18:52:04 David Smith: While she's getting that ready if I can just mention for folks that are concerned about taxes, which everybody is. Keep it in mind that some of the people you may want to be contacting are your State legislators who are bound by law to fund education at 55% and don't, and who keep backing off what they promise to pay or revenue sharing and roads and that sort of thing. Calling your State senators and State representatives may be a course of action we want to think about.

18:52:37 Donald Newell: I would include your county commissioners in that because the county are going up very rapidly.

18:52:50 Emily Newell: Okay this is really tiny so I'm going to read it to you. Now these are all estimates because I'm working off from this tax calculator, which is close. What it does is you can put in what your property is worth and it's updated to reflect what we appropriated at Annual Town Meeting. I will go

down to here. Here is your school budget. They put that out what they're going to ask us to vote on. The county tax is the new amount there. With those two items and the municipal increases, our taxes are going up 1.058% overall. Takes last year's tax bill without talking about this loan. Take your current tax bill and multiply it by 101.058 and that's your new tax bill plus maybe we borrow some more money. Why this is an estimate? Because of April 1st we can reassessed, people build properties, the values go up or down, whatever, things change so it's not perfect but its awful close. So somebody should ask, how much is my tax bill going to up? So let's say we borrow \$750,000 over five years. We've been quoted 2.1% interest. Let's take somebody's house at \$150,000 of value, you're going to pay an extra \$184 a year, and over the life of that loan, \$922.

18:54:39 Sue Nason: And the \$184 is on top of what? The bottom piece...

18:54:47 Emily Newell: Yep, without getting a loan for roads, if your house is worth \$150,000, you're already going to be \$135 more than last year. This is kind of complicated but what if you're 100, what if you're 150, what if you're 200...if anyone wants me to point out one in particular. Five hundred thousand at 3, 4, and 5 years. And I also put in 750 at 10 years just to show you what that would be like. It's interesting that the life of the loan commitment, e.g., \$750,000 at 5 years versus ten years is \$54 extra dollars and it's a lot less a month, but it is a 10-year commitment.

18:55:39 Ted Swanson: Can we get a copy of that somehow that we can read it. [Right now?] Well, not right now but in the office...would it be....because it's hard to see it from here.

18:55:58 Emily Newell: Yes. It prints really small. The print is like this big on a page. Yes, absolutely.

18:56:08 Bill Allen: Just seeing if I understand this right. So much money, what a million and a half, has been approved and budgeted for road repair for certain roads? [Yes] But did roads that aren't included in that repair, we would have to wait another six years to do anything to them?

18:56:30 Emily Newell: Yes or raise more money some way.

18:56:35 Jackie Bradeen: I live on one of those roads, as you know, and its hard going at times. After the last meeting, and at the last meeting, I wanted to raise the amount too then. Nothing has been done to these roads for 20 years.

18:56:55 Emily Newell: It's more with some.

18:56:58 Jackie Bradeen: And now we need to pay for it. I don't think it's fair to do part of it and have the rest of the town wait six years to have something done to their roads. Mine is a road that is scheduled to be fixed. I really don't think it's fair to people on the roads who are not on that list. Seven years is a long time to have a rotten road.

18:57:29 Resident: Can I clarify what the extra roads are?

18:57:32 Emily Newell: Yes, so the million and a half plan includes Waning from Town Farm to Crowell, and Crowell Road. It includes rebuilding Stagecoach to the top of the hill, to Dr. Moore's house if you know where he lives, and then making the rest of the road gravel. It includes rebuilding all of Stevens Road, two and a half miles. It includes finishing the shim job on Hunter so that the whole road is in equal condition and then chip sealing it, which is kind of a cheap solution but you definitely get what you pay for. So that answers that. Then the extra roads, the Selectmen, we established that...Elwell Farm is over here. It's getting done. We established that Clark, Bryant, Crosby Brook, and the rest of Waning were all equally important to be done next. So that's what we're looking at next.

18:58:37 Resident: So those are the extra roads?

18:58:42 Bill Allen: By next meaning six years?

18:58:42 Emily Newell: In six years or with additional money that might be raised tonight. They are so bad that most of these roads it's not costing more to do it later, as far as how bad the quality of the road is. It's just that it's going to cost more for asphalt then and it's going to cost more to maintain your car then. But there are already like craters everywhere.

18:59:14 Dennis Jones: Are you saying chip sealing the Town Farm Road?

18:59:24 Emily Newell: Hunter, and we're doing top coat on Town Farm. It's there but I didn't say it.

18:59:27 Todd Converse: So a million and a half has already been raised?

18:59:36 Emily Newell: Yes so now we're looking at what part....

18:59:42 Todd Converse: Okay so those roads that you just went down through are already being done or are going to be done. [Yes] And this is all the extra money we're trying to raise? [Yes] Right now if we have a \$150,000 home our taxes are going to go up \$135.00 approximately, and if we vote in the additional that wants to be done on top of \$135.00, the taxes are going to go up \$226.00 or...

18:59:55 Emily Newell: If you're \$150,000? [Yes] They'll go up \$184.00 if you did a five-year loan, or \$97.00 if you did a 10-year loan.

19:00:08 Clem Blakney: Everyone looks at this that paving is the only option that we've got for repairing roads in this place. Paving is just one option and sometimes when money gets to be a frugal item and taxes continue to go up, why don't we look at some options to that? Even if we eliminate those potholes and grind it into nice smooth gravel road as opposed to horrible potholes because we can't afford to pave it right, and we spend a lot less money grinding it into a nice smooth road. That's a whole better option than saying let's spend all of that money now and then because all it is is an addiction that we feel that we have to have everything paved. I don't think we do.

19:00:51 Emily Newell: Thanks for commenting that. I will say, as a Select board, we've gotten these numbers down since Annual Town Meeting because we committed to making some roads gravel. For example, Stagecoach, we committed to it. At Annual Town Meeting we were still like feeling it out. We save a lot of money there. We're talking about Crosby Brook Road, revert to gravel. It's a third of the cost. To pave that we're talking over \$300,000 to redo the whole thing.

19:01:18 Bill Allen: You're talking about reverting Crosby Brook to gravel? With 20,000 cars on a weekend, a rainy weekend, we'll have to hire the Amish to haul them out of there with their horses. Look at your company roads up north. The best gravel roads anywhere and they shut them right down to trucks in the spring. They're going to use trucks to get their tents in and out and all of their exhibits and all that.

19:01:48 Emily Newell: You don't think it'll be hard enough in September?

19:01:51 Bill Allen: It depends on what kind of weather we have. If we have a rainy summer, it's going to be a mess. I live on a gravel road. I haul my equipment over a gravel road and it gets graded what, twice a year, and in the spring have these potholes that you sink right into. I don't think Crosby Brook is going to be any different, especially where you don't have any ditches. At least we've got ditches.

You're going to have to build it up.

19:02:18 Emily Newell: its water out and away from the road. That's the most important thing we can do.

19:02:30 Dennis Jones: Well you're going to have to build the road up.

19:02:34 Emily Newell: Oh yeah, oh yeah. It has to be.

19:02:39 Donald Newell: Explain that that's part of the plan, to build the road up.

19:02:45 Emily Newell: Oh yeah. We're not just going to grind it back and say, okay, your left with it. It's getting it built up, compact it, add salt.

19:02:50 Bill Allen: But it's still going to be pot hole after pot hole after pot hole. The company roads up north that I traveled, there are graders on those all the time and we grade our roads what? Twice a year?

19:03:02 Emily Newell: Twice a year. We have a lot less traffic. Thank you. I'm going to move on.

19:0:06 Resident: I live on the Stagecoach Road. I live above the cutoff. Right now I live on a tarred road, which is what I moved to and now I'm going to go back to a dirt road. There are more people there now than when I moved in and that seems to me like step backwards. The road definitely needs to be fixed but I'm concerned about it going back to dirt rather than maintaining a paved road.

19:03:33 Gene _____: As far as the value of people coming in and buying houses, revaluating the land values, who is going to want to buy a house on a dirt road when it's graded twice a year. If you've ever lived on a dirt road you know that it doesn't stay up at twice a year. You say, well, we don't see it, we don't travel on it, who cares. [Inaudible] pay taxes. That's not the way to go. We're trying to build this town to bring more people in, to bring the property values up to bring in more taxes, and now is the time to do it when the price of tar is cheap. I would say to anybody who wants to invest in this town to do it now and not transfer it to your kids and grandkids.

19:04:24 Lynn Warman: I'm concerned about my kids who have built their homes in Unity. Since we moved to Unity 28 years ago, my taxes have gone up more than 400%. If I'm lucky enough to live 20 more years, I know I won't be able to hold onto my home and pay \$10,000 a year for taxes. I live on a dirt road that's never going to be fixed and never going to be on anyone's list and I don't care. I don't want to pay \$184.00 for somebody else's road to be fixed. I have to beat my new truck over my road to get home tonight, and I have to beat it over that road to get out. Sometimes I have to park outside of road and walk in because you can't ever pass it. It's just not right to keep upping and upping and upping and upping and upping our taxes for instant gratification. Sometimes you just have to wait.

19:05:20 Dennis Jones: I think we ought to get after the school budget.

19:05:26 Lynn Warman: Nobody goes to the meetings. Everybody votes yes because they work there.

19:05:31 Chris Rossignol: The reason we're in the situation that we're in is years of neglect, years of cheap taxes. We're paying for the sins of our fathers. I've said it 100 times and I'm going to say it again. The only way to fix this is money. Putting it off, they're just going to get.....there's going to come a point where the Selectmen are going to have to make a decision on any given road because it has become a

safety issue. Now they have to make a decision, whether it's dirt, paved, whatever, to correct the safety issue.

19:06:05 Jackie Bradeen: I live on Stagecoach Road. Down beyond me where the Amish family lives and where I walk often, the road is great. It's much better than the tarred. It's that way in most of it. There is one place there by Irving's driveway which gets soft in the spring. But if we make these roads dirt roads, and they're built well graveled, that doesn't mean that sometime in the future we can't tar those. But, as of right now, you look at my road, the road bed is gone.

19:06:57 Nancy _____: I live on Crosby Brook Road and the issue with Crosby Brook Road is that the salt and sand shed is on it. It doesn't matter what the weather is like, when those trucks, those really heavy trucks with blades on the front of them, need to go out to get to the highway they travel on Crosby Brook Road and that's why the road is in such bad shape because they go when the road is soft and the blades gouge the road out, and trying to keep it in tar is insane.

Trevanion Grenfell: I just wanted to say that I agree with Clem. I live on Waning Road and I thought it should be dirt for a long time because it's full of potholes because of the old tar. It was explained to me that you can't put tar on a certain pitch so there's a lot of road...you can't put dirt on a certain pitch. There is a lot of it that has to be pavement. I trust the Board of Select people are doing the best with this. I think the only problem with this proposal is that we should've borrowed more money and done more on the roads. I move to move the motion.

19:08:19 Donald Newell: That motion takes precedence as long as it gets passed. Do we have a motion to move [yes], do we have a second [yes]? That is a two-thirds vote. Everybody understand what we're doing? [No] The motion is to limit debate and to call the question. It's a two-thirds vote. Two thirds of you have to agree that you want to limit debate and then off we go and I call the vote. So all in favor of limiting debate, raise your green cards. Those that are opposed? We need to count them. All in favor please raise your hand so I can count. If you're in favor of limiting debate. Twenty five. And those opposed? Twenty three. Motion fails. The floor is open for discussion.

19:09:41 Resident: I agree that's we're dealing with the maintenance costs and I think that if we're going to look at the [inaudible] term of the loan [inaudible] reduce the tax burden. [Can you please repeat?]

19:09:55 Donald Newell: His point was in order to soften that the term of the loan should be extended so we're not paying it back so quickly. Do you have those examples right there, Emily?

19:10:10 Emily Newell: Yes, I'll put them up.

19:10:13 David Smith: Instead of getting to the next phase in roads in six or so years, you're talking about even longer before we get to the next set of work on roads.

19:10:26 Emily Newell: All of the road work should be able to be done, estimated, with \$750,000 more. We're looking at crack sealing and skim coating, and the life of this work is 8-12 years depending on what you do.

19:10:50 Resident: With no maintenance?

19:10:52 Emily Newell: We have \$100,000 for maintenance.

19:1:55 Charlie Schaefer: The million and a half that we accrued at the Town Meeting is straight out loan, 2.37%

19:10:56 Emily Newell: Yeah, 2.38%.

19:10:58 Charlie Schaefer: I notice here you're talking about selling bonds. Is it favorable for us to go to a bank and get a straight out loan from them? Are we maxed out on limit? Or is it cheaper to get bonds?

19:11:11 Emily Newell: It's still a loan from a bank, even though it's called bonds and that's as far as I can talk on that. I can refer to Don on that

19:11:19 Donald Newell: In regard to the rates they're lower because you're quoting 1.6, 1.8, and 2.1 depending on the term.

19:11:24 Charlie Schaefer: The cost issue with bonds itself, there's a charge for that. Which is more feasible, to go bonds or straight debt?

19:11:38 Andy Reed: You still need to get an attorney to do the paperwork. Did you say they're callable?

19:11:46 Donald Newell: Well, the Article said may be callable. That makes no sense to me.

19:11:58 Andy Reed: Because the thing is they could call them after a year.

19:12:01 Donald Newell: If they're callable, we're the ones who would call them. The Town would say, we're going to pay that off but the investor doesn't want to buy them because they put their money into it and if the rates go down they get their money back, they're going to have to try and reinvest at a lower rate. It wouldn't make sense for the Town to make it a callable loan because the interest rate is going to go up.

19:12:20 Andy Reed: I don't think we've got any lottery coming in.

19:12:25 Donald Newell: No, it isn't like we're going to pay it off.

19:12:29 Alicia McCormick: I just wanted to make the point. Someone had said earlier that it would be 10 more years before we could take any more loans out to keep them maintained; however, in six and a half years, as soon as the 1.5 is paid off then we would be in a position to start on a different... I think that was inaccurate. In six and a half years that budget could be recommitted to fixing roads that are in a better condition and won't need as much maintenance. Is that a fair way to put?

19:13:07 Resident: At the Town Meeting I thought I heard at some point 3.5 million to have the roads all fixed up and now I'm hearing 2.25 million. What's the difference?

19:13:21 Emily Newell: The difference is we're getting gutsy (er) talking about gravel roads so we're saving a lot of money there. Also the State guys reassured us we can do a medium repair, it doesn't have to be a full four inches of pavement because our roads just don't have enough traffic to warrant that. So we're able to be more confident on the lower end of the estimate. At Town Meeting I wasn't as confident.

19:13:46 Resident: So I'm thinking there's people in this room that are much more knowledgeable in roads than I am. Say three inches of pavement versus four will suffice what we need? Is that what I'm hearing?

19:14:03 Resident: Everybody talks about paving. I've been in the construction business all of my life. If you don't put a binder down on the road, you're wasting money. What they do is they go out and put a finish coat, say two or three inches on gravel. That's not going to stand up for a long period of time. You've got to put a binder down.

19:14:21 Dennis Jones: They are putting a binder. They put a two-inch modified binder on the bottom, and then they're putting, I believe, an inch and a half [inaudible].

19:14:30 Resident: They didn't on the cemetery lane there. That hasn't been sealed. When they put that blacktop down, they graded it. They didn't even compact it. They just put asphalt on top.

19:14:41 Dennis Jones: That's not true. It was compacted because they took the compactor from bridge down here, it's a 12-ton compactor, and they went up there and compacted it. I watched them.

19:15:00 Resident: Yeah you saw it.

19:15:01 Dennis Jones: They did it. I saw it.

19:15:02 Donald Newell: I don't want to slam my gavel. Thanks for helping and thank you for your comments.

19:15:08 Penny Picard Sampson: With this loan we're actually ahead of the game. I know everybody is concerned about how long it's going to be before we get to these additional roads but at the pace we had been going, instead of six years you'd be looking at 20. So this 1.5 million loan is a good start. If we can get more I'm certainly for it. It doesn't have to be \$750,000. It doesn't have to be \$500,000. It's any amount up to \$750,000 so if you wanted to say a quarter of a million dollars, that's something we could look into. We don't have the rates on that but that's certainly something. To be honest with you, I'm not totally on board with turning a lot of stuff to gravel. The gravel roads that I was on this spring actually looked pretty good to me and I like driving like Dukes of Hazard on them, but they were nice. Better than a lot of the paved roads. I'd like to hear the input from the people that live on the roads so, for instance, Fisher. I'll talk about Fisher because I talked to Jim earlier. Gene lives on that too and they're good guys because we leave them a pile of gravel and they go fix their roads. They don't want it touched. They don't want it turned back to gravel. I'm okay with that. If they want to continue to help us on the road to not have it turned back to gravel, I'm good with that. If the majority of people don't want Crosby Brook turned back to gravel, I want to be able to listen to listen to the people who live on the road. But having said that, it takes money to fix them so you've either got to put up or shut up. Right? One or the other.

19:17:20 Chris Rossignol: Just to clarify, the program that Emily uses puts down a two-inch base with an inch top finish coat.

19:17:35 Max ____: There has been nothing said here about what comes in to support this from State funds. Are state funds part of this package and how does that figure in because speaking for the Stevens Road that I'm most familiar with, I have to believe a heavy component of traffic has nothing do with us who live in Unity. It's a very heavily travelled outside of town traffic road and I don't think we should be paving a road without, there's got to be some State support coming in.

19:18:16 Emily Newell: The State give us the put aside money for capital improvements for towns every year. We already got it. It's \$35,000.00 this year. It is already planned into our calculations at Annual Town Meeting of how much we would have to bring to the table. It's based on how many miles of road we have. It's cute isn't it?

19:18:44 Maureen Haley: I'd be happy to tell you about life on the Fisher Road. I bought property up there 13 years ago and the main reason I bought up in there is because it was a tarred road. It is no longer tarred in front of my house. So for the past five years I have gone to the Town Office and said when are we going to pave? Next year, next year, next year. That was five years ago.

19:19:13 Penny Picard Sampson: That wasn't any any of us.

19:19:17 Maureen Haley: My husband and I have called and said would you at least put down some calcium chloride to keep the dust down. Yep. That never happened because they say that it's a tarred road. I've got white wicker furniture out in the spring and within a month it's all tan. I can't open my windows because of the dust rolls in off the streets. I can't keep my car clean because there is so much dust on the road with the traffic and what not. That's my perspective.

19:19:50 Resident: I'm glad to follow you because that's my concern. As I said, I live on the Stagecoach Road and have talked to Penny. I live on the part that is not going to be tarred, that is at this point. What does that do to the value of my house? It's not going to be as valuable I'm assuming. That's a concern I have and I think other people that might be turned from tar to dirt might have the same concern as well. I feel it's a little unfair where it was that way when I moved there and now it's going backwards.

19:20:29 John McIntire: I live on the Crosby Brook Road right next to the sand and salt shed where they've gouged it pretty nicely. Twenty years ago I think was the last time anything was done to that road. They chip sealed it. It looked good for 10 years. It was amazing. I have reason to go down to Palermo during probably what I think is the worst road season, February, March, and travel the Benton Road, which is dirt gravel beyond a certain point. Palermo, last year they rebuilt it but they also maintain that. They graveled it, they grade it three or four times a year, and that road looked a whole lot better than the road outside my driveway. I think that with proper maintenance, grade this thing three or four times a year and we're okay. You know, put the calcium to it and it will harden up. I've seen that and I think it will work and it will be a lot easier to repair when the plow digs it up next spring. It's just how it's going to be. And if it does anything to the value of the house, yeah, it will go down but your taxes will go down correspondingly. [LAUGHTER] There's a silver lining.

19:22:17 Bill Allen: A couple of things. I live right where the tar stops and the dust is horrendous on our road. Everything in the garage is covered with dust, freezer, you name it. Living on a dirt road, I don't care what you do, living on a dirt road you're going to get a lot of dust. You can spread calcium till hell freezes over. Secondly, when you plow it, Todd can't plow our road in the spring or in the fall on an early storm, a lot of times he doesn't even plow it because as soon as he drops that blade, you know, the road starts rolling out in the ditch. That's just the way it is. You can't make dirt hard. Not that time of year.

19:23:16 Gene _____: I think the problem with maintaining the road is you don't have a designated grader operator. Any chance we could share with other towns so he may come here the day before it rains and he may grade it. It rains and the potholes just come right back again. Are we going to wait another six months to finish the roads? That's why, Jim and I, we maintain the Fisher Road with the filler that you provided. Some times when the Town comes round and they start filling it with cold patch [inaudible] but as long as we maintain it, its fine but the problem with our road is after they ditched it, what used to be level road is now all crooked and not built up like it was. Water runs off different. I would say our road is maybe 25% tarred now with all ditching that was done that lifted out seal. When our road was paved, we only had like 3/4 of an inch of pavement, and maybe two inches on the side because the middle was a lot thinner. If we had a committed grader here that could maintain the roads once they could do it, it would be a lot better than to just leave them to fall apart in six months. If they applied calcium regularly it would help pack it down. But it does not happen.

19:25:01 Andy Reed: The only thing I was going to say, basically we've got one chance, in other words, we do our roads and we turn them back to dirt, are we going to have another revolt like we did on the cemetery road that we had to go and repave that after we turned a paved road back to dirt, and we had to repave the cemetery road. So the question is, we've got to get it right the first time otherwise we're going to have another meeting, more money to take and pave the road that we turned back to gravel. They're not dirt roads, they're gravel roads. That's all I'm saying and it's got to get done right the first time.

19:25:44 Craig Lowe: I have a short attention span and I hope I remember. Whoever said that we hadn't done our homework for the last 20 years is exactly right. It's time to pay the piper. We have a right to decent roads. Please don't advocate gravel roads if you live on Route 9 or you live on a nice paved road. It isn't fair. I go to the school budget, I have two daughters and a son-in-law who are both teachers. I vote no for the school budget and they don't take no for an answer. You go there and you're going to vote for it or you're going to be there until two o'clock in the morning until it's passed. That's five times what we're asking here. I remember the proportions when I was in the Selectmen's office. The school budget is why our taxes are going up. It is not the roads that are getting fixed for the first time in 20 years. That's it.

19:26:07 Clem Blakney: I kind of look at the roads another way too. You're absolutely right. Some of us live on paved roads. That's kind of like the artery. We still have capillaries. Capillaries just don't get the priority that the arteries do. Your arteries are what bring the 911 cars closer to the capillaries. So when they were talking about graveling some of these roads, before you pave a road you've got to get to grind that road and get it conditioned as it is. Some of the, like Stagecoach for example, that's the oldest road in this territory. It's hundreds of years old. Before it gets paved we have to spend a lot of money to recondition the road. So going part way, even graveling is not like going backwards. We have to repair those roads before we pave them. It's not misused money. It's just the first phase to getting it better and then down the road we can save it. So, again, that's an option. If we have to spend the money either way, do it in portions.

19:27:56 Dennis Jones: If we gave them all, that's an extra \$500,000 or \$750,000. It isn't gonna pave them all. So what do we do in that case?

19:28:11 Emily Newell: We don't do it all.

19:28:15 Dennis Jones: We wait six and a half years and borrow more? What are you going to do until then?

19:28:20 Donald Newell: Certainly if you don't raise the money it's going to continue the way it is or worse. We've under budgeted, as many people have said, for many years and how long are you going to go on down kicking that can down the road is really the question.

19:28:36 Jackie Bradeen: I think that, what I said before, it's not fair to do half of the roads that are in bad shape because the ones that are in bad shape, all of them are in bad shape. It's not fair to the people who wait six years to have something done to their road, whatever it happens to be. I know on the Stagecoach Road, which is one of the oldest roads, was the main route from the Kennebec to the Penobscot River. It needs to be rebuilt and as Clem says, rebuilt for a while, have it be dirt for a while. Maybe 10 years. I've lived there for 48 years and it was always tar.

19:29:38 Donald Newell: You moved in when you were five? [Laughter]

19:29:44 Jackie Bradeen: Thank you, Don! I am in favor of this \$750,000 to improve the roads for every one that needs an improvement. I think the Select people have done a great deal of work to try to do the most for the most number of people.

19:30:06 Jolene Tupper: I might get hung out to dry for suggesting this, and maybe I'm out in laa laa land somewhere but, would it somehow benefit the Town to somehow get some kind of a second hand good grader? That could be used instead of, that would help grade the roads more frequently. If that would help some of what I'm hearing in different places, you know, and keep the dirt out of their windows. I do live on a tarred road and I'll admit it but when I lived in the old house there was plenty of dirt that came in through my windows. I don't know if it makes sense or not.

19:31:19 Donald Newell: The Selectmen will certainly consider that issue.

19:31:21 John Dowdy: We've talked a lot about it's been 20 years. I was riding in trucks when I was this tall, when they were paving on my grandfather's pit. I remember when they did that very well. I was there. This isn't just a money issue, this is a time issue. I think we need to find a balance of money and time. We're not going to fix this overnight without the 3.5 million or whatever to get it all paved. So we can't go forever by not do anything but at the same time, to fix this overnight, how many of us can actually afford to do that? How many of our residents who are on fixed incomes? Thankfully I'm young, I can go and try to find extra work or something like that. Are we going to try to push a bunch of our residents to put a bunch of our houses up for sale on Bacon? We have to find a balance. That's what I'm concerned about here. If I can, can I make a move to vote.

19:32:42 Donald Newell: You've got the floor. We've got a motion to move the previous question. Do we have a second? Okay we need a two-thirds vote in order to do that. Please raise your green cards if you're in favor of limiting debate. And those opposed? Motion carries. We are now ready to vote on the Article and what we're voting on is to borrow \$750,000 additional over the 1.5 million that we approved at the Town Meeting. The Article says \$750,000. Nobody changed it. I'm just stating that. If you don't want that you're going to have to vote no and then we can open it back up for a different figure.

19:33:26 Bill Allen: Don, just to clarify, is that voting to revert to gravel on like Crosby Brook or whatever the other roads are?

19:33:33 Emily Newell: No, we still have discretion.

19:33:39 Donald Newell: The Selectmen still have discretion and they've been listening to everybody. As Penny says, try to listen and adjust as best they can. They are continuing to get information from professionals on how to do it best and cheapest. Obviously, as they go out and get pricing on paving and all this sort of thing, they'll be a lot of tweaking to try to get the biggest bang for the buck.

19:34:01 Alicia McCormick: Does this Article specify how many years this loan will be for?

19:34:09 Donald Newell: It does not.

19:34:15 Emily Newell: I'd love to do a straw poll.

19:34:20 Donald Newell: Let's see if we approve it. I planned on doing that because of the last comment. If folks think that they would prefer to pay a little more interest and soften this blow on folks, have a 10-year term instead of a five or six or seven, or two or three, then we want to hear that. Let's deal with the motion because I have to. We have a motion to move the previous question. I need to all for that

vote and then afterwards we'll do a straw poll to get you a sense on timing of the term of that loan. So we're ready to vote on the motion.

19:34:35 Emily Newell: Is the motion for the number in there or does it allow a lesser amount?

19:34:52 Donald Newell: its \$750,000. You had to have a figure or otherwise we don't have an action. It's \$750,000. If folks don't like that figure then they'll turn the motion down and the moderator will entertain a motion for a lesser figure, not a higher one. So is everybody all set? We're going to call for the vote. All in favor of the Article with the \$750,000, please raise your green cards. And those opposed. Motion carries. Okay, before you move, the Selectmen would like to get a sense of the term decision. The length of time that we will borrow that money, we as a community. You saw some of the options. Emily, can you give us a rundown of what, do you have numbers to take us out to 10 years on the \$750,000.

19:35:48 Emily Newell: Yes, \$750,000 on a \$150,000 house, so you can see the difference between 10 years and five years in these two rows here [demonstrating on projected slide]. So if your house is worth \$100,000 and it's a 10-year term, it's \$65.00 additional dollars a year versus an additional \$123.00. So it's about half. The total commitment you can see here, you'd pay \$400.00 dollars more in interest [\$40.00], \$40.00...

19:36:15 Donald Newell: In order to get the 10-year term.

19:36:30 Alicia McCormick: The 10-year term is still 2.65.

19:36:39 Donald Newell: Everybody got that?

19:36:41 Alicia McCormick: You keep saying \$100,000. How about the \$200,000 house? Exactly. Okay go.

19:36:53 Emily Newell: \$130.00 at your 10 years, and five years is \$246.00 additional.

19:37:01 Alicia McCormick: And that's a huge difference. I'm sorry but people with expensive houses, you know that can barely afford their taxes as it is. I'm going to be paying more taxes then my mortgage. I'm going for the 10 and encouraging people to go for the 10 years.

19:37:14 Donald Newell: We're not here to debate. All of the Articles have been decided.

19:37:23 Jackie Bradeen: I'd like to make one little comment first. How many years longer will this be paid for, how much for the fire department.

19:37:46 Emily Newell: This one has another 20. It was 30. We refinanced it a couple years ago.

19:37:56 Jackie Bradeen: And the Town Office?

19:37:57 John McIntire: Nine now the town office.

19:38:11 Donald Newell: Okay, so we want to do a straw poll before I lose your attention. Those of you that are in favor of a 10-year term, and those of you that are in favor of a five-year term. The Selectmen still have some wriggle room, maybe go seven, but just to get a sense of where people's heads are on this subject. How many of you are in favor of a five-year term? Please raise your green cards.

Five-year term? We've got seven. Those in favor of the 10-year term? Twenty three to seven. Okay, that's pretty clear. We've had a wonderful debate. I really appreciate it. Thanks for coming out.

19:39:12 Meeting adjourned.

**Respectfully submitted,
Sherry Powell-Wilson, Notary Public**