

# **JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE AND SELECT BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

**THURSDAY DECEMBER 20, 2018**

*(Entire meeting can be viewed at <http://www.src-tv.org/> - Select Limerick Town Meetings)*

**Presiding:** Ed Morgan, Budget Committee Chairman

## **Budget Committee**

**Members Present:** William Jones, Steve McLean, Sue McIntyre, Ed Morgan,

## **Budget Committee**

**Members Absent:** Howard Burnham, Paul Donnellan, Justin Reinhartd

**Selectmen Present:** Joanne Andrews, Gil Harris, Dottie Richard, Wendy Thorne

**Selectmen Absent:** Sonny Lepage

**Guests:** John McIntyre, resident; Steve Malamute, resident

### **1. Call to order – count for quorum**

The meeting was called to order at 7: 04 p.m.

A quorum was established

### **2. Review minutes of prior meetings**

*A motion was made by Bill Jones to accept the minutes of December 6, 2018, seconded by Steve McLean. Motion passed with four (4) Budget Committee members in favor.*

### **3. Housekeeping Items**

Ed Morgan referred to Articles 2 and 3 that will be included in the upcoming Special Town Meeting scheduled for Wednesday, December 26<sup>th</sup>. Since these Articles pertain to monies, the Budget Committee is required by Ordinance to review the Articles and provide its own recommendations. However, because we were just told that the Warrant has already been printed, the Budget Committee's recommendations will not be printed / listed below the Articles.

**Article 1:** *To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Municipal officers to spend up to \$20,000 of the current annual Fire and Rescue Budget during the period from the beginning of the next fiscal year January 1, 2019 to the next annual Town Meeting March 9, 2019 to fund the second shift coverage.*

The Article refers to "Option 2" that is proposed in the Fire Department's Budget for 2019 which encompasses the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> shifts, as well as, overnight staff coverage. The entire "Option 2" proposal will be voted on at the March Town Meeting.

***Sue McIntyre motioned to accept Article 1 / Option 2 as described by Ed Morgan, seconded by Bill Jones.***

Discussion followed. Concerns were expressed about the way the language was written in the Article. The language seems to indicate that there was a surplus of \$20,000 in the Fire and Rescue funds and the Article is requesting to transfer these 2018 funds to compensate staff on the 2<sup>nd</sup> shift from January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019 until the March Town Meeting. (The 1<sup>st</sup> shift is covered under the current system in place.) Ed stated that it had been stated on more than one occasion, that the Town had made clear that it does not "carry balances forward". Ed expressed his concern about the way the Article had been written because he believed that the Town had an Ordinance that disallows carrying balances forward to another year, subsequently, he felt that this request would violate that Ordinance.

Bill asked why the Fire Department had a surplus of \$20,000. Dottie replied that it was not uncommon for some Departments, especially those with larger budgets to have surpluses toward the end of a year. Gil noted that taking care of staffing the 2<sup>nd</sup> shift for the safety value of the Limerick citizens was an important factor for the Fire Department in that they had made efforts in being frugal in their spending on certain things. It was important to them to be able to fund coverage for that 2<sup>nd</sup> shift. Ed pointed out that the Department had found some monies in their budget to compensate staff from November thru December, and now seem to have another \$20,000 in surplus. Dottie commented that some of this surplus may also be due to some shifts that also had not been covered up until that point in time including some with stipends and per diem pay, as well as calls that had not been responded to, hence the surplus. She also clarified that the policy of not transferring monies forward is not an Ordinance, but a Policy. Dottie added that in certain cases such as this, the Townspeople can vote for carrying funds over. It is a one-time action.

Questions continued. Bill asked if the \$20,000 had come from the Department's payroll, operational costs, or, a combination of both? Dottie replied that she believed some was from the operational budget. Gil added that the \$20,000 request in the Article is a projection. That is why the wording specifies "up to" \$20,000. Bill wondered if the Department had not been able to purchase certain items that they may have needed in order to have this surplus for staff coverage. Did they have to go without something, he asked?

Dottie and Gil both replied not that they were aware of, or, had been told. Questions and discussion continued. Steve pointed out that some of the surplus was also because the Department had purchased two new trucks this year. Subsequently there was a decrease in the number of repairs needed. In his opinion, he did not feel that the issue was so much about carrying balances but, instead, in this case, more about the fact that there is a major problem with staff coverage. Now, the Department has this \$20,000 surplus that has not been spent on repairs and maintenance and they are essentially turning it back to the Town and would like to utilize it to ensure the needed staff coverage. They are taking it to the Town to decide. He then described the current staff shortage situation. The Department gets on average between 400 to 500 calls a year now, and, "it is sad when the dispatcher picks the phone up" and has to say that we have nobody to respond.

Wendy provided some financial Fire Department budget stats. As of December 17, the Fire Department's Budget balance was \$29,388, Paramedics balance is \$2,025, the Per Diem balance is \$4,900. Gil noted that he had consulted with Municipal attorneys, and they noted that it was fine in their own view, and, that they had suggested wording to be used in the Article.

Ed added that he had no problems in paying for the coverage but simply had concerns with the "process". He pointed out that this issue was presented to the Budget Committee at the last minute and therefore did not allow the Budget Committee to fulfill its obligations of providing the taxpayers with its own listed recommendation as required by Town Ordinance. He additionally is concerned with setting precedence in whether the Town does carry balances or not. Gil, however, felt this was a special situation. The Town's policy is "not to carry balances forward", but there is the option of bringing a situation up to the voters to decide with special circumstances.

*A vote was taken on the motion. Three (3) in favor, with Ed opposed.*

***Article 3: To see if the Town will vote to carry the unexpended balance of \$42,500 from the 2018 warrant article 54 from the Capital Project Reserve Account for a universal electronic waste building which will include a bathroom with electricity, plumbing, septic system, well donated, at the Transfer Station.***

*Sue McIntyre motioned to move Article 3 along, seconded by Bill Jones.*

Discussions followed.

Ed began by stating that the Budget Committee had been told “two Mondays ago”, by the Board of Selectmen’s Chairman that this project had been cancelled as of September 2017. Following that, a request was made and granted by voters last March of 2018 for an additional \$17,500 over the original budgeted amount of \$25,000. So, apparently this vote was taken for a project that was “supposedly canceled?”. Then, three weeks ago, or so, this same project came up for bid again. If it was “canceled”, why out to bid again?”. No bids received this second time. However, back in August of 2017, the Board accepted a proposal that they were given by Morgan Construction. Ed could not find any evidence that the Board had reversed its decision on this proposal. Now, the Town’s voters are being asked to “carry a balance”, however, this is a “Capital Reserve” project. Because the funds already exist in that account it does not need to be carried forward. Last March voters were asked that the \$25,000 be carried forward with an additional \$17,500. That motion was amended on the floor because it was noted that the Town does not carry balances forward. It is a Town policy. So, again, Ed noted that either “we are carrying”, and “not carrying”. Ed stated “it is one or the other”. If this amount is automatically carried forward as it stands, because it already exists in the Capital Reserve Account, then, it does not need to be voted on in this Special Town Meeting. It will be just an automatic action because it is part of the Capital Reserve account which has “no” sunset”. Subsequently, the question again is, why is this Article even on this Special Town Meeting warrant?

Wendy replied that she had received the Article at the last moment. Steve asked if the Board had actually voted in favor of putting this Article in the warrant? Joanne replied that Sonny had contacted her along with some other Board members to include it in the warrant. Joanne noted that she did not agree with Sonny’s use of the word “cancelled” in reference to this project. Joanne said the project had been “postponed”. She pointed out that she had already explained this when she first presented her budget for the Transfer Station. The reason for postponing was because the Transfer Station did not know if it would get a company to bid on the door-to-door trash pick-up contract. If a company had not bid on the door-to-door, then the Transfer Station would have had to spend that money (\$42,500) for a trash compactor. This action would have required a Special Town Meeting with voters having to approve the transfer of these monies for a trash compactor instead, since residents would have had to take their household trash to the Transfer Station. Joanne stated that in her mind it was postponed and not cancelled. When a bid proposal was received from Mellen & Sons for trash pick-up, that’s when the Transfer Station project was put back out to bid. No bids were received. This project will be going back out to bid in the Spring.

Steve commented that, “that aside”, the Selectmen should have voted on this in public which would have provided for residents to express their opinions, whether in favor or against this project. Joanne replied that it was voted on, on the previous Monday night’s Board meeting, then, posted on Wednesday.

Bill asked if the \$42,500 was currently sitting in a separate account? Joanne replied that in her mind, it is in a designated account. It is essentially earmarked for this project in the Capital Project Account. Bill pointed out that if these funds are already earmarked for this project, then what is the Special Town Meeting for? Bill wondered why these questions did not come up among the Selectmen when they voted on it on that Monday evening? He noted that he had questions that he would have wanted to ask.

Sue stated she had questions as well on several fronts. First, if someone had already been awarded a bid or proposal, and, an agreement had already been reached with a company on this project, and the Board had not followed through on their end of this Agreement, then, that is wrong. Secondly, Sue noted that since she had not been part of the process that had taken place early on with this project, she wondered why the need for the bathroom or bathrooms? The Town will have to pay to heat that bathroom(s) during the winter and cold months, even during the days where no one is there. She asked how long the Transfer Station was open during the Winter. Was it 18 hours? Yet, she explained that the Town would still have to pay for heating, despite whether the Transfer Station would be open or closed. Also, she wondered how many people would this serve?

And, thirdly, as noted, if the funds are already there, then “what are we doing?” Why is this on a Warrant

for a Special Town Meeting? Ed pointed out that funds will remain regardless of how the Budget Committee votes.

*Subsequently, Sue McIntyre withdrew her initial motion, and motioned for a “no” vote for Article 3, Bill Jones seconded the motion. Vote taken, all in favor.*

#### **4. Review of Proposed 2019 Warrant Update**

Ed reviewed the proposed articles pertaining to the Charities.

He specifically referred to the Charities where the Budget Committee differed in its recommendation as compared to the Select Board’s recommendation. Those charities which differed were the following:

**Article 10.** *To see if the town will vote to raise and appropriate \$500.00 for Maine Health Care (formerly Visiting Nurses). The Select Board recommends a “yes” vote for \$500.00, whereas the Budget Committee recommends raising the amount to “\$700.00” (per year).*

**Article 11.** *To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$1,000.00 for St. Matthew’s Food Pantry. The Select Board recommends a “yes” vote for \$1,000,00, whereas the Budget Committee recommends raising the amount to “\$1,200.00” (per year).*

**Article 15.** *To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$500.00 for Southern Maine Area Agency on Aging. The Select Board recommends a “yes” vote for \$500.00, whereas the Budget Committee recommends raising the amount to “\$700.00 (per year).*

All charitable donations will be listed in the Warrant under secret ballot. Voters will have the opportunity to choose between a \$500.00 (per year) amount or raising the amount to \$700.00 (per year). Voters will also have the option to choose a “no” vote.

Steve advocated to have **all** Articles to be placed on the Warrant as secret ballot due to the small amount of voters who come out to vote at Town Meetings, such as when 30 people who show up to essentially make decisions for 3,000+ residents. A short discussion followed pertaining to this topic as well as the many Town policies that either need to be updated or added in moving forward. Steve noted that policies also need to be enforced. Wendy agreed. Gil added that the Board does have workshops that are scheduled to address many of these issues, and, how to deal with them properly.

The next topic the group discussed were the “Board of Selectmen Housekeeping Items” that the Board has been considering for the Warrant. These are as follows:

#### **Housekeeping item G:**

*Authorize the Selectmen to make town buildings available for use by Limerick residents, non-residents, non-profit organizations, all related town committees, clubs and town sponsored activities. The following conditions will apply to town sponsored activities:*

1. The Board of Selectmen shall appoint the individuals for planning, organizing and staffing the activity.
2. The Board of Selectmen shall have the authority and oversight and jurisdiction of the activity over hiring, safety, and cash management policies and procedures.
3. All funds collected and disbursed for the activity shall be accounted for in the municipalities annual audit and overseen by the municipal treasurer.

Wendy explained that this item addresses the use of Town buildings / property. The current ordinance only refers to “Limerick residents”, while the Policy refers to both “Limerick residents” and “non-residents”. The proposed “item G” provides a broader definition and clarification of the ordinance with regards to use as well as Town sponsored activities. Ed requested further clarification of “town sponsored activities”.

Wendy stated that any Town Department that is planning to “sponsor an activity” would need to first come to the Board for Board approval before moving forward on that activity. Sue asked if this also pertained to renting space at Town owned properties and how the fees would apply in comparison to residents vs. non-residents. Wendy explained that the Town does have a rental policy and provided a scenario as to how that works. According to current policy, residents can rent space with a returnable deposit once the space is left clean and in same condition prior to rental. Non-residents pay a rental fee however the fee is non-returnable since they are not residents / taxpayers of Limerick. A brief discussion followed on the term “resident” and “non-resident” in relation to those who live in Limerick on a seasonal basis, such as those who live along the Lake. It was determined that those who live on a seasonal basis on the Lake are defined as “residents”. This proposed ordinance is meant to deter the abuse of of Town-owned property. Steve pointed out that he had a concern with the word “intent” and felt it was a broad term. Wendy stated that the “rental policy” itself will be further defined in their workshops. Bill asked for a little more clarification on the word “taxpayer” in reference to those who reside on the Lake on a seasonal basis such as for four (4) months in relation to be able to vote in Limerick. Wendy replied that they cannot vote because they are not listed as permanent residents and Limerick is not their primary residence. Gil noted that there are situations where municipalities can vote to allow a category of residents to vote. The Town voters would have to vote on a warrant article that would allow seasonal residents to vote in Limerick.

The group moved on to the next item.

***Proposed article: To see if the town will vote to establish a separate interest-bearing bank account(s) at the town’s current financial institution for voter approved Capital Projects. Any interest earned will be credited to the project. The funds will be reported on the general ledger as separate cash account. This will stay in effect until appealed or amended.***

Wendy explained that this allows the Town to establish separate account or accounts for funds that are earmarked by voter approval for specified projects. Gil noted that this simply provides clarification and transparency. Currently all funds are sitting in one account which gives the false impression that the Town has lots of monies, when in fact, some of those funds are earmarked for specific voter approved projects. Joanne added that establishing these designated accounts will allow those funds to accrue interest.

***Proposed article: To see if the Town will vote to return any unencumbered monies from an approved Capital project to the Capital Reserve Account once the project is five (5) years old from the date of approval. Any project over five (5) years old must go before the voters again for approval. This will stay in effect until appealed or amended. If this article is adopted, any capital project approved prior to Dec.30, 2018, will have their “date of approval” reset to Dec. 30, 2018.***

Wendy commented that the term “five (5) years” had been a topic of discussion among the Selectmen. She preferred that it be “three (3) years” instead of five because in essence you are holding funds “hostage”, so to speak for a specific time period. Ed pointed out, that in addition to that, if a project, for instance, like the \$25,000 that is earmarked for the parking spaces in front of the Brick Town Hall would sit in that account for five (5) years, the cost of doing that project in the meantime is increasing due to basic economic principles. Consequently, the Town is then requested to approve more taxpayer monies for that project due to increased costs. The Town currently has no limit as to how long the funds for any earmarked project is allowed to “sit there” in an account. Ed stated that he would prefer to see nothing longer than two (2) years unless the Town is looking at some massive project. Steve felt that the Selectmen needed to decide what term limits they are proposing. Is it five years or three years? He noted that he would prefer to see three (3) years as the limit. Wendy stated that the proposed articles this evening are a result of their preliminary workshop. Sue felt that five (5) years was way too long. The Selectmen will be holding another workshop on some of these articles to “fine tune” them.

Ed asked if it would be possible to list two different recommendations as a choice to voters if in the end the

Board recommends five (5) years in comparison to the Budget Committee’s limit of three (3) years recommendation? Wendy replied that, that could be done.

***Proposed article: To see if the Town will vote to approve employee annual cost of living raises to be tied to the cost of living as measured by the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The CPI-W for the third quarter of the current year will be used and take effect in January of the next year. If the CPI-W is zero or negative, no cost of living raise will be given. This will stay in effect until appealed or amended.***

Wendy explained the proposed article. If the cost of living is 2.2%, that is what will be used for cost-of-living raises regardless of any merit raises issued along with that, when applicable. However, she pointed out that at this moment, the Town has not conducted any wage surveys since 2013. The Town paid \$6,000 for that wage survey, now five (5) years old, and it hasn’t been utilized and/or updated along the way. In the meantime, the new minimum wage begins January 1<sup>st</sup>. It will be increasing by \$1.00 per hour each year until 2020 or 2021. Wendy is advocating, in looking forward, that a Committee be established, with perhaps two from Budget Committee along with two Select Board members and perhaps with the Town Treasurer to work on a Salary Survey. There is serious interest among the Select Board members for doing this soon. As a result of the 2013 survey, Joanne pointed out that raises were given in increments for three (3) years following that survey in 2013 so the Town would not experience “sticker shock”. Ed recommended that the Wage Survey Committee be formed as soon as possible. Joanne noted that when the Wage Survey was completed in 2013, the information from that Survey included Towns that paid benefits to their employees, while Limerick was paying virtually no benefits at all to their employees. Wendy stated that the “benefits” portion had been taken into consideration. Steve asked if the cost of living increases would also apply to “per diem” employees that work for the Fire Department, now that the Department is a Municipal Fire Department. Joanne replied that the cost of living increase was given to everybody last year. A brief discussion took place about making sure that all employee categories be included in the next Wage Survey such as Road Commissioner, Fire Department personnel, etc.

***Proposed Article: To see if the Town will vote to establish the following parameters for Fixed Assets:***

- 1. A fixed asset has a value of \$5,000.00 or has an estimated useful life of 5 years or more.***
- 2. The decision to acquire fixed assets may be secondary to keeping existing fixed assets in good working condition.***
- 3. Capital Projects (which will result in a Fixed Asset) available for State or Federal funding, may be prioritized when the Town may be eligible for funding.***
- 4. Department budgets that have surplus funds in any budget, may not spend those funds on a fixed asset without Selectmen approval. This will stay in effect until appealed or amended.***

No comments or discussion on this proposed article.

The next item of discussion was the proposed article pertaining to Town Revenues.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 20):**

***To see if the Town will vote to appropriate estimated revenues from Excise, Fees, Urban Rural Improvement Program, Department Revenues and Undesignated Funds to reduce the 2019 Tax Commitment.***

***Selectmen and Budget Committee recommend:***

<b><i>State Block Grant</i></b>	<b><i>41,000.00</i></b>
<b><i>Excise Taxes</i></b>	<b><i>550,000.00</i></b>
<b><i>Boat Fees</i></b>	<b><i>8,000.00</i></b>
<b><i>Agent Fees</i></b>	<b><i>11,000.00</i></b>
<b><i>Clerk Fees</i></b>	<b><i>3,800.00</i></b>
<b><i>Code Enforcement</i></b>	<b><i>29,000.00</i></b>

<i>Board of Appeals</i>	<i>0.00</i>
<i>Planning Board</i>	<i>1,000.00</i>
<i>Recreation</i>	<i>3,000.00</i>
<i>Town Hall Rentals</i>	<i>0.00</i>
<i>Fire Department</i>	<i>500.00</i>
<i>Bank Interest</i>	<i>6,000.00</i>
<i>Property Tax Interest</i>	<i>26,000.00</i>
<i>Transfer Station</i>	<i>25,000.00</i>
<i>Transfer from Unassigned Account to Reduce Tax Commitment</i>	<i>200,000.00</i>
<i>Anticipated Revenues to Offset Tax Commitment</i>	<i>904,300.00</i>

Revenues projected in this article total \$904,300.00. Ed asked, “how close are we on those projection amounts”? Wendy replied that they are close but will need to be reviewed again at the end of the year. Bill wanted to know what the total revenue amount was for last year in comparison to this year’s projections. Wendy replied, last year it was “741,400.00”. Joanne pointed out that in last year’s Town Budget, the Town added only \$100,000 from the “unassigned account” to reduce the tax commitment’, whereas this year, this article is proposing a tax commitment reduction of \$200,000. However, Wendy noted that the \$200,000 is contingent upon the year-end report for 2018.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 24)**

*To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for the operations of local, State and Federal elections including stipends, payroll and FICA Taxes.*

Ed asked if the Select Board agreed with the change listed for “payroll...”. Totaling \$8,250.00. Wendy replied “yes”.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 28)**

*To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for eligible employees for a Health Insurance Plan administered through Maine Municipal. Employees that opt out shall receive \$6,000.00 in comp pay.*

*8 eligible employees @ \$6,000.00 per employee                                totaling: \$48,000.00*

Ed stated that it is now his understanding that the number of employees has changed from 8 employees, to 9 (employees). Is this correct?

Wendy replied yes, so this total will now be \$54,000,00 with FICA increasing to \$4,131.00. for a total of \$58,131.00.

Steve asked if the “per diem” Fire Department employees, who at times work 30 hours a week, would be eligible for this benefit? A clarification followed on how many hours per week, if done consistently, would qualify. Wendy and Bill agreed that it would have to be consistent, and not 10 hours one week, and 30 hours the next. Subsequently, per diem is simply that “per diem”. They are not full-time employees. Steve asked about the Road Commissioner’s eligibility? It was pointed out that the Road Commissioner is an “elected position”, so he would not be qualified as a “full-time” employee, however, as an “elected official” he is eligible through Maine Municipal Association’s insurance plan. Dottie pointed out that the Road Commissioner also does not consistently work 30 hours every single week. The “full-time” payroll definition must meet the criteria of at least working a minimum of 30 hours consistently every single week. She added that “elected officials” can opt into the Maine Municipal Health Insurance Plans, but would need to pay the entire premium. The Town would not be picking up any portion of that premium since they are not full-time employees.

Gil pointed out that there is additionally a special provision for Fire Department employees that if hours

average over a time period, something like 28 days, that there is a special way of calculating out job pay for Fire Department personnel because of the variance in per diem weekly hours. Joanne said she thought it was something like an average of 56 hours per week for per diem.

Another brief discussion took place pertaining to ongoing negotiations for the Town to implement a Health Insurance plan for Town employees. Ed suggested getting employee input / feedback on the Health plans that may be proposed by the Town setting a timeline for gathering and summarizing that feedback as it pertains to this Warrant Article.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 29).**

*To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for support of the poor. (General Assistance).*

Ed pointed out that the Selectmen have recommended the yearly \$10,000 whereas the Budget Committee has recommended \$13,000 due to increase in requests by those who qualify for this assistance. The Town does get a re-imbursment of up to 70% from the State depending on what the assistance is for. Therefore, the Town would get a little more in return, for the little extra the Town is providing. Gil confirmed that the Town gets 70% back from the State for whatever the Town submits to the State. Dottie noted that the Town had already gone over the \$10,000 that had been budgeted for 2018, but the State will still reimburse the Town for that. A report is sent every month to the State and the State does come in now and then to audit the Towns. Joanne added that the amount that is returned to the Town will be listed in the Revenue section of the Warrant. The group agreed that they were all fine with proposing \$13,000. Steve recommended that in moving forward the Select Board should indicate on the Warrant the total amount of State monies that were returned to the Town under this provision. Gil noted however, that the timing schedule when the Town receives the re-imbursment would make it difficult to list actual returned monies. Some funds are not returned until the following calendar year. You may submit a report for the last quarter of 2017 for instance, but not receive that revenue until 2018. Gil added that when this article comes up at the Town Meeting someone will be there to explain how the Town is reimbursed by the State. Sue asked if the Warrant could include a short sentence, in parenthesis, with something to the effect of, “the Town of Limerick receives up to 70% in returned monies from the State for these expended funds”.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 32)**

*To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for the operations of the Code Enforcement Officer, Assistant and Secretary, including payroll, FICA taxes, office supplies, computer software and equipment.*

There are ongoing discussions taking place among the Select Board members as to whether or not to include the Code Enforcement Department’s request for a new software called *iWorQ*” which would streamline the permitting process, provide a better database, etc.. and would allow taxpayers to apply online for various construction permits, etc. Ed noted that there had recently been a decrease in the proposed costs of the software that had been submitted by this software company. The decrease totals \$1,175. Ed further pointed out that there is now about \$3,225 difference between the Budget Committee’s recommendation and the Select Board’s recommendation. Ed recommended that the Budget Committee take time to review the *iWorQ* software company’s newest revised quote adding that he had also attached letters from three separate Towns that already use this software. All these Towns are very satisfied, and the letters are very positive.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 46)**

This article pertains to the proposed Fire Department’s personnel payroll “Option 2”. The Budget Committee’s recommendation is for \$248,970, and the Select Board’s recommendation is for \$249,740. The groups agreed that the difference wasn’t much and could simply be due to the way FICA was calculated. The difference is \$770. The Budget Committee agreed that they were satisfied with the \$249,740.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 50)**



***To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for operating traffic signals and street lighting services.***

Ed noted that the Budget Committee had previously recommended the previous proposed amount of \$22,000, the amount approved at the March 2018 Town Meeting. The current article proposes \$18,000.

***Steve McLean motioned to accept the Select Board's recommendation of \$18,000 seconded by Bill Jones. Vote taken. Motion passed with all in favor.***

**Proposed Article (currently Article 55)**

***To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for stipends, payroll, FICA Taxes, supplies, equipment, utilities for the operations of the Recreation Program.***

The Budget Committee approved a recommendation of \$12,000. The Select Board's latest recommendation totals \$14,000. Bill asked why the Select Board's recommendation was \$2,000 more than the Budget Committee's recommendation. Wendy said the Board had decreased the amount that had been requested for sports equipment and had made other changes. Steve pointed out that in reference to the Swim Instructor's fee, that there had been two (2) members of the Fire Department that are certified swim instructors that had been willing to volunteer their time. There would have been no fee involved. Bill noted that the Swim Instructor had been paid \$25.00 per hour and asked who had made that "payroll" decision. It was stated that the Director of Parks and Recreation had made that decision. Bill wondered why the Select Board was not involved in making that decision. He recommended that in moving forward that the Select Board should take into consideration that there may already be certified Fire Department personnel that could conduct a Swim program versus paying a fee for someone else.

It was noted that there is a new Parks and Recreation Director that will be starting, once a decision is made by the Board. They have already received a resume. The Board plans to review all of the Programs with the new Director once he/she comes onboard.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 57)**

***To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for the operation, maintenance, repairs and improvements to the Limerick Municipal Building.***

<i>Utilities</i>	<i>\$20,650.00</i>
<i>Repairs and Maintenance</i>	<i>17,000.00</i>
<i>Professional</i>	<i>8,000.00</i>
<i>Supplies</i>	<i>3,000.00</i>
<i>Flooring Library</i>	<i>2,112.00</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>50,762.00</i>

Sue had a question about the word "Professional". We seem to see this category in two or three proposed articles. What is included in the funds for "Professional"? And, then, there is "Repairs and Maintenance". So, what are the "Professional" monies used for? And, what do the "repairs and maintenance" involve?

Joanne replied that the "Professional" category includes paying those who come in, for instance, to certify the elevator, or those who certify the boiler. Sue wondered why these monies might not come out of "maintenance". Bill asked who does the "repairs and maintenance"? Gil replied that perhaps a good chunk of that right now might be the doors that have needed attention. The doors will be a big project in moving forward. Sue wondered about the amounts because there is a proposed amount of \$17,000 for repairs and maintenance, and a proposed amount of \$8,000 for professional, making that a total of \$25,000. Steve asked if the Committee could get a breakdown of those amounts. A short discussion followed about the doors.

Gil noted that the amount for the doors may additionally need to be increased. A quote has recently been submitted at a cost of \$13,000. Sue asked if the Select Board had received only one estimate or if an effort had been made to “shop around”, so to speak. Dottie replied that she was currently working on acquiring another estimate from another company. Discussion continued about making the Warrant Articles somewhat clearer, listing what comes under the word “Professional” and the words “Repairs and Maintenance”. Wendy pointed out that the vendors are listed in the Annual Town Report.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 58)**

*To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate for the operation, maintenance, repairs and improvements to the Brick Town Hall.*

<i>Supplies</i>	<i>\$1,500.00</i>
<i>Repairs / Maintenance</i>	<i>6,000.00</i>
<i>Utilities</i>	<i>10,500.00</i>
<i>Professional</i>	<i>3,300.00</i>
<i>Handicap Doors</i>	<i>4,500.00</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$25,800.00</i>

Wendy stated that there is currently an unexpended balance of \$5,700 for the Brick Town Hall. Last year the total budget was for \$23,700. Dottie added that, that would mean that there has been about \$18,000 spent so far.

**Proposed Article (currently Article 64)**

*To see what sum the Town will vote to raise and appropriate to acquire grants for restoration, renovation, preservation, handicap accessibility and energy efficiency projects for the Brick Town Hall.*

*Select Board recommended amount is \$5,400*

Sue had some questions. Last March, the Town approved \$5,400 for grant writing and the Town also approved an additional \$9,000 for writing a grant for the CDBG grant (Community Development Block Grant). Sue wondered how many grants had been written for the \$5,400 since last March, and were those grants written by only one person? Same question with the \$9,000 in reference to was that paid to only person?

In reference to the \$5,400, Sue additional asked how many of those written grants are “active or pending” and “how many were already awarded to the Town”?

Joanne thought that Mr. Cleveland had written four (4) grants that she knew of, however, Dottie thought it might be three (3). Gil pointed out that there is a balance remaining of \$1,400 in that account, subsequently, the Board will be recommending \$4,400, instead of \$5,400 at next March’s Town Meeting.

Joanne stated that Mr. Cleveland had hired someone to do the plan for the “access pathways parking” project at the Brick Town Hall. However, Sue pointed out that, that is separate from the \$5,400 topic. The handicap parking pertains to the \$9,000 for the CDBG grant. Wendy stated that there was a balance of \$2,300 left from the \$9,000 grant writing account for the CDBG grant. Sue again noted she was specifically referring to the \$5,400 (or, \$3,800 already expended).

Wendy said that there is the Belvedere (Maine Community Foundations) Grant that was received / awarded to the Town in the amount of \$10,000. There is another grant scheduled to be decided in December. That grant is from the Morton-Kelly Foundation. The potential award would be for \$10,000.

A discussion took place pertaining to funds that normally require “matching funds” in comparison to those grants that normally do not require “matching funds”. Wendy stated that the Morton-Kelly Foundation was

requesting a 100% match, which would equal \$10,000.

She said there is another grant from the Narragansett Number One Foundation that would be awarded during the first quarter of 2019. That potential award from that grant would be for \$15,000, "if" the Town is selected to receive that award. Joanne said that Mr. Cleveland was also looking into other grants pertaining to the Main Street Revitalization project.

The term "matching funds" was discussed some more. Sue pointed out that requesting the Town to raise more funds, doesn't necessarily mean that the Town "needs" to raise those funds in order to receive a grant. There is a difference between a "mandated" fund match as a requirement to get the awarded fund, versus simply requesting the Town more money that is not actually required in order to receive a grant. Sue felt that clarification is needed when requesting those funds. It can be misleading to the taxpayer.

Wendy noted that she had just noticed that she had not included another proposed article for the Handicap Access Pathways (parking) for the Brick Town Hall. There currently is a balance of \$25,000 in that account. There will be another proposed article in the Warrant for an additional \$15,000 for that project. She stated that there is a total of \$40,000 needed to do that project.

In reference to the "re-pointing" of the Brick Town Hall, Joanne stated that if they only receive \$20,000 for instance for that project, they will only do \$20,000 of re-pointing work. Ed asked if the Town had firm bids on re-pointing that project. Joanne replied "no". Wendy replied that it is an "estimate" of \$70,000 for the re-pointing. Ed said that he would like to see, at least two or three quotes from professionals to get some firm quotes. Questions to these professionals should be: Do we need the re-pointing at all? Or, what areas would need the re-pointing done, if not all areas? And, then, what is the cost?

Wendy stated that she was working on that. Joanne re-iterated that they would use the grant monies first. Ed pointed out that this would apply to only those grants where the Town meets whatever grant stipulations might apply. Ed re-iterated the need for "written quotes".

Joanne spoke of the handicap doors and stated they had based that price on what had been spent on the municipal building. Sue noted she had another concern with the proposed handicap doors. She said from what Gail had stated that the work done on those doors would also depend on what the Historic Commission approves. Joanne stated they are talking about retro fitting the existing doors and that they did not need to have it approved by the State Historic Commission. If they don't change the "look" it should be fine.

Ed asked if anyone knew when those prices would come in on the work for those parking spaces. Wendy replied that they would be meeting on January 15<sup>th</sup> to review the RFP. They will be reviewing an estimate by the architect. Questions were asked as to why there was an additional request of \$15,000 more for those parking spaces. Why did the Town not have the complete and accurate information from the beginning when the request for \$25,000 was made at last March's Town Meeting? Joanne also mentioned that they would be looking at adding underground power for lighting the ramp and walkways. Lighting will also be needed for the pathway to the parking lot outback. Ed pointed what if the RFP comes in considerably more than the additional \$15,000 that they are looking at? The Select Board should be looking for firm quotes. Ed commented that this "thing" could keep going and going and going. Steve stated that the entire project should have been calculated first, from the beginning, instead of doing \$10,000 here, \$20,000 there, etc.

Steve brought up the "administrative services" that would be conducted by Mr. Cleveland for overseeing the CDBG grant Main Street Revitalization Project. He pointed out that it had come to his attention that Mike Gilpatrick had recently received certification to administer / oversee such projects. Steve wondered why the Town could not utilize a paid employee like Mike, instead of paying someone else to perform this function.

Ed noted that he had asked Mike about this project, and Mike had replied that he would not be interested because this would be his first project to administer, and since this project is a substantial project, he

preferred not to take part in this one, as his “first project”.

Sue asked who had oversight over all the grants, the grants that come in? Wendy replied that the funds come into the Town. When it is a Federal and/or State funded grant, they will come in to oversee it, to audit it, etc. However, Sue was referring to who is charged with overseeing the list of grants that have been written for the Town; which are active; which have the potential for getting an award; and, which grants have been denied, etc. The reply was that it was John Cleveland and that Laura May and Wendy also keep track of those grants. The question was asked if we had received a grant from the DOT (State Department of Transportation). Joanne replied that the Town had received a grant for \$10,000 but then stated that it was not actually a “grant” but that the DOT had waived a \$10,000 fee. She stated that the DOT does not give out grants for sidewalks anymore. Steve suggested that this might be a good item to include on the Town’s website which would include the list of grants awarded, etc.

Another brief discussion took place pertaining to efforts that should be made to improve the Town’s website. It was noted that at the end of each Select Board meeting when announcements are made, the Board always states to the public to go to [www.limerick.org](http://www.limerick.org) for more information. However, most often important information, especially pertaining to Special Town Meetings is not listed and/or posted in time, or, at all, as with the October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Special Town Meeting. However, it was noted that the Town has been without a Board Secretary for over two (2) months, and that one of her duties included updating the Town website. Wendy pointed out that the Board has hired a new Secretary and she will begin on January 2, 2019. The Select Board will meet January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019 to finalize the numbers the numbers discussed.

Joanne wanted to point out that Limerick has received about \$1.2 million in grant funds since the year 2000. More information is available on the Limerick CDBG website. Steve suggested that a link to the CDBG website be posted on the Town’s website.

Ed ended the meeting by stating that he sometimes gets the impression that the Budget Committee is seen as an “afterthought” and that he said he’d like to say that “we are an elected body and that we have as equal value to the taxpayers that the Board of Selectmen has”. He added that he was referring to the Budget process. Ed additionally believes that the Budget Committee is providing lots of good information to the voters that they need to have in order to make well informed decisions when voting. Wendy commented that per her past experiences of having sat on the Budget Committee, Board of Selectmen and various Committees, that she found value in having another body working together toward a common goal.

Sue wanted to state that she strongly advocates for bigger efforts to be made in bringing in more revenue to the Town. She referenced the Business Park. She believes that more could be done with that effort by signing an agreement with a professional commercial broker who works on commission, and who could do the ‘legwork’, and, additionally provide good marketing for the Business Park. Brokers only receive a commission when a sales agreement is signed.

Steve commended the Select Board by stating that they did meet their goals this year.

***Sue McIntyre made a motion to adjourn. It was seconded by Bill Jones. Motion carried with all in favor.***

**Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** TBD (*as of this writing, it has been scheduled for Jan. 17<sup>th</sup>, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.*)

Respectfully Submitted,  
Suzanne McIntyre  
Recording Secretary