

WALDO COUNTY FY 2008 BUDGET COMMITTEE
6th MEETING DECEMBER 13, 2007
PUBLIC HEARING

PRESENT: Commissioners J. Hyk, A. Fowler, D. Berry; Budget Committee Members: B. Sneed, J. Bennett, R. Desmarais, T. Biggs, H. Dean Potter, R. Lee, R. McLaughlin; County Clerk B. Arseneau; Deputy County Clerk V. Stover

Public Comments:

Joe Slocum, Belfast City Manager: I was asked yesterday if there should be a county administrator. Perhaps we can think about that, but I don't really know if we need a county administrator, or not. I do want to talk to you, whether it's in this budget or a future budget, about some common ground that we all have. We've all heard about Athena Health is going to move into Belfast, and that's good news for the City of Belfast, for all of Waldo County and all the communities in Waldo County. The people who work there are not going to be only employees from the City of Belfast. People employed there may not even be from Waldo County. I do want to say that the City is making an investment of economic development. We're not islands anymore; we just can't do one thing for ourselves and not expect other people to benefit from it. We have some economic developments in the City – we know it has been beneficial to the whole region; and we're really proud of that. One of the things we contribute money in the City budget every year is \$15,000.00 to a group called Knox Waldo Economic Development Council, not Belfast/Rockland Economic Council. It's a good investment, not something we just throw money at; it's something we actually participate in. I'm not saying it should be in this budget, but I think it's something the County should really think about in the long term because economic development benefits the whole county. It would be great if we could find some common ground in more than one municipality in the County. It benefits all of us – the dollars don't stop at our borders. We currently have a situation where a career center located in Belfast is state financed with federal dollars, and it's in danger of closing. There isn't a town in Waldo County that doesn't benefit from that career center. We're trying like crazy to fight to keep it open. I hope you and your towns are - I hope the County steps up and tries to keep that center open. I've been there; I've seen the people walk in; and I can tell you these are people who are finding jobs who would not find jobs, who are finding training who would not otherwise find training. They are not just young people – they are adults, as well. I didn't come here to preach; I just came out here to give a pitch for, if not now, then at some point in the future, if the County as a broader entity for the whole region would think about putting some money into supporting economic development. Jobs are important to all of our communities; a tax base is important to all of our communities. Thank you very much.

S. Story: My question is just a point of order. As we go through the budget like last year, we can address something of this subject in those exchanges?

J. Hyk: Sure. I guess what we now want is the second part of this party, which is we're going to go through the budget again, one last time, not line by line probably, but certainly from department to department and try

Jeff Trafton, Board of Communication Center: I have a question. As you go through the budget by department, will members of the public be allowed to ask questions, or do you want it done now?

J. Hyk: I want that done now.

J. Trafton: I'm Jeff Trafton, the Belfast Police Chief. The reason I'm here tonight is...I'm a member of the Board of the Communications Center, and I helped put the budget together that was submitted to the County. In that budget, we had to make some tough decisions because when we looked at over-time that was spent and whether or not it would be cheaper, we determined, with a lot of work on Owen's part that it would be cheaper for the County if we actually hired a couple of people full-time – we'd spend a lot less on over-time. I wasn't here for the other meetings, but I understand that budget was cut severely and ended up being a lot smaller at your proposal than it was with what we put together. I'm just wondering if you could answer some questions about how you came to cut that budget. We did the best we could with what we had and to get the job done, it's a very important job; the function that they perform for the Belfast Police Department is critical. It involves communication with the public, other departments, other officers, other agencies – we can't function without them. If you want to address that when you actually go through the budget for them or if you want to do that now....I just want to make sure that I understand. When we built that budget, we did it with the what the best deal was for the County and for the taxpayers, and for the City of Belfast, also. The City is one of the biggest users of the Comm. Center.

B. Sneed: We've added two dispatchers!

J. Trafton: Well, there was a marked cut – about \$33,000.00?

O. Smith: \$21,000.00.

B. Sneed: Yeah.

O. Smith: There was \$21,000 cut that was taken off the bottom line. I sensed that certain members of the [*Budget*] Committee did not like hiring two more people.

B. Sneed: The money's in there, Owen, for two more people!

O. Smith: Yeah, but there was \$21,000.00 cut from the budget. I can't finance that new schedule and the current schedule is even more money than the new schedule. The one thing I think needs to be remembered is that my budget is primarily for people. I don't have a lot big ticket items, either, that I can take money out of. Tower sites, yes, is a big number but tower sites and those and those contracts we have to use other tower sites, but there are no other big tickets in my budget to often \$21,000.00. That's all I am – I'm people and technology. I don't have cruisers and other types of equipment, or gasoline or anything else that I can take from. It's all people – all people and technology, and

commitments to various sites we have. The recorder lease, yes, comes out of my budget but everybody benefits from. That's all my budget is – people. So, to take that kind of hit, with the schedule situation, is a very difficult adjustment. The new schedule will save us money if we continue the way we're going. Out of the 4400 hours that I have to cover, more than half of that is vacation and comp time, which I have to cover by union contract for full-time employees, at over-time. This last year, more people have taken more time. If I have forty open shifts in a month, thirty to thirty-two of those shifts are at over-time.

B. Sneed: Let me interrupt. Here's one of the problems that I've got; I don't know about the rest of these characters. We added two new people and the over-time still stays at \$30,000. Why? You're adding two more bodies, and you are still going to have \$30,000 in over-time?

O. Smith: By adding two people, we're not going to have to cover everything by over-time because we're going to have seven people floating that can take those shifts...

B. Sneed: But, you've set the same amount that you asked for last year, which is about \$31,000. You're adding two more people this year as you had last year, and you're still asking for the same amount of over-time. What's the logic of this?

O. Smith: We believe we're going to have substantial savings of over-time, because we're not going to have to cover every vacation shift; we're not going to have to cover comp time with over-time. I mean, we've spent to date almost \$126,000 on over-time and part-time. We're not going to have anywhere's near that with the new schedule

B. Sneed: Good! Then they take the \$21,616 out of the \$30,000, and there's your savings. Am I the only one who doesn't get this, how you can add two more people and still spend the same amount in over-time as you spent last year?

O. Smith: We're not going to be able to cover all of it with two people. There's seven people floating to cover shifts, instead of being stuck on shifts now. We're not thinking that we can cover every single hour of over-time and part-time by doing this, but we can cover a substantial amount of it.

B. Sneed: Let me ask you a question. How many people would you need over and above the sixteen or so you have now so that over-time and part-time would be zero? How many more people would you need for that?

O. Smith: I currently have twelve full-time; I want to add two. I currently have six part-time, but that's really only four because they are the core part-timers. I'm not having luck attracting new people and new applications for part-time jobs. There's a long training curve and that's all covered by somebody training them. We want to try and stabilize it. Based on this year's money to date, we're going to be \$129,000 next year under the current schedule, if we can't go and use this. There's going to be savings by going to the new schedule both next year and in the future.

B. Sneed: Who are the part-timers? I don't see a part-timer listed on your budget.

J. Bennett: It's there in 3100 – Part-time.

B. Sneed: Oh, O.K.

J. Trafton: I think another thing you have to keep in mind, too, is because of labor contracts, the full-time people get first grab. I have the same problem at the police department, so you don't always have the option of bringing in a part-timer to cover a shift. It has to be offered to the full-time people first under their labor contract, so you're never going to be able to do away with over-time completely. It's not a possibility. There has to be some there.

B. Sneed: So, we could hire another 12 people for the Communication Center and still pay \$30,000 a year in over-time?

J. Trafton: Oh, I think you'd have to take a closer look at that. That doesn't make sense to even make that kind of a statement.

O. Smith: The biggest cut was in Part-time last year. Last year we projected \$68,000 for part-time, and this year we're looking at \$14,000 for part-time, as opposed to that, because...(J. Bennett broke in and said, "It's still more than that because we've added \$30,000.00 apiece for two, so that doesn't make sense." *(O. Smith was still talking, but it could not be heard over J. Bennett's comment.)*)

O. Smith: ...there's \$126,000.00 in those two figures. We've been hit hard, and hit hard, and hit hard every year. We had three Family Medical leaves last year. Not only in most cases they are using vacation and comp time or sick time, but then we have to back-fill those positions while they're out. And then there's training. Basically the State has been picking up all the training, but we have to back-fill the slots when we send people. (Papers were being shuffled, so the remainder of O. Smith's comments were unclear on the tape.)

R. McLaughlin: A question - I'm not sure how this plays out, but in 2007 you budgeted roughly \$99,000 for part-time and over-time. You say you're going to spend \$120 some odd thousand before the year's over? *(B. Sneed asked R. McLaughlin to repeat the question for O. Smith.)*

R. McLaughlin: In 2007, you budgeted \$99,000.00 for part-time and over-time, but you say it's going to be closer to \$120-something before the year is over?

O. Smith: Based on what we've done this year, if we continue with the same schedule, we predict just shy of \$120,000. Based on what we did this year, in actuality, with the 3% increase, it's going to be closer to \$129,000, if things stay the same.

R. McLaughlin: So, if I add up your two new dispatchers, your part-time and over-time, it comes up to \$104,000, which is over the \$99,000 that was with the two less employees, but then you have insurance benefits to bill for those two employees, which comes up to what, approximately?

O. Smith: I can't speak for the benefits, but I think the benefits are a floating target all the time – depending on who the players are, who comes, who goes, what level of benefits they receive or need. But benefits, while it is part of the overall County budget, is not part of any department's budget, and I just think it's a floating object. I think this is the best opportunity we have to stop this increase every year in what we need for part-time and over-time. I was asked to develop a schedule, develop a budget based on that, and that's what I did. Right now it's going to be hard to do either schedule with a \$21,000 cut. As I said before - and I'm going to repeat it - all I am is people. I don't have any huge commodities that I can widge money from. I don't have any place else. It's people and technology.

R. McLaughlin: Okay, if you cut \$21,000, then you've only cut one employee. You still have one person you can put on.

O. Smith: You can't do it with one person. The schedule, as it changes now, is going to rely on either over-time or part-time to fill the other one. I agree that if you had a bunch of part-timers you can rely on, part-timers you could keep, it would be a whole lot cheaper than full-timers. I don't have that situation. I'm down to a core group of four and not a lot of promise of applications in the drawer.

R. McLaughlin: I can see your point one way – you're going to have \$124,000 if we leave it the way it is; but if you have two new people, you're still going to have \$124,000 and it's going to be a wash either way.

O. Smith: I just think we're better off to develop a new schedule and work it for everything it's worth then we ought to continue down with the present staffing we have. The schedule that we're developing, during the early '90's, Belfast Police Department was sold on the fact that they could utilize officers and build these open float shifts by moving them around. It was adopted by the Sheriff's Department in the early 2000's and then adopted by us. The thing with us – the float became a fixed schedule to fill the other half of our one-to-eleven shift so we'd never had the advantage to move people around. We still have to pay the over-time; still have to pay the comp time, so we have no place to move people into these slots except to continue to pay and as Jeff said, by contract, full-timers get first refusal on vacation/comp time – over 2,000 hours of vacation/comp time every year.

T. Biggs: So, we better remember that the employee benefit package is almost \$14,000 a year, so we're adding \$28,000 to another line somewhere else, which is almost another employee.

R. McLaughlin: Like I said before, I'd like to see the employee benefits go back into the departments, then we have a true picture of what it costs, but that's not the way it is.

R. Lee: What is confusing to me is that you're not presenting us with any analysis that shows whether your proposal to go to an additional two full-time people costs more or less, including all the costs, including the benefits. I have a sense that it costs more. And so I guess the only justification for going that route would be the fact that you can't get part-timers, it's just impossible – that the County is going to be at risk because you won't be able to find people. I get a sense that with the \$28,000.00 in benefits that your proposal will cost the County more money. If it's not true, it would be nice to show the arithmetic for why it's not true.

O. Smith: We don't see it as costing more money; we see it, in actuality, as saving money. I know it's going to cost more money under the benefit package.

R. Lee: But you have to include that.

O. Smith: And I understand that. But *[unclear words]*...my department is only people. I'm not lying to you when I say we're going to need more money if we continue the schedule we've got. I cannot find part-timers and train them and lose them, and train them and lose them. Half of my part-time budget this year went to training part-timers.

R. Lee: The concern I have is that we have, I think our proposal is to level fund them at \$649,000 and it will be \$650,000 and you've saved about \$6,000 because you had two people leave and you hired replacements at slightly lower levels, but I don't really know how much the non-personnel figures have gone up. You have something like \$60/70,000 in total for contractual services and commodities and I could do the math, but I haven't done it. I imagine it climbed a little bit.

O. Smith: Well, it pretty much balanced off. Some things are down, some things went up. Back on Tower Sites, which the rent that we have to pay, the Commodities, in general, my overall budget to start with is only up 3% - a little over 3%. As I say, that accounts for people and cost-of-living increase.

R. Lee: The one thing you say that is persuasive to me is that if you've got a bunch of cost of living increases here, then we ought to be taking those into account in the amount that we vote for. You did save some money because you took people at a higher step level and replaced them with people at a lower step level. You saved some there, so it's not the full 3% that you should be appropriating. It may be that the \$650,000 is a little low, but since we don't get to specify whether you hire the full-time people or not...

O. Smith: That is true. Directly, that's true, but indirectly, by the numbers, you certainly do control that. We don't have enough money to hire the second person because if I had a second person, we can't make the schedule work. We certainly don't have enough money to keep going the rate we're going this year. Every year the Board hopes we get lucky next year and not have the cost that we had, but we've never got lucky. It's time

we stop hoping on luck and hoping next year we don't have the medical costs, and hope next year we don't have the family medical leave. You can't control that. My budget is all people.

B. Sneed: Owen, in fact, about 80% of the County's budget is people.

O. Smith: And I understand that.

B. Sneed: So your not the only department where most of it is people.

O. Smith: And I understand that, but the highest percentage of that, I believe, is. And there's nothing else to spread it around, that's what I'm trying to say.

B. Sneed: All right. So, if we give you back the \$21,000, whose department do we take it out of?

O. Smith: I'm not making that decision; that's not my decision to make. I just mean that you need to put back some of that money in order to try and make this new schedule work. Yes, I can grab a couple thousand here maybe, maybe get a little bit on the Tower Site by not getting the new site going as soon in the year, etc., save a little money here, with luck, maybe we can pull part of it out, but I certainly can't make up \$21,000 out of what I've got in personnel.

R. McLaughlin: I see, with the \$60,000 for the new employees, you have \$44,000 in over-time and part-time, so we can essentially cut \$21,000 off of that budget – part-time and over-time, and make it come down a little bit.

O. Smith: It's what we reasonably expect to be able to do, But we're never ever, as the Chief [*Trafton*] said, never ever going to be able to cover all of it, but we certainly can cover more of it. Right now, if I have a full-time person go on vacation for four days, every one of those vacation shifts are covered by a full-timer at over-time. With the new schedule, we can take those four vacation days, and cover them with the person who is floating because they are available to use. Then, when we get the crunch that we've had so far in December, which has been pretty bad weather, we've got the people there to fill in instead of bringing people in to work because we've got a major snow storm. We're going to be able cut it and I can't answer, I fully recognize, what the benefits are elsewhere, but as I said the benefits are a floating target. If somebody leaves today and someone comes in tomorrow, and you have less benefits, then you've saved money.

R. McLaughlin: Would it be fair to say that if you weren't going to add two new employees and you went with the 2007 budget, that you would have added \$60,000 to the combination of over-time and part-time, which would have made it about \$150,000?

O. Smith: Well, in actuality, even that wouldn't have been enough because, as I say, this year to date, we've spent \$126,000 in part-time and over-time.

R. Lee: But it looks like your regular numbers' low, so people must have left and you must have replaced them with over-time...

O. Smith: We're going – by the year-to-date, that's what we've spent today, on full-time personnel. We're just a little bit under. We've got one full-time payroll to go and we are under because not all of the time that was taken on Family Medical Leave, and we had a fellow in the Guard that took off, by order, so part of Family Medical Leave we had, not all of it was paid, so we did some some money but the bulk of it was this time because people had the time to use. Family Medical Leave is a really great thing, but you still have to pay for it.

R. Lee: Are you going to come in for the year over the \$649,000, or \$650,000? I think that the total appropriated for this year for your department is \$649,900.

O. Smith: So the 97% is under one payroll left. Right now we're out of the heavy over-time.

R. Lee: (*Reading through papers*) With the size of the payroll, there's \$17,700. Is that the payroll?

O. Smith: And most of that is going to be payroll. We are over [overdrawn] on a few places... We're not over as much as we cut it, but we are a little bit over.

R. McLaughlin: I guess I was trying to follow up with that we might be better off to give off the \$60,000 in the over-time and part-time budget and not hire the two people and save it on the end in benefits, but we can't control that because we don't say who you can and can't hire. We'd still be just the same well off; we'd just be saving \$28,000 in benefits, and you'd still have your budget.

O. Smith: Do you mean, flat-fund it?

R. Lee: Can't we control what we give the Commissioners for benefits?

R. McLaughlin: Do what?

R. Lee: We can control what we give them for benefits.

R. McLaughlin: Yes, we can do that. [*To O. Smith*] You'd still have the money; you just wouldn't have two more employees – you'd have enough money to cover your part-time and over-time based on what you think the projection is going to be for next year.

O. Smith: Under the status quo, which is the schedule we're working under now, we projected that we're going to need \$119,000 to cover part-time and over-time. How would you break that? We broke it at \$82,400 for over-time and \$36,700 for part-time.

R. McLaughlin: That's without the two new employees?

O. Smith: That's one way to do it – continue the way we're going. It's never going to get smaller.

R. McLaughlin: No, but we'd be saving the benefits on the other end, and you'd still have your people that you needed. They wouldn't be full-time; you'd still have to depend on part-time and over-time, which goes back to the question – did you ask because you don't have enough part-time, you just don't have the right number of people or good personnel to put on for part-time people?

O. Smith: If you get a really good, reliable part-timer, you could promote them to full-time. We don't have that person anymore.

R. McLaughlin: I didn't follow what the chief said about the union - hiring somebody, paying them over-time instead of paying them at...

O. Smith: The union contract says that all vacation time and all comp time - full-timers have first refusal. For the schedule for next month, they take shifts that are vacation and comp time.

R. McLaughlin: Even if that puts them in over-time?

O. Smith: Even if it puts them in over-time.

R. McLaughlin: I see. Thanks.

B. Sneed: When I said that the County - probably 80% of it was people, Dave [*Parkman, Treasurer*] scrunched his eyes up and looked at me like I didn't know what I was talking about. Once again, he's right. It's just a ballpark figure – it's about half, about 50%; roughly \$3.3 million, as things stand to date.

O. Smith: We're still \$21,000 short, and it's going to have to come out of this over-time/part-time. And it just doesn't happen.

R. McLaughlin: Not if we add \$81,000 to your budget and you don't hire two new people.

R. Lee: I don't get what you're talking about here – adding \$81,000.

R. McLaughlin: Well, you've got to take \$60,000...

R. Lee: He's asking for \$671,000 – he's asking for \$21,000 more.

R. McLaughlin: Yeah, \$21,000 more but he's also got that figuring two new employees, which we'd have to be paying benefits to. I'm saying give him what he wants, but if you don't hire two new employees, you don't have the benefits.

O. Smith: With the status quo, the total amount will be approximately \$686,755. The budget that was created to continue going the way we're going, it would have been \$686,755.

R. McLaughlin: You're asking \$671,000, which is \$15,000 more.

O. Smith: As I say, the bulk of the \$21,000 has got to come out of personnel somewhere.

B. Sneed: We've got a lot of other department budgets to do.

R. McLaughlin: Yup. I know, and we can't control whether they hire people if we give them all the money, so...

B. Sneed: When we walked in here tonight, this budget as it stood, was \$137,000 over the L.D. 1 limit.

R. Lee: What I don't follow, though, is that we're saying to this department [*Communications*] that we're going to give them less than what's required to pay the cost of living increase.

B. Sneed: Make a motion.

R. Lee: Well, it seems to me, that what you could do is, if you look at those two people who left who were \$33,800, they've have been replaced, I suppose, by people at \$31,000. It's around something like \$6,000 in savings there. So, what you could do is, instead of giving them \$650,000, take \$6,000 off what he asked and give him \$665,000 or the \$671,000. I just think its – I don't see how we can fund below...I suppose we could do that, but let's be consistent. When we go through all the other budgets, let's make sure we cut all those.

T. Biggs: We're happy to do that.

R. Lee: O.K. but let's at least be consistent.

O. Smith: I don't think it needs to be said, but you have to realize that everybody else is busy. The Sheriff's Department is busy; Belfast P.D. is busy, Stockton has a department now that's busy and Lincolnville's busy, but it all starts with us. We have got to staff to take care of it! It's a very busy, busy center. We have not increased personnel since we started six years ago, and, as a consequence, we have to fill these seats 24/7. It's not getting easier and it's not much money to do that. The demands are becoming greater all the time. We don't have anywhere to put the calls. They have to come here; that's what we built the Center for, and that's what we committed to do seven years ago. We've got to be all staffed or we're going to be in trouble. We have to keep the Center running. Thank you for listening.

R. Lee: What is the procedure tonight? Are we taking these and making a decision on each one in order?

B. Sneed: Well, we are a little out of order already.

R. Lee: To me, whether we can afford to put this back up at something closer to \$671,000, a lot turns on what we do with the rest of the budget.

B. Sneed: Then, let us start with 1010 [EMA].

R. McLaughlin: We need to come out of public session.

B. Sneed: Let's close this public session – nobody else in the public wants to speak? Let's close this public session and get on with the budget. 1010, whatever that is.

A. Fowler: EMA [Emergency Management Agency.]

****J. Bennett moved to fund Department 1010 (EMA) budget for \$92,172.000; R. Desmarais seconded.**

(A woman from the audience asked for the Budget Committee to raise their voices a little higher so people could hear them. The motion and second were repeated.)

B. Sneed: All in favor? All opposed?
Motion passed unanimously.

B. Sneed: District Attorney – 1015. You sent a couple letters; I want to make sure we have this straight. The capital outlay is down to \$750, is that correct?

G. Rushlau: That's correct.

B. Sneed: And under contractual services, the Metro D.A. Central is reduced by \$1,400, so the bottom line there is \$44,868, as you stand tonight, right?

G. Rushlau: I believe that it is. Yesterday, I'm not sure how many of you would have gotten that - I E-mailed the budget, but I have copies for those of you who didn't get it. The reason I wanted to write again is was to point out that non-personnel expenses of my office are basically right on target in 2007. In other words, there is nothing excessive about the budget.

****B. Sneed moved to fund Department 1015 (District Attorney) budget for \$156,001; R. Desmarais seconded. None opposed; motion passed unanimously.**

B. Sneed: That's what you asked for, right?

G. Rushlau: Yes.

B. Sneed: That's what you got.

G. Rushlau: Thank you very much.

B. Sneed: You're welcome, thanks. Sorry for the trouble.

B. Sneed: 1020, the Commissioners budget. When we first addressed this budget, we basically knocked \$129,782 off the requested amount, and we neglected to specify which lines they were going to come from. They are going to come from line 7000, 7001 and 7002.

J. Hyk: Bill?

B. Sneed: Yes, sir.

J. Hyk: We do have a final figure on the liability insurance, and I believe it will reduce that amount by \$4,000. Is that right, Barbara? So, that is a little help right there.

B. Sneed: So, the liability over 4722 is now down to \$96,000?

B. Arseneau: Yes.

B. Sneed: Every little bit helps. James [Arseneau]?

J. Arseneau: There's just one thing I just wanted to address the Budget Committee on is that there was a request here for data cards for the deputies and the patrol vehicles. Based on some calculations, and if you want to see the spreadsheets, there could be some savings for the County from the standpoint that the officers in their patrol areas, making their response time much more efficient for the citizens in the County, making it less likely they would have to travel from Belfast back to their patrol areas when there are calls that come in, making response times better - plus, at the same time, servicing the citizens and potentially, also, providing some savings from the increasing cost of gasoline. Specifically, you can't say you're going to save "x" amount of dollars, but there is a substantial thing that should be considered regarding the data cards and I'm more than willing to share the information with you folks so you can see the breakdown, but I would like to request that you folks reconsider that. We've got the final numbers from Verizon and U.S. Cellular with the cards, and the outlay for one-time cost of the card, as well as the monthly fees would be about \$13,000 versus the \$19,000 that has requested in the budget. We ask that you reconsider increasing the budget by that amount.

B. Sneed: Thank you. Any questions, any thoughts, any motions?

J. Bennett: On the whole thing?

B. Sneed: Yeah!

J. Bennett: Yeah, I do. On the Human Resource and Payroll Director, I believe we send the checks out. They had a part-time Human Resource person that did the job in 14 hours, so I don't think we should be paying for a full-time Human Resource Director.

A. Fowler: If I could just throw something out there, Jim - I see where you're coming from, but, however, let me just remind you all again that we have new unions coming in which means that this person is going to be working right out tight. We did have a part-time woman when the person was out on maternity leave, but as I said, with the new perspective unions coming in, there is going to be a lot more with payroll and everything else. If you just take that into consideration.

J. Bennett: You don't send your payroll out? It says "Payroll - \$8,500."

A. Fowler: Right, but somebody still has to go through all of it.

B. Sneed: Barb, go ahead.

B. Arseneau: The payroll company doesn't put pay scales together, or deal with the personnel issues, or that sort of thing. There are a number of hours put in on those things. It's not all just payroll - that's probably a third of this individual's job. The remaining two thirds is dealing with a lot of other things; keeping up on FMLA laws, ADA laws - there's a lot of stuff that changes all the time.

R. Lee: Is this position new, or is it something we have now? It was new last year, right?

B. Arseneau: No, it has been since 2004.

J. Hyk: We've had this position since 2004.

J. Bennett: It was a part-time position, then it went to full-time, then they hired someone who did it part-time, now the woman's back - or whoever's back - doing the job at full-time.

R. Lee: Last year, it looks as if it was in the budget, anyway, as full time.

J. Hyk: It has been.

B. Arseneau: In the summer, when it was a part-time person, a lot of the extra fell on me and there are a lot of hours were put in that I'll never be paid for - a lot of extra work.

R. Lee: Thank you.

B. Sneed: Do you want to make a motion about this, Jim?

****J. Bennett: I move to fund it at a half – position, you know – cut it...**

B. Sneed: So you want to reduce that by...

J. Bennett: Cut it in half.

B. Sneed: Well, let me see what...we have to speak to the bottom line.

R. Lee: We're at \$525,000, now, right?

B. Sneed: Yeah, \$521,000, because of the \$4,000 from the other line.

A. Fowler: Right.

T. Biggs seconded it.

B. Sneed: Motion made and seconded to reduce...

T. Biggs: When we get to Benefits, we can drop another \$14,000.

B. Sneed: ...to reduce line 3000 by \$15,713.00. That's half of the current salary. So, I mean we have to specify a number, so that's the number. So it will be to reduce line 3000 by \$15,713. Motion made and seconded. All in favor? (J. Bennett, T. Biggs, R. Desmarais.) All opposed (R. Lee, H. Potter, R. McLaughlin, B. Sneed); motion failed.

B. Sneed: If there's any way we can take more money out of Dave [*Parkman*], back there... (*Joking.*)

****B. Sneed moved to fund Department 1025 (Treasurer) at \$54,700.00; R. Lee seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. Arseneau: What is the amount, again, Bill?

B. Sneed: I'm sorry, Barb - \$54,700.00. Are you keeping up [*plugging the numbers into the computer*] so I don't have to?

B. Arseneau: I'm trying; I figure if there's two of us, there'll be a checks and balances.

B. Sneed: O.K. I didn't even turn it [*his computer*] on. Facilities Management:

****T. Biggs moved to fund Department 1030 (Facilities Management) at \$299,500; B. Sneed seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. Sneed: Let's skip 1050 (Jail) for a moment. Oh, you're not getting out of here early [*to Sheriff Story*]! We've got to go to the bottom, Scott.

S. Story: I wasn't, but I have some stuff for you.

B. Sneed: Oh, O.K. You've got sheets?

S. Story: I can make some copies, if you like. It's pretty simple.

B. Sneed: You don't think we could keep up if you just read it?

S. Story: This is really...yeah.

B. Sneed: Can we skip over you for the moment?

S. Story: Sure.

B. Sneed: Let's go to 1065 - Deeds.

R. McLaughlin: We're still going to back...

B. Sneed: Pardon me?

R. McLaughlin: We're going to go back on the final and we're supposed to make comments on the final votes.

B. Sneed: O.K.

****B. Sneed moved to reduce line 3100 (of 1065) to zero; J. Bennett seconded; 6 in favor, 1 (R. McLaughlin opposed); motion passed.**

****B. Sneed moved to fund Department 1065 (Register of Deeds) at \$241,639.00; R. Desmarais seconded; 6 in favor, 1 (R. McLaughlin) opposed; motion passed.**

****H. Potter moved to fund Department 1070 (Probate) at \$182,000; B. Sneed seconded; motion passed unanimously.**

****R. Lee moved to fund Department 1076 (Communications Center) at \$665,000 rather than \$650,000, which would basically level-fund them with the 3% cost-of-living increase.**

Discussion: R. McLaughlin asked for the amount again and was told \$665,000.

R. Lee: \$665,000 rather than – he asked us for \$671,000 and we'd given him \$650,000 but...

B. Sneed: Motion made and seconded: All in favor? (B. Sneed, R. Lee, H. Potter); opposed (R. McLaughlin, J. Bennett, R. Desmarais, J. Biggs.) Motion failed.

****R. Desmarais moved to fund Department 1076 (Communications Center) at \$656,500 (1% increase); B. Sneed seconded; in favor (B. Sneed, R. Desmarais, T. Biggs, J. Bennett; opposed (R. Lee, H. Potter, R. McLaughlin). Motion passed.**

****B. Sneed moved to fund Department 1080 (Advertising & Promotion) at \$8,500; R. McLaughlin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

****J. Bennett moved to fund Department 1090 (Auditing) at \$6,000; B. Sneed seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

****R. McLaughlin moved to fund Department 1095 (Debt Service) at \$79,200.00; T. Biggs seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

****R. Lee moved to fund Department 2000 (Interest) at \$50,000. B. Sneed seconded.**
Discussion: D. Parkman said it just depends on what the County owed for interest this year. If the County has to borrow the money sooner, they may have to add a few extra thousand dollars in that account. He told the Budget Committee to do what they wanted to because it would have to be paid whether it went over or not. He said he'd feel more comfortable if they added two thousand dollars.

****R. Lee withdrew his motion.**

B. Sneed: So you recommend \$53,000, David [*Parkman*]?

D. Parkman: \$53,000 and we'll see what the heck happens on that one. I was wrong last year.

B. Sneed: We'll catch him at it twice in a row! (*All laughed.*)

****T. Biggs moved to fund Department 2000 (Interest) at \$53,000; B. Sneed seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

****R. McLaughlin moved to fund Department 2005 (Extension) at \$49,150; R. Lee seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

****T. Biggs moved to fund Department 2025 (Employee Benefits) at \$1,000,000; J. Bennett seconded.**

Discussion:

R. Desmarais: Let me make sure I'm sure on the insurance, here. Anthem came in came in with the same figure as last year? Then this new insurance company entered the picture. Where do we stand on that? They came in with a lower price?

J. Hyk: Here's where we stand on that. There's a letter, I believe, in front of you. I have a letter here from Bernstein/Shur, from Linda McGill Attorney. The situation is precisely this. This is going to take some time to work this out; it's not going to happen today, this week – it's not going to happen because the terms and conditions of the new outfit that we want to go with – of the direction we want to go – are different than what currently

exists. And, in terms of going into negotiation with the three units, the labor negotiations, the terms and benefits have to remain the same now. So Linda McGill is advising, and we can, for a period of time – we can go monthly with Anthem – rather Aetna, not Anthem. So this is where we are. We need to commit the same amount of money as we did last year because that is what [Aetna] wants to continue the coverage. We cannot go immediately into Meritain – we can't do that.

R. Desmarais: What is the timeframe for this?

J. Hyk: It's unknown. The negotiations are already behind schedule from the first snowstorm two weeks ago. Don [Berry] can speak to this better.

R. Desmarais: Don, do you have any timeframe on when you would be...

D. Berry: No, because that is totally dependant upon the process of negotiations in each one of the units. And those negotiations don't start until tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock with one of the units and so you have no idea how long that process is possibly going to go. I hope would hope it doesn't go very long, but that's going to be determined on the process of negotiations itself.

R. Lee: Could you give us two or three examples of where the conditions are not as favorable as Aetna's.

J. Hyk: It's not even necessarily that; it's a matter of are the same people...go ahead, Don.

D. Berry: Yeah, it simply comes down to the fact of the choice that could exist by the employees. We have no ability in our system to dictate who is going to be a carrier for your insurance, or the coverage you're going to get. That is all processed with negotiations, and so that's where all of that sits, and I'd love to give you better answers; I can't give you better answers.

R. Lee: It strikes me as a little odd, here, that we're right in the budget season wrapping up the budget and we've got these negotiations, so what's going to happen a year from now; are we going to have the same problem?

D. Berry: I can't answer that. The reason I can't that is because I don't know whether this is a one-year budget, a two, a three – or how many years that budget would be for in the contract.

J. Hyk: The agreement. The contract.

D. Berry: It's stated within the contract itself. I can't answer that. That will be determined through negotiations. So, yes, it's just as frustrating for us on our end as it is for you.

B. Sneed: Dick *[McLaughlin]*?

R. McLaughlin: Well, last year, we said that we weren't going to fund the insurance any more than the year before and for them to get together and come up with a plan that wasn't going to cost us anymore for insurance than it did a year ago. I think they did that. I'd like to save \$350,000 on this line but I don't think it's fair for what made for sort of a verbal contract. If they had come in with a \$1, 476,000.00 I would have been very happy to cut it \$120,000.00 to keep it back at the flat fund, but I think, based on the unknowns and the fact that they did do what we asked them to do, I think we should stick with the \$1,350,000.00.

R. Desmarais: I'm not comfortable going to \$1,000,000.00 and I don't think we should have to stay with \$1,350,000.00. We know the direction we wanted things to go in. They have held the line. There is a new company out there that's available to us that I would assume at a lower price; I could support taking \$100,000.00 off of that line even though they're going into negotiations. I think the time has come where these negotiations had better come out with something a little different than things that they have been, in fairness to the taxpayers of the County. I'm not going to support \$1,000,000.00; I'm not going to support \$1,350,000.00. I think we should step down a bit, but still give them some wiggle room.

R. Lee: Could we do this? Fund them at, say \$1,250,000.00 and then, if the negotiations go poorly and they decide they can't go with this other carrier...

R. Desmarais: The negotiations will go...

R. Lee: I hear – I hear your point, but my point is there is a process for them to come back to this committee to, down the road...

B. Sneed: Well, that turns out not really because they can only – the County – and John explained to us well in the past – they can only issue one tax bill a year. Now we can come back any number of times but they can only send out one tax bill for the coming year, unlike the Towns, where we can send out one a month

R. Desmarais: Let me make sure I'm clear on the insurance here – Anthem *[Aetna]* came in with the same figure as last year; then this new insurance company entered the picture. Where do we stand on that? They came in with a lower price.

J. Hyk: I have a letter from Linda McGill, our attorney at Bernstein Shur. It is going to take some time to work this out – not going to be today, this week, not going to happen. The terms and conditions of the new outfit we want to go with in the direction we want to go are different than what currently exists. In terms of going into labor negotiations with the three units, the terms and benefits have to remain the same. Linda McGill is advising and we can, for a period of time, can go on a monthly basis with AETNA. We need to commit the same amount of money as we did last year, because that's what Anthem

wants to continue the coverage. We cannot go immediately into Meritain – we can't do that.

R. Desmarais: What is the time frame for this?

J. Hyk: It's unknown. Negotiations are already behind schedule from the first snowstorm, two weeks ago. Don can talk to this.

R. Desmarais: Don, do you have any timeframe?

D. Berry: No, because that is wholly dependent on the process of negotiations in each one of the units. Those negotiations don't start until tomorrow morning at 9:00 with one of the units. So, you have no idea how long that process is possibly going to go. I hope it doesn't go very long, but that's going to be turned on the process of negotiations, itself.

R. Lee: Can you give us two or three examples of where the conditions are not as favorable as Aetna's?

D. Berry: It simply comes down to the choice that could exist by the employees. We have no ability in our system to dictate who is going to be the carrier for your insurance or the coverage you are going to get. That is all processed through negotiations. I would love to give you better answers, but I can't give you better answers.

R. Lee: It strikes me as a little odd here that we are wrapping up the budget, and yet we have these negotiations. What is going to happen a year from now? Are we going to have the same problem?

D. Berry: I can't answer that because I don't know whether this is a one-year budget, a two-year, a three, or how many years that budget would be within the contract. Again, that will be determined through negotiations. Yes, it is just as frustrating for us on our end as it is for you.

R. McLaughlin: Last year, we said that we were not going to fund the insurance any more than the year before and get together and come up with a plan that wasn't going to cost us any more for insurance than it did a year ago. Based on the unknowns and the fact that they did do what we asked them to do, I think we should stick with \$1,350,000.

R. Desmarais: I am not comfortable going for one million, and I don't think we should have to stay with a \$1,350,000. We know the direction we wanted things in; they have held the line; there is a new company out there that is available to us at what I assume is a lower price. I could support taking \$100,000 off that line, even though we're going into negotiations. I think the time has come when these negotiations have to come out with something a little different than they have been, in fairness to the taxpayers of the County. I'm not going to support \$1,000,000; I'm not going to support \$1,350,000. I think we should step down a bit, but still give them some wiggle room.

R. Lee: Could we fund them at \$1,250,000 and then if the negotiations go poorly and we decide we can't go with this other carrier. My point is that there is a process for them to come down.

B. Sneed: That turns out to not really be the case because the County can only issue one tax bill a year. We can come back any number of times, but they can only send out one tax bill for the coming year unlike the towns where we can send out one a month, if we want to.

R. Desmarais: I think the taxpayers of the County...I can't commit the taxpayers of the County to this \$1,350,000 in light of what we have discussed in more than one budget, to start getting some responsibility into these benefits. Taxpayers, I think, are willing to provide a certain amount of insurance; I think the employees have to step up to the plate and recognize there's not many people getting 100% anymore and we've got to work in harmony together on this. That's why I'm saying I'm willing to go \$100,000, maybe even a \$150,000 off of that, but I'm not willing to go down to \$1,000,000.

R. Lee: Could I get something clarified? You do have in hand a bid from the new insurance carrier that is \$100,000 lower. Is that correct? If they agree to it, you could save \$100,000.

R. Desmarais: And that's without the employees paying. That is the figure for the County to pay \$100,000 less. That's why \$100,000 to \$150,000 less I could support; I still can't support this motion.

J. Hyk: I don't think you're quite getting the point. *[To D. Berry]* Do you want to try and make it clear?

D. Berry: The point is that, as I see it, when you look at the entire process of negotiations and how has to occur, you walk a fine line, here, at a point where it could be brought forward by these groups in negotiations that we actually are compelling them to join another group. We can't do that. They actually still would have the right, if they choose, to stay with the Aetna plan, and if we try to compel them to do otherwise, then *[to R. Lee]* - you don't like the word compel, but you also don't like the word negotiate, sir - but we have to do that; we have no choice.

R. Lee: Right, I think this point is you might be a stronger negotiator if the Budget Committee cut your budget.

J. Hyk: Don...Don.

D. Berry: I will be as strong a negotiator as I possibly can be, but we still do not want the case in front of us where you are in violation of labor law because you do something incorrectly.

R. Desmarais: Don, I don't think you get the other side of that point – they can go with Aetna; they go with any company they want, but they're not necessarily going with us, the taxpayer, picking up the total tab. That's what I'm saying. They can go anywhere – and there will be a cost put to that, but you'll have "X" amount of dollars to spend and that's a fact of life, and that's what I'm saying on this.

D. Berry: I understand.

R. Desmarais: O.K.

J. Hyk: I want to finish this up by saying this: We've got a letter from our lawyer, here. I'm not going to make it public. It says "Confidential" at the top and I'm going to keep it confidential. Her advice is, appropriate the same amount, stay with Aetna until you work this thing out, or you could wind up in a jam. To me, that is the prudent thing to do, and it is consistent with what you committed to do last year at this table - you said you would come up with the same amount of money. We went out and made it happen. That is the prudent thing to do. Thank you.

R. Lee: I will just add that it is pretty unusual, the last few years to see a health insurance premium stay flat for an organization. The direction has tended to be up.

T. Biggs: You've only been on this committee one year; they've been going up 15%, 17% for years now. Now, in the town of Freedom, we can't afford our three-time and part-time employees' insurance and I don't feel like covering county employees - 60 of them, including you guys [*the Commissioners*] your \$15,000 - \$14,000 a year benefit package. You don't understand what it's like at the ground level; you're up here in the clouds in Waldo County. My people can't even pay their taxes; we have no businesses to help us in our town. So, maybe you cut back on the benefit levels. I don't know. I can't support it.

J. Hyk: You said you would last year.

B. Sneed: I think...I'll put words in Tim's mouth – I don't believe he supported it last year.

J. Bennett: He didn't...

J. Hyk: That's probably true! (Laughing) I'm sorry. I was asking the wrong person!

B. Sneed: Yeah, you probably were, there. **Anyway – motion made and seconded. All in favor?**

R. Lee: What was the number again?

T. Biggs: \$1,000,000.00

B. Sneed: Fund department 2025 at the rate of \$1,000,000 even. Motion made and seconded. **All in favor? (J. Bennett, T. Biggs and R. Desmarais) All opposed? (R. Lee, H. Potter, R. McLaughlin and B. Sneed. Motion failed.**

B. Sneed: Sorry, guys.

****R. Desmarais moved to fund Department 2025 (Benefits) at \$1,250,000; T. Biggs seconded; in favor? (J. Bennett, T. Biggs, R. Desmarais) All opposed? (B. Sneed, R. Lee, D. Potter, R. McLaughlin) Motion failed.**

****H. Potter moved to fund Department 2025 (Benefits) at \$1,350,000; B. Sneed seconded. All in favor? (B. Sneed, R. Lee, H. Potter, R. McLaughlin) All opposed? (J. Bennett, T. Biggs, R. Desmarais) Motion passed.**

B. Sneed: Good thing Mr. Nelson wasn't here or we'd be in a hell of a bind, with eight people!

B. Sneed: It's got to come out of some place! It's coming out of some place!

R. McLaughlin: Soil and Water (*joking.*)

B. Sneed: Yes! We'll take it out of Soil and Water!

****J. Bennett moved to fund Department 2035 (Waldo County Soil and Water Conservation District) at \$19,675; H. Potter seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

****J. Bennett moved to fund Department 2040 (Records Preservation) at \$6,072.00; H. Potter seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. Sneed: 2045 – Reserves.

****R. McLaughlin moved to fund Department 2045 at zero. J. Bennett seconded.**

Discussion:

B. Sneed: I don't think we can do it at zero, Dick.

R. Lee: Why?

B. Sneed: Because at least \$15,000 has to be in there for severance, at an absolute, bare minimum. And, I think...

J. Hyk: Well, don't you have a technology line there, too?

R. McLaughlin: \$41,000.

B. Sneed: \$41,000.

J. Hyk: I don't see how you can skip that, but do what you got to do. But, I'm saying that's going to be difficult to make up.

B. Sneed: The Employment Security has to be there, too, right?

J. Hyk: Yes.

B. Sneed: I mean, we just can't make that zero, as attractive as that may be.

****R. McLaughlin rescinded his motion.**

(There was quiet discussion among the Budget Committee members that was not audible.)

B. Sneed: The only other one that's the only new one in there is \$40,000 and that's Dale's [EMA Director] grant matching.

J. Hyk: That's the tower.

(Someone asked if that was just the tower.)

A. Fowler: Well, \$10,000 was the tower, wasn't it?

B. Sneed: Yeah, there was \$10,000 in there for Communications Improvement...

A. Fowler: Right, and then I think the other was just to cover ourselves if we get the grant from Eastern Maine...

R. Lee: The handicap ramp.

A. Fowler: Right. We needed "x" number of dollars to match that, also.

J. Hyk: I don't believe there was any extra money in there. I think that's the money that you need if you get the grants that we've got out there.

B. Sneed: Yeah. No, I didn't mean "extra" – it was the new thing in there, not the extra thing. I miss-spoke.

R. McLaughlin: I think we should have two departments of reserves; ones that have to be there and ones that are...

B. Sneed: There's already three types of reserves now, aren't there, David [Parkman]?

J. Hyk: There's Restricted, there's Capital and...

D. Parkman: There's Capital, Active and Restricted.

B. Sneed: The Restricted's mostly Scott's *[Sheriff Story]* stuff, right?

J. Hyk: Yes.

B. Sneed: Stuff for law enforcement.

****D. Potter moved to fund Department 2045 (Reserves) at \$123,000; B. Sneed seconded. All in favor? T. Biggs opposed. Motion passed.**

B. Sneed: Is there anybody we forgot?

R. McLaughlin: Grant Writing.

B. Sneed: Oh, sorry!

R. Lee: And Grant Matching, whatever that is.

B. Sneed: Department 2050 - \$8,000.

R. McLaughlin: Can you tell me again, where that's going?

B. Sneed: To Utah.

R. McLaughlin: What is their recovery? How much do they get back for us?

B. Arseneau: Every grant they applied for, they got in full. Give me a second and I'll find that figure for you.

J. Hyk: *[To B. Sneed]* Are you going to take a break?

B. Sneed: Oh, shoot! It's twenty after eight!

J. Hyk: If you took a break, she could find it for you.

B. Arseneau: Yeah, I need to go get it downstairs.

B. Sneed: Can we take a ten minute break? Does everyone want to stick around ten more minutes? O.K.

[BREAK]

B. Sneed: Where did we leave off? Grants – 2050.

B. Sneed: Dick *[McLaughlin]* asked what was the return on the investment.

B. Arseneau: Out of the grant applications just for records preservation, alone...let me just give the totals here: Requested was \$180,851.50 and that was what was brought back - \$180,851.50.

A. Fowler: She got everything she applied for.

B. Arseneau: That wasn't just Records Preservation, by the way. I meant to clarify.

B. Sneed: That answer your question, Dick?

R. McLaughlin: Yup. Keep on with a good investment.

B. Sneed: Probably best one we're going to make tonight.

****R. McLaughlin moved to fund Department 2050 (Grant Writing) at \$8,000.00; J. Bennett seconded; motion passed unanimously.**

B. Sneed: What do you want to do first, Scott, the Jail or the Sheriff [*budgets*]?

Sheriff Scott Story: Let's do the Sheriff real quick.

B. Sneed: O.K. That's 1075. Oh, wait a sec – 2055 – is the one that started out as a grant thing for Dale and we put it in the reserve, so that money should be yanked. Some of us still have that page. Sorry.

S. Story: No problem. I've got nothing new on 1075. I'm sure the first thing you folks notice is I'm only at the 90/95% mark of the year. I'm going to ask you like I did last year - don't punish me for being thrifty. About a month and a half ago, I froze spending up there because I knew what the boarding was doing to the county. Believe me when I tell you we've been putting gas in the cars and doing patrol, but we have them parked, and there's no new uniforms – a lot of stuff we “woulda-coulda-shoulda” got, but didn't because we knew what a predicament we were in, so please don't punish me for being thrifty on that one.

B. Sneed: Anybody have questions?

B. Sneed: Dick? [*Desmarais*]

D. Desmarais: No, I'm trying to find my sheet.

R. Desmarais: What did you have to read to us, Scott? Does that reflect on the Sheriff's Department?

S. Story: No, it's just the Boarding. What I've got for that is my moving target as of today.

B. Sneed: Somebody asked me yesterday or today a practical question: When do you replace the cruisers? Is it a mileage thing that you do, or is it a yearly thing?

S. Story: Usually when the ball joints fall off transporting to the office (*joking*) but, no; the newest one we're replacing is 101,000? [*To Chief Deputy Robert Keating*]

R. Keating: We usually we keep them on the road three years at full-time service patrol; then retire them back and try to get the fourth year as a spare car, if we can. We have sometimes moved them to a detective. This year we took the best of our seconds and gave them to Correction because they had a car that was killing them, and we had one, though that had pretty high mileage, about 130,000, but we gave it to Corrections because it was a little better than what they had, and they were getting rid of one of the Corrections vehicles.

B. Sneed: Somewhere around 120,000 or 130,000 is when you start turning them over?

R. Keating: Yeah, the ones, well – just a moment and I can tell you the three that are scheduled to come off.

R. Desmarais: What have you got out there to bid, Bob? You're seeking bids on a couple of them, right?

R. Keating: We've two sitting there right now that are out to bid. In fact, the bids are set this Saturday. There's two that are going – those are both – one is in sad, sad shape; it's got about 140,000 and will not run. We retired it early because it had been a mechanical nightmare from the time the car got up around 100,000, so we pulled it off as a spare. It was still costing us so we made the decision to dump it in the auction and we'll be lucky to get \$500.00 out of it. Somebody may want for the transmission, rear-end; I don't know. It's in bad shape. The other one isn't too bad a car. It probably has about 150,000 on it. The ones that are slated to come off the road right now will be a detective's car, which is driven by Matt Curtis. Keep in mind right now today, that car had 115,000 miles on it. If we are awarded our three cruisers in the budget and go out to bid in January, we probably won't take delivery until somewhere in July, so whatever I tell you for mileage, that car is going to run another seven months; and the other two slated to come off are the one Dan Thompson drives and the one Glen Graef drives. Glen Graef's car right now has 110,000 on it. That's a full-time on the road patrol for another seven months. To give you an idea, the three spares have – one of them has 140,000, one has 124,000 and the other has 126,000 miles on it as of today. We run them up to around 110,000/120,000 on the road, and then they go to a spare and we try to get another year out of them as a spare car. When we get three new ones, we sell three and we rotate back. This year, like I said, one of them we took off the road and was going to use as a spare was a little better than what Corrections had for theirs – so we gave that one to them and they got rid of theirs.

R. Lee: Thank you.

(There was some quiet talking among a few of the Budget Committee members that was inaudible.)

R. Keating: The other thing, if I could before we move off of the cruisers, I think the other thing to keep in mind; I'm telling you what the odometer says. That doesn't tell you how much time that thing has sat running at accident scenes with the lights running, or crime scenes, or whatever. That's just what the odometer says. Those are working automobiles and they may have hours upon hours upon hours of idling time just running, as well.

R. Desmarais: I happen to move a vehicle for a company – the Chevy, not the pick-up truck – and in their system; they have motor hours, which I thought was rather interesting.

R. Keating: A lot of your fire departments do that on their fire trucks; they have an hour meter because, as you know, fire trucks don't get a lot of miles on them, but, boy, they get a lot of use out of them. You see, ours are sitting running radar; sitting at accidents, etc.

R. Desmarais: It just amazed me that a civilian car like that, off the shelf, would have the motor hours built right into it. *[To B. Arseneau]* Barbara, I don't know whether you got my question, if we maintain these two bottom lines, how far are we away from L.D. 1.

B. Arseneau: If you keep the budget the way it is?

R. Desmarais: Right now, finish it out as is.

B. Arseneau: You should have that right in front of you – those sheets?

B. Sneed: Well, we've changed things a bit.

(B. Arseneau continued plugging numbers into the computer.)

B. Sneed: *[To B. Arseneau]* Sure, go ahead and work on that.

J. Hyk: While she's doing that, the question is, maybe somebody can answer right off the bat – the money that we are lacking for this year's board, is any of that in this budget?

B. Sneed: Yeah! You guys asked for it!

R. Desmarais: \$200,000.

B. Sneed: Yeah!

S. Story: Remember, you guys whacked that out of mine and whacked another 93,000 out of boarding on top of that. The commissioners had asked for 1.1, then you took it down to 93,000; then you took another 93,000 off that and rounded it down to...

J. Hyk: I'm confused about that. That's why I asked.

B. Sneed: Oh, O.K.

S. Story: And I think the comments at the time were we would revisit it at this point in, I don't know if you said a reserve, or something else.

J. Hyk: You're comparing apples and apples here. I have a bad feeling about that.

A. Fowler: Yes, because you felt it made Scott's budget reflect poorly where the board was so excessive and high, and a lot of it was a rollover from this year. You talked about doing a reserve with it, and that's where it was kind of left until...

J. Hyk: So it's your idea that it's in there.

R. Desmarais: Well, in theory.

B. Sneed: Can you do this, Barb?

B. Arseneau: Yes.

B. Sneed: Or do you want me to help, too?

(B. Arseneau continued to work on figures in computer. There was quiet discussion among the Budget Committee members.)

B. Sneed: Do we want to take a vote on the Sheriff's Department?

****R. McLaughlin moved to fund Department 1075 (Sheriff) at \$1,036,281.10, as it is on the table; B. Sneed seconded, if what's in there is the amount.**

Discussion:

J. Bennett: I get \$38,948.00 more than last year.

A. Fowler: How much, Jim?

J. Bennett: I think it's \$38,940 over last year.

B. Sneed: That's about right. \$36,000 plus \$3,000 – that's about right.

R. McLaughlin: Which is the wages?

J. Bennett: I think the wages was \$20,000, wasn't it? It's right here - \$20,000.

R. McLaughlin: I thought the total budget was whatever you said and...

S. Story: Your only increases in this budget was the 3% wages and the vehicle gas; gas money for the cars.

R. Desmarais: Well, you've got a couple of Capital Outlays - Vests and Tazers.

S. Story: Oh, yes - I'm sorry. The vests we always have. The Tazers were an additional in the outlay.

R. McLaughlin: Yeah, we took it out of the over-time, remember?

R. Keating: They took from the Tazers out of the over-time.

B. Sneed: If you go back and just look at line 3000, it is all the personnel, if we leave off the over-time, leave off the full-time, leave out the clothing and education, there, Scott's personnel line was up 2.85% over the previous year. It's just pure salaries - that's it. And the department as a whole, with this number is up 3.9%.

All in favor of \$1,036,0281.10. Motion passed with two opposed (J. Bennett and T. Biggs) and one abstention (R. Desmarais.)

B. Sneed: 1050 - Jail

S. Story: In 1050, the only thing I wanted to bring you was exactly where we are year-to-date on our boarding: Our year-to-date 2007 projections are putting us at about 23.3 inmates boarding daily. Between contractual - I'll say contractual, they're mostly verbal agreements because we can't get it in writing - with York, Lincoln, Sagadahoc - those jails - if we keep large numbers of people there, we have most of the year, we get it at \$85 per day for boarding cost per inmate; if we don't, that runs to \$95 a day. Some places we pay a little more, some places we pay a little less. The Captain has even done a little wheeling and dealing with one County that needed trustees, so we presently have four that are sitting Aroostook County when they needed trustees to work in their kitchen, so we presently have four inmates who are sitting in Aroostook for free because they needed some trustees to work in the kitchen up there. So I guess my point of all this is we are doing the best we can to manage it. Now, we had DOC (Department of Corrections came to visit us last week.) We would have liked to have gotten there a little earlier, but they're a little preoccupied with their state takeover program that we're working on right now. Having said all that, we brought Ralph Nichols down from the DOC, walking through with his tape measure. We talked to him about doing some capital improvements in the place to see if we could get more beds than the 27 we are going to lose at the end of January 31st. If we agree to make some capital improvements in the place -double bunking in some cells, a little bit of audio visual stuff - and we have to also comply with not holding any maximum security inmates or high medium inmates, he will write us a permanent population for 32, as well as a 72-hour hold in the facility.

So, we can go back to permanently keeping 32 inmates. Now, that comes with a cost. We've done a lot of work this last week; we've runs some numbers. These capital improvements include some of these steel beds, sinks, toilet fixtures, things that we need so that we have the right equipment for the amount of inmates that we have there. It's going to cost somewhere around \$25,000. I don't have that in stone, but I think it's a fair figure so far. Having said all that, the 2007 year-to-date projections, if they were to happen again next year based at \$90 a bed-day, would cost us \$765,000 – \$405 on top of that. Add in \$25,000 for capital improvements, the total is \$790,405, which is \$10,000 less than what you've already appropriated that line item. Now, having said all that, I'm not going to sit here and recommend you take \$10,000 off because that number is this year's number. There's no anticipation for any increase in inmates for next year. So, I guess what I'm here to tell you is I am going to try to live within the \$800,000 that you've appropriated on that. If we don't do this capital improvement and we have to go down to 27 inmates in that facility and board out the other five, those numbers, again, with no anticipation of increase in inmates next year; just simply based on this year's numbers, would be \$765,405 again, plus \$150,000 for those additional five inmates for 11 months – because our variance runs out January 31st of next year – totaling \$915,705. What I'm asking you to do tonight is to take \$25,000 out of my boarding line, shift it over into capital outlay – I know it's nothing more than a shell game with the money – but I need to move it over to capital outlay so I can utilize that money to do some improvements in the facility improvements to keep us at 32 inmates.

B. Sneed: You can do that without even asking us.

S. Story: I don't think I can. I can't money move from some place to capital outlay. I think that is one of those sacred places.

J. Hyk: That's how we play it. It won't go from board to capital improvements. You have to put it there.

S. Story: You can cut my board \$25,000 and then put the \$25,000 into capital outlay.

B. Sneed: We could go in the other direction; we could take it capital outlay and put it in board. Capital outlay is a box all by itself within the budget.

J. Hyk: Yeah, right there. In his budget.

J. Hyk: It has to go from the board in his budget to the capital outlay of his budget.

B. Sneed: O.K.

R. Lee: I see that through the 13th when this report was prepared, your board number is \$593,820.

S. Story: Yes.

R. Lee: I'm just trying to put those two together, because you say it is costing \$725,000 for the year.

S. Story: That's correct.

R. Lee: But you're only at \$593,000 right now.

S. Story: I've probably got about \$80,000 worth of bills out that we haven't even seen yet.

A. Fowler: We just started to get some for October.

J. Hyk: We don't have the bills for November; they haven't come.

R. Lee: Yeah, but the ones that don't come by the end of the year, you wouldn't be paying them this year.

J. Hyk: Well, usually we don't get December's bill. Now it looks like we won't get November and December.

R. Lee: What was the 23.3 last year?

S. Story: I'm lost where you're getting that...

R. Lee: You said your average boarding was going to finish the year at 23.3.

S. Story: Oh! I'm sorry. 23.3 is the number of boarders we boarded this year.

R. Lee: What was that average number last year?

S. Story: I think I have that; hold on. In 2006, that number was 14.6.

J. Hyk: The good news is here is, for \$25,000 you can avoid boarding five inmates; that's pretty good news.

B. Sneed: That's basically a no brainer, there.

R. Keating: This will be permanent number that will be in the house.

S. Story: This isn't anything that we'll have to keep reapplying for every year.

****R. McLaughlin moved to appropriate \$775,000 on line 4030 (Department 1050) at \$775,000.00 and \$25,000 on line 7000 – Capital Outlay. (A. Fowler asked him to repeat that.)**

B. Sneed seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Sneed: Now, I hate to go looking for trouble here, Scott, but your average daily population has basically been going up since 1985. Using your numbers, I project last year you had 61 as an average daily population. If the trend continues, I calculate it at 66.7; .7 being from Prospect, probably (*joking.*) Do you really think you're going to hold steady? You haven't held steady in a lot of years – 2000/2001 was the last year you held steady.

S. Story: To be honest with you, I really don't know what is going to happen. You guys cut the \$93,000 out of it the last time; I didn't offer it up was the mistake I made last year. You've given me this; I'm going to try and work within those parameters. I will tell you this much – our D.A. and I have had many conversations; we're working to try to move things through the court as quickly as possible – at the end of the day, folks, and I've made this speech before and most all of you that have been up and see me and have gone through this will understand this, for the people who are left holding the bag the most, we have the least influence on how many people we have in that jail. And yet, we seem to have the most impact on trying to get them out on the other end. The new Jail Administrator has been very aggressive working with the D.A. on programs to get more people out (*Tape ran out briefly*)...because, as I've explained many times, pre-trial people stay in my Jail a lot longer than post-conviction people. So the quicker we get them through the system, the better off we are. Maybe the D.A. could speak to how much court time we have coming next year. Is there any increase over last year? Every extra day at court drives my numbers down.

G. Rushlau: I wrote to you back in November when I described all the things that were affecting my budget and one of the things that had changed. In 2006, we had four sessions of court that caught up, so we got cut back in 2007 and then we got even more cut back in 2007, so we have tended to have more people in pre-trial detention this year probably than in any previous year. We just haven't had court time. The court system in the whole state is underfunded with too few people, but because we are getting behind, in 2008 we're back up to five sessions in Superior Court starting in January. And so we anticipate that some of these people who are in long-term detention will be starting to move out of the jail and into the Department of Corrections, or at least out of pre-trial sentence status when the sheriff has a lot more mobility to get them into programs and move them out of custody. We hope to see some improvements in that in 2008, but we sure don't want to have you put a number on it and predict that the numbers could go down dramatically. We can't promise that, we just see that there's certainly improvements in the court system.

B. Sneed: If the past is any indication of the future, not only is it not going to go down, it's going to continue to go up. Just based on the numbers that Scott [Story] gave us a couple of months ago, this thing has been going up since 1985. I just did just plain old numbskull statistics 101 on this and then I figure next year you'll have 67 people.

S. Story: You made a good observation at the last meeting; when I floated it in Augusta it didn't get much support, but I asked if the counties were to kick in about \$100,000 if

we could get a full-time judge here, I didn't get much response out of that one, but it could be a great investment if we had a full-time judge.

B. Sneed: Buy our own judge.

S. Story: Yeah, well they didn't like it when I put it that way, though!

G. Rushlau: We do have a judge, however, who is moving to the Camden area who is going to be, basically, our resident Superior Court Judge for here and Rockland. That is a big improvement over what we've had in recent years and nobody really is committed to *[inaudible]*.

B. Sneed: John *[Hyk]*?

J. Hyk: Barbara has a number for you.

B. Arseneau: The Deputy Treasurer generally does this, but if you're trying to get down to the cap, what you've got there on your sheet tells you that you are \$147,817.34 over. If you want to get down to the cap, you've got to subtract that.

B. Sneed: Yup, that's about what I figured.

A. Fowler: So we need to subtract what you've taken away tonight...

R. Lee: But this is \$200,000 we're talking about...

B. Sneed: Go ahead, John.

J. Hyk: I would like to ask that question again of the sheriff, since he spends the money. He has the prisoners – he may know the answer. Where's the money? Is the money that we need for the rest of this year – is it in this budget?

S. Story: No, it's not. It was cut out in the first round with the Budget Committee. You had asked for \$1.1 million in boarding. They cut that back to \$800,000. I had asked for \$893,000; you guys added onto the 1.1 so we could make up what we've overspent this year; they've cut it back to \$800,000.

J. Hyk: I don't want to start the year out all screwed up. I want to know where I am, and I think the money is not in there to pay this year's bills, unless somebody can say it is. He *[S. Story]* says it isn't; I don't know.

B. Sneed: Sounds like it's not.

J. Hyk: So, then it's worse than that.

B. Sneed: Dramatically worse.

J. Hyk: Yes. I'm sorry for asking the question but I didn't want to ask it after the first of January.

B. Sneed: There ain't a rug big enough to sweep it under; I mean...So, \$147,000 plus \$300,000.

J. Hyk: Well, where we really...we don't really, and that's part of the thing here, is we don't really know where we are because we don't have November – we have October's bill which was \$60,000.

A. Fowler: Right, but that's only have one of October's bills.

B. Sneed: Dave? *[Parkman]*

D. Parkman: We only have – we have record and we're saving – the Boarding Costs if over \$44,000 as we sit here. Most the bills all the way through September. The bills have been paid. We are holding two bills in October totaling \$60,000. We haven't received a bill for November and we don't have one - it seems to be later and later every year that we're getting these bills.

J. Hyk: So, we're \$100,000 over; is that right?

D. Parkman: Your \$44,000 over the bills that have been paid in that line, that item, right today. \$44,000 and we have another \$60,000 - two bills for October - that we're holding that have not been paid.

J. Hyk: So, there's \$100,000, and you've got whatever the bills are in November and December.

R. Lee: Now hold on: You don't normally pay out the bills right to the last...you don't December's bills by December 31, you normally pay them in January.

D. Parkman: We keep 2007 open for two or three weeks into January to take those wandering bills that come in late.

R. Lee: But it couldn't be because you're telling me you send October's bills now; December's bills are not going to show up until February.

D. Parkman: This is the first year that it's happened. One county that has been slow right along has been York County. They have been about a month late getting the bills in. That's why this year we started out with \$550,000, but we had one bill for 2006 that was paid in 2007 which was a York County bill for December. This the first year where we haven't gotten those bills – they haven't come in. I'm sorry to tell you. It's November we haven't seen, and December.

J. Hyk: I think it would be fair to say - since I'm the guy who has to sign this warrant to pay the bills - that we have already paid \$44,000 we didn't have; we already have a bill for \$60,000 from October; that's \$100,000. I think we ought to figure that November will be the average daily, times whatever the rate is and come up with a number for that...

R. Lee: They know what November is going to be. They know how many inmates they had out. They can compute it.

J. Hyk: We can do that. And, then if you want to say we're going to tack December onto next year, I don't really have a problem with that. I think we have to have some money here, guys. We've gotta have some money!

(There was some quiet discussion at the table that was inaudible.)

S. Story: *[To B. Arseneau]* Barbara, is there anyway to know what the next payroll – total payroll amount – we only have one more payroll, correct?

B. Arseneau: Yes.

S. Story: Do we know what a total payroll is out of 1050 for one payroll, 1050? Is there any way to know that?

B. Arseneau: Tell me that just one more time.

S. Story: I just need to know what one week's payroll is out of 1050. Two weeks; I'm sorry at the 2007 rate. *(B. Arseneau went downstairs to try and obtain those figures.)*

(There was quiet discussion among the Budget Committee about boarding increases in recent year.)

B. Sneed: This is the board line of \$775,000; if we took the \$25,000 and put it into your capital budget. Now, we've still have to come up with, what, another \$137,000 over and above that.

R. Lee: I thought what we talked about last time made sense; not putting it in the board line

B. Sneed: John *[Hyk]* and his predecessor, here, Jethro Pease *[who was in the audience]*; they worked for years to get the budget in the budget because...

J. Hyk: It's bad policy to put money in a capital reserve account and then turn right around and take it out in operating.

A. Fowler: And then operate on it, right.

J. Hyk: It's not the way to do it.

B. Sneed: It's a philosophical decision that they have made over the years.

J. Hyk: And even if you put it in there, you've still got to find it somewhere.

A. Fowler: Bill, what was the figure you said on board because I had \$750,075? I'm wrong.

B. Sneed: \$775,000. \$800,000 minus \$25,000. And then we know we need to find another \$137,000 to make the board go away, basically, for this year, so \$775,000 plus \$137,000 is \$912,000.

****B. Sneed moved to increase line 4030 (Boarding) of Jail budget to \$912,000; R. Lee seconded. All in favor (R. Lee, H. Potter, B. Sneed, R. Desmarais, R. McLaughlin; opposed (T. Biggs); abstained (J. Bennett); motion passed.**

B. Sneed: Basically, we've added \$112,000 to the bottom line; so we go back over to page one and it's \$2,309,700.38, plus \$112,000, Amy [Fowler]?

A. Fowler: Yes. It's \$2,421,700. Is that what you've got?

D. Desmarais: And .38 cents.

A. Fowler: Correct.

T. Biggs: Wow. That's a 20% increase, at least.

B. Sneed: Well, interestingly enough, it's within \$5,000.00 of what Scott [Story] originally asked. So, he's a good guesser.

S. Story: I take no pride in being a good guesser.

B. Sneed: Hey, it is what it is.

S. Story: You know, I've got to tell you guys, though, you're sitting – I just want to give you one last one minute editorial, here. This has not been fun. The other department heads and my patrol division; we're all kind of taking it on the chin because of this damn Jail situation and I don't sit here and blame anybody. I think it just is what it is and we've got to deal with it the best that we can, but rest assured, the D.A.'s Office, myself, my Jail Administrator – we're all doing our damndest to try to keep a lid on it and all I can say is I hope that next year I can come back in and say, "Here's a couple of hundred thousand we didn't use – here you go. That's my hope. Thank you.

J. Hyk: Bill?

B. Sneed: Yes, John?

J. Hyk: A question.

B. Sneed: Yes, sir.

J. Hyk: Did you give me the two-minute ditty on what happens if you exceed L.D. 1? Do your teeth fall out or what happens? If you exceed L.D. 1, what happens?

B. Sneed: Well, that's a good question. In towns, what happens is then the town meeting has to vote.

A. Fowler: Right. To exceed it...

B. Sneed: Or increase it, or not allow it – I which case the whole problem goes back into the laps of the Selectmen and they have to make do with the L.D. 1 cap. It doesn't appear to be a similar mechanism for the counties.

J. Hyk: Well, in your mind, how does it work?

B. Sneed: Well, I mean – we're over. Clearly, we're over.

A. Fowler: Right. How much? Do we know how much we're over?

J. Hyk: \$300,000.

B. Sneed: \$284,000. So, it's easy enough to figure – well, it's not easy enough to figure out.

J. Hyk: Here's one possible bad way of dealing with it: You cut the \$280,000, and you pay as much board as you can, and then you have the same problem again next year; only bigger and sooner.

B. Sneed: Oh, yeah!

J. Hyk: Unless you get lucky and you don't have as many prisoners, but that's not a good way to do business.

B. Sneed: Probably not even realistic.

J. Hyk: So if you exceed, L.D. 1, what happens?

B. Sneed: You can go over it two ways: You either increase or you exceed. When we get to our joint meeting here, in a couple of seconds, the eleven of us are going to have vote to either increase or exceed. If we increase, next year's base becomes this year's budget.

A. Fowler: No, say that again.

J. Hyk: Yes. Next year's base becomes this year's budget.

B. Sneed: If you vote to exceed, next year's base is last year's budget.

R. Lee: That \$137,000; that's a special amount, here and we shouldn't vote to increase that because that really is a one-time...\$137,000 that we're kicking in to pay out of next year's budget for the problem this year, I don't think that should be an increase, because that shouldn't repeat.

B. Sneed: Then you vote to exceed, rather than increase. It's a – how many of us are there? Seven and three, so it's ten. We'll have a simple majority here in a couple of seconds to make this – well, let's get the 1050.

****B. Sneed moved to fund Corrections (1050) budget at \$2,421,700.38. H. Potter seconded.**

Discussion:

R. Lee: How much is that over – that's up by...

B. Sneed: \$2,421,700.38.

R. Lee: Did you forget about the \$25,000?

B. Sneed: The \$25,000 was just moved from one pocket to another.

R. Lee: Because you're only going up by \$112,000. I thought you had to go up by \$137,000? I think you've got to add another \$25,000.

B. Sneed: Right you are.

A. Fowler: Well, yes. I just thought of that, too, Bill. What are we adding? \$137,000?

B. Sneed: Yes, it should have been – we have to add another \$25,000 to this, so it's \$2,446,700.38. If we keep thinking about this, we could drive it up even higher.

****B. Sneed moved to fund Jail budget at \$2,446,700.38; H. Potter seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. Sneed: Barbara, I've forgotten; do we usually vote on the total bottom line?

B. Arseneau: I think so.

B. Sneed: Do we know what it is?

B. Arseneau: I mean, you voted on each budget, so technically you voted on each. It's up to you. I just need to plug in 1075. Do you want me to read the figures for individual budget amounts?

B. Sneed: Yes.

B. Arseneau read the totals as follows:

Emergency Management Agency	1010.....	\$92,172.00
District Attorney	1015.....	156,001.00
County Commissioners	1020.....	521,000.00
Treasurer	1025.....	54,700.00
Facilities Management	1030.....	299,500.00
Jail	1050.....	2,446,700.38
Deeds	1065.....	241,639.00
Probate	1070.....	182,000.00
Sheriff	1075.....	1,036,281.10
Communications Center	1076.....	656,500.00
Advertising/Promotion	1080.....	8,500.00
Audit	1090.....	6,000.00
Debt Service	1095.....	70,200.00
Interest	2000.....	53,000.00
Extension Office	2005.....	49,150.00
Employee Benefits	2025.....	1,350,500.00
Soil & Water	2035.....	19,675.00
Records Preservation	2040.....	6,072.00
Reserves	2045.....	123,000.00
Grant Writing	2050.....	8,000.00

Grand Total: \$7,380,590.48

B. Sneed: Scott [Story]?

S. Story: I really hate to muddy things up, I truly do but a just quick thought has crossed my mind. If, for some reason, the Governor's plan passes as it has been proposed, our future assessment for that Jail is going to be based on this year's budget. One of the issues I have with that is \$137,000 being in that that's for this past year. We might want to reconsider where that money gets put.

J. Hyk: I think that's a bookkeeping and auditing situation. The money would be applied to the year in which it was...you can't say that that was the number, because it isn't true. The number with one year is the number. The number for the next year is the number.

S. Story: Just throwing it out there.

T. Biggs: Did it come out to the percentage, here?

B. Sneed: I'm going to try to, Tim. Unless Barb's already got it.

T. Biggs: Do you have the percentage increase?

B. Arseneau: 8.65%.

R. McLaughlin: O.K., what was it before we even had a meeting?

B. Sneed: 6.48%.

R. McLaughlin: 6.48%? Before we cut anything? I don't mean tonight – I mean when we first got the budget before we had our meetings.

B. Sneed: 20-point-something-or-other.

R. Desmarais: 24.88%.

B. Sneed: No, it was less than that, Dick, because there were a couple of typos.

R. McLaughlin: 20-point-what? I know it was less tonight before we started, but I meant when we first got the budget...

B. Sneed: 20.70.

R. McLaughlin: So we cut it 13% by virtue of being here. So we did something.

T. Biggs: We cut their dreams a little bit.

B. Sneed: Well, that finishes the second part of this and the third part is a joint meeting between the three Commissioners and the Budget Committee. Now, we have to decide what we are going to do with LD 1 because it has clearly gone over its limit.

R. Lee: That limit is?

B. Sneed: If we had stuck to the LD 1 of 4.46%, we would have had a budget of \$7,096,147.00, but now we have a budget of basically \$290,000 more than that.

R. Lee: For those of us new to this game, could tell me again how you get the LD 1 number?

B. Sneed: How we get the L.D. 1 number? It is a weighted average on the assessments to the towns.

R. Lee: That's 2.17%?

T. Biggs: Well, that's personal income growth. That's added to it. Property growth factor is 2.17.

B. Sneed: That's the State's given – that's State value.

R. Lee: Oh, I see and they added 2.24 which is something that the State gives us for the average for personal income growth.

B. Sneed: Right. They figure that every year.

R. Lee: Do they figure that for the whole state?

B. Sneed: We have no idea. It's a total and complete black box.

R. Lee: No, but is it the same number...?

B. Sneed: No, last year was 2.47.

R. Lee: Is it the same number in Aroostook as it is here in Cumberland?

B. Sneed: Yes.

R. Lee: So it's State-wide; same numbers.

B. Sneed: Same number that's applied to the Towns, too. Each one of our towns gets the same amount.

J. Hyk: The only thing we know for sure about this process is that they don't pay one bit of attention to any of it. They spend whatever they want. The State does.

T. Biggs: Apparently, the counties do, too.

J. Hyk: You're passing the budget. You're the Budget Committee; you've passed every budget for the last seven years I've been here, so don't give it to me – I'm going to give it back to you. *(Laughter.)*

R. McLaughlin: Looking at it another way, too; we had a pay increase 3.4%, so we had an actual 5.2% increase over other than payroll.

R. Desmarais: That makes it feel better going with it.

R. McLaughlin: Yes. *(Laughing.)*

B. Sneed: Now we have to decide whether we are going to increase or exceed the property cap limit.

R. Desmarais: Are they [*the Commissioners*] in the session now?

B. Sneed: Barb, do we have to...

B. Arseneau: Technically, you need close your final budget meeting.

****B. Sneed moved to close the Budget Committee meeting; R. McLaughlin seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

B. Arseneau: Now you vote to open the joint meeting.

****B. Sneed moved to open the Joint Commissioners/Budget Committee meeting; A. Fowler seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

A. Fowler: Mr. Parkman, I want you to read out loud the difference between exceeding and increasing the LD 1.

J. Hyk: [*To D. Parkman*] Exceeding and Increasing.

D. Parkman: I have no idea what you're talking about.

J. Bennett: I can tell you.

A. Fowler: Jim, I just wanted to make sure we all understand.

D. Parkman: If you go over the cap, when you make to go over the cap and that's the end of it. Then you vote for it.

B. Sneed: That's not the end of it, because there's two ways to go over the cap.

D. Parkman: I don't have the law with me...

B. Sneed: I do!

D. Parkman: Wait a minute I do, right here..... "The majority vote of the County Budget Committee and the Board of Commissioners will authorize the County to go over the cap. All budget committees have the authority to vote to exceed or increase the cap. LD 1 makes no distinction between advisory or final authority budget committees. We are picking our words very carefully here – the terms of increase and exceed have very different consequences. A vote to exceed the limit should be reserved for extraordinary, circumstances and the amount of funds exceeding the limit may only be used for one year. A vote to increase the limit allows additional funds to be used in the following year

and becomes part of a base used to calculate each subsequent year's assessed limit. The record vote should be to increase assessment to keep this flexibility." How's that?

J. Hyk: Excellent. Thank you so much.

A. Fowler: Thank you! Thank you.

B. Sneed: Dick's taking a powder, so we'll need to wait.

R. Lee: I would move that we vote to increase rather than exceed.

B. Sneed: Let's wait.

(There was discussion with many members speaking at once regarding whether this was a one-time situation and whether it should be exceeded or increased. J. Bennett did some explaining of the difference to the others.)

R. Lee: If the budget goes up 4% next year, it will be a 12.65% increase, won't it? Because our LD 1 won't have gone up. *(Some were not sure about this.)* I thought the whole idea of voting to increase that you kind of lift the base up and then you work from that base in the ensuing year. If you're going to lift the base up, then you should take it down here.

B. Sneed: That's why we're going to vote. Make a motion.

J. Hyk: The motion is fine; I would just like a chance for some discussion.

B. Sneed: We got to have to have a motion to have a discussion. So somebody make a motion.

A. Fowler: Was that a motion, Mr. Lee?

****R. Lee moved to increase the LD 1; A. Fowler seconded.**

Discussion:

R. Lee: Are we voting on the amount over the LD 1? It's the excess? We're up by 8.65% and LD 1 is 4.41 or whatever - 4.24 - is that what it is?.

T. Biggs: Would someone please explain this? Increase means forever.

B. Sneed: Forever.

T. Biggs: If we do the LD 1 next year and, say, it's 4%, we'll go over what the budget is this year?

B. Sneed: Yes.

T. Biggs: 4% over?

B. Sneed: O.K. It could be - drop it down to the \$6,900,000 it was.

J. Hyk: My only thought on this is when I listen to what Dave read, I think it used the word "extraordinary," I thought. Whether it was an extraordinary circumstance is when you exceed. Do I have that wrong or do I have that right?

D. Parkman: You have that right.....like a disaster; that's what they're talking about with exceeding.

J. Hyk: You would vote to exceed. In the other case I would say - I don't know what to say except to say you increase it. It seems unlikely to me, when you look at the price of fuel, and inflation, electricity, gasoline, heating fuel - I don't see that this budget even if it stayed relatively flat, even there were no real changes, I don't see how you would get it by next year either if you don't change the base. It seems to me the base should increase some. So, I am in favor of the motion to increase, rather than exceed, unless, you just want to go through the motions every year of exceeding it, which is where I think you will end up. But that's just one guy's thought.

R. Desmarais: John, I'm going to take a different approach. What I think is driving this budget is the boarding costs of the Jail; it can be zeroed down to one thing. I think exceed is where we should be.

B. Sneed: A motion has been made and seconded to increase LD 1 cap.

All in favor of increasing: Four in favor (R. Lee, J. Hyk, A. Fowler, D. Berry. All opposed? (B. Sneed, R. McLaughlin, R. Desmarais, T. Biggs, H. Potter, J. Bennett.) Motion failed.

****B. Sneed moved to exceed the LD Cap.**

R. Desmarais: By the 4.24?

B. Sneed: Yes; we've got, actually, a dollar amount.

R. Lee: I would just like to hear somebody's articulation of how, if it's the jail boarding costs that is the cause of this increase, the Jail boarding cost, how that fits within what we just heard read.

H. Potter: I think that what makes it extraordinary or exceptional is the cost overrun. Like you've already mentioned, you don't need to increase to that.

R. Lee: The \$137,000 in there, which is about 2%...

B. Sneed: We are not allowed to split.

R. Desmarais seconded the motion. B. Sneed called for all in favor and all opposed.

B. Sneed: I don't even know what it was. Did everybody vote?

R. McLaughlin: We voted the other one down. Why doesn't it make this one good?

T. Biggs: We have another option.

B. Sneed: What's the other option?

T. Biggs: The other option is not to exceed L.D. 1.

****T. Biggs moved not to exceed L.D. 1.**

R. Lee: How did this last motion come out?

S. Story: Wait a minute; your last motion passed – Six/four.

T. Biggs: Maybe we ought to vote again.

R. Desmarais: Who abstained? One, two abstained?

T. Biggs: I didn't vote.

R. Desmarais: Did you vote, Jim? You abstained?

J. Bennett: No, I voted against it.

V. Stover: Yes.

A. Fowler: Vote again.

J. Hyk: What was the vote?

B. Sneed: A motion was made to exceed the L.D. 1 Cap for the coming year. All in favor of exceeding the cap for one year? (Counting) Five [in favor]. (R. Lee, R. McLaughlin, B. Sneed, R. Desmarais, H. Potter).

B. Sneed: You know what's going to happen? Nothing!

(There were several people talking all at once.)

J. Hyk: You need to finish the vote.

B. Sneed: All opposed to it? (Five) Opposed: (J. Bennett, T. Biggs, J. Hyk, D. Berry, A. Fowler). It's a tie!

J. Bennett: It's a tie, so you don't exceed, then.

D. Parkman: The motion fails.

A. Fowler: Yeah. A tie vote is a "no" vote.

B. Sneed: We voted not to increase, and now we failed to exceed.

J. Hyk: Well, sooner or later, we'll do something!

J. Bennett: No, it's all over with.

S. Story: Well, just a point of order – your vote just changed. I mean, you did the same vote twice and unless...

B. Sneed: *[Regarding those who abstained]* They didn't vote the first time.

S. Story: I understand that, and that's my point. You had two abstentions over there the first time around, and now you've repeated the vote and then you had two that decided to vote against this time, I mean...come on, folks.

B. Sneed: Don *[Berry]*, you're the parliamentarian.

D. Berry: He *[S. Story]* is absolutely correct as to what occurred just then.

B. Sneed: O.K.

D. Berry: Because there were two people who did not vote on that first round.

B. Sneed: All righty, so then the first vote is what stands.

D. Berry: The first should be the standing vote.

B. Sneed: And that was to exceed. That's the way it is.

****B. Sneed: I make a motion we adjourn.**

R. Lee: What was the vote to exceed?

B. Sneed: Four.

S. Story: Five.

(Several people were talking at once.)

(Unidentifiable speaker): Five to three.

J. Bennett: We vote against it.

T. Biggs: I thought I voted against it.

R. Lee: Who abstained?

B. Sneed: They [*J. Bennett and T. Biggs*] didn't vote.

J. Bennett: No! That's not right! We did vote! We voted against it.

B. Sneed: The second time.

J. Bennett: No, the first time I voted against it. We did. We both did. (*Unintelligible word.*)

R. Lee: So these, the five of us here voted for the motion?

V. Stover: I didn't see who did.

R. Desmarais: That was the second vote, did...

R. Lee: Now, tell me the vote he's saying counts?

B. Sneed: Don [*Berry*]?

D. Berry: You actually have unrecorded vote.

B. Sneed: And then what's the process, then?

D. Berry: The process is that you didn't do a damn thing, in all actuality, because it was never counted; it was never announced by the chair.

B. Sneed: O.K.

D. Berry: O.K.? Because it was – none of that occurred.

A. Fowler: So, should we have Scott witness it, or something? Vote again and somebody...

B. Sneed: What – how do we get out of this mess?

B. Arseneau: The one recording the minutes need to be told the amounts so that they can put it in the minutes.

D. Berry: Correct, and it was never recorded in the minutes.

S. Longley: Didn't he say, "six/four?"

S. Story: Well, he said "six/four" – I counted five/three. The chair said "six/four." I don't know.

D. Berry: If you actually said "six/four" on the original vote...

J. Bennett: But we voted. And they counted [unintelligible] vote.

A. Fowler: Is that what you have, Veronica?

V. Stover: For which one – the increase, or the exceed?

A. Fowler: The original vote.

D. Berry: In the original vote, if he said "six/four" and it was announced, then that stands.

J. Hyk: What do you have written there?

V. Stover: For the increase there was four in favor and six opposed.

A. Fowler: O.K., and then to exceed?

D. Berry: The next vote.

V. Stover: I had opposed – Jim Bennett, Tim Biggs, Commissioners.

J. Bennett: See, so there you are.

(Several people talking at once.)

T. Biggs: So that's a tie.

B. Sneed: So that's five and five.

A. Fowler: So that's five/five.

B. Sneed: We've still got to do something.

S. Story: Yeah, I was going to say, there was a vote before the five to five.

D. Berry: Yes, there was.

A. Fowler: There was.

T. Biggs: But it wasn't recorded.

S. Story: And I'm sorry, neither Mr. Biggs nor Mr. Bennett had their hand up, you both abstained the first time around, gentlemen.

T. Biggs: It wasn't recorded anyway.

(Several people talking at once.)

S. Story: Yeah, exactly. At that point you had made a comment about the third option and then you did the re-vote again. I'm sorry, but I'm...

D. Berry: There was abstention in that first vote.

S. Story: There was. Two abstentions.

T. Biggs: It's immaterial. It wasn't recorded, so we voted again, everybody and...

(Unknown female voice): How do we know it wasn't recorded?

(Unknown male voice): It's on the recording.

V. Stover: Oh, actually it is on the...on the recorder.

R. Lee: You can't see the votes. There's no camera in here. How can you tell?

A. Fowler: But it's not going to show a show of hands.

J. Hyk: The recorder isn't going to record the hands in the air, unless it's got a little feature I'm not familiar with...

R. McLaughlin: No, he's got a "six/four." He said "six/four".

(Several people talking at once.)

T. Biggs: Nothing prevents us from having another vote.

D. Berry: Is there a record of him saying the vote?

B. Sneed: How, Don – how do we get out of this mess? It's ten minutes to ten [o'clock].

D. Berry: I know. First of all, just a comment – the mess should never have happened.

B. Sneed: Right. It did.

D. Berry: But it did, and since it happened, what I think your only procedure that you can logically do, here – and using logic in this process – is to recall that vote. That’s the only thing you can do. In other words, that vote just never happened in the process. You’ve got to go with the wishes of the total committee – us and you – and what are the true wishes of the total committee. So...

Judge Susan Longley: Would it be...so we had a one, two, three. Vote one was the increase that went down. Vote two was the exceed and it was announced “six/four”; maybe it was a wrong count, but he announced “six/four” and then there was a third option that was suggested and my thinking that, if you want to go back, you need a majority vote of those voting in support.

D. Berry: And you need – what you need, right, you need the reconsideration – that’s where I was going. You need a reconsideration. I had to deal with this at Mount View one time.

S. Longley: But it takes a majority to decide to reconsider, so I think...

D. Berry: Correct.

S. Longley: ...essentially, you have – somebody moves to recon...somebody who voted... [D. Berry interjected]

D. Berry: Someone in the majority.

S. Longley: ...who wants to reconsider; maybe you don’t want to...

D. Berry: I know that Dick [McLaughlin] voted in the majority on that. Dick, ask, actually, for a vote of reconsideration, then we vote to reconsider...

S. Longley: If there is a majority...

D. Berry: If - if it gets a majority to reconsider, and then you make a new motion and go again. That will get you out of the process.

****R. McLaughlin: All right; move to reconsider the vote.**

A. Fowler: Second!

D. Berry: (*Laughing*) That is not discussed!

B. Sneed: All in favor of reconsidering the vote? All opposed? All right. (Motion passed. (There was one abstention noted in written record without name recorded.)

D. Berry: Now you’re open for a new motion.

B. Sneed: I'm open for a new motion. You do it this time.

D. Desmarais: I'll make a motion that we exceed LD #1.

B. Sneed: I'll second. Hopefully, there's no discussion. Anybody want to...?

(Unidentified male voice): Take a close count of wherever we're going.

B. Sneed: All in favor of exceeding L.D. #1? Opposed to?

J. Hyk: Let's record that vote.

A. Fowler: Yeah, really. Put your hands back up. Biggs, Bennett. Got it?

V. Stover: Yup.

(Several people talking at once)

R. Lee: Increased 4.41.

(Unidentified female voice): Motion? Motion?

(Unidentified male voice): ... turned the vote down.

(Unidentified female voice): Motion to adjourn?

J. Bennett: So it goes back to where we was.

B. Sneed: I don't know what we do? I mean, we voted down the first one...

J. Hyk: Move to increase. I move we increase.

R. Lee: We already voted on that.

J. Bennett: We already voted on that.

A. Fowler: And lost. It didn't – it didn't – they lost to exceed it, so obviously it has to increase.

R. Lee: No, we voted on it...

(Several people talking at once.)

R. McLaughlin: We can still move to reconsider that first vote, right?

(Several people talking at once, again.)

R. McLaughlin: Don [Berry]?

S. Longley: Procedurally, if there's a new motion, like changing the vote to increase by a dollar, is a change...

D. Berry: Correct, and that would solve the problem here. He could simply add one dollar to Scott's [Sheriff Story] account, or something and that makes it a brand new piece of motion – or to decrease it by a dollar – anything.

J. Hyk: That part of this is over.

D. Berry: No, not at this point in time, because you've got to have a new motion, here. You've already acted on two motions; both of those motions have failed in the process. You've got to have a new motion. [Looking through the budget] Where were the pennies, here?

A. Fowler: There was .48 cents – was the...

D. Berry: There was .48 cents on something – Grant Matching? No. In the total – up in the registry, in the Jail account you've got .38 cents.

S. Story: Give it the whole thing! *(Laughter)*

A. Fowler: Take it!

D. Berry: He can't have it! *(Laughing.)*

****D. Berry: The new motion: I would make a motion, then, to correct the budget by reducing it by .38 cents in the Jail account and therefore move to increase L.D. #1.**

J. Bennett: He shouldn't handle this part of the budget. That's already been settled. We're voting now this way. I'm sorry.

J. Hyk and A. Fowler simultaneously seconded the motion.

B. Sneed: Motion made and seconded. All in favor to do that?

J. Bennett: To do what, now? Repeat it again.

A. Fowler: To increase.

(Tape ran out.)

(Recorded in hand-written notes,) all in favor: (J. Hyk, D. Berry, A. Fowler, R. Lee, H. Potter, R. McLaughlin. Opposed: (B. Sneed, R. Desmarais, T. Biggs, J. Bennett). Motion passed.

****R. McLaughlin moved to adjourn joint meeting; B. Sneed seconded; motion passed unanimously.**

Recorded by Deputy County Clerk Veronica Stover and transcribed by County Clerk Barbara Arseneau.

Respectfully submitted by *Barbara L. Arseneau*
Waldo County Clerk