

WALDO COUNTY FY 2009 BUDGET COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 19, 2008
PUBLIC HEARING

PRESENT: Budget Committee Members James Bennett, Tim Biggs, Richard Desmarais, Richard McLaughlin and Bill Sneed. In attendance as observers were Waldo County Commissioners J. Hyk, D. Berry, and A. Fowler, Treasurer David Parkman, County Clerk Barbara Arseneau, numerous County Department Heads and County employees, members of the press and several citizens. Also present was Deputy County Clerk Veronica Stover to take the minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING – FY 2009 BUDGET:

B. Sneed: For those of you who don't work for the County, this meeting normally would be in three parts: an hour or so for public comment – even if you do work for the County, you're still part of the public; then, in normal times, we would go through each budget quickly because we have already gone through each one slowly. Tonight is going to be different because we have basically just gotten the new budget. Thirdly, if necessary, we would have to meet jointly with the Commissioners to decide whether LD-1's cap had been exceeded. If we've gone over, we have to meet jointly with the Commissioners to decide whether that would be allowed. That's not going to happen tonight; so we'll start by introducing ourselves to you. (Budget Committee members introduced themselves.) And, Richard Crossman, who is normally here, from Frankfort; he couldn't make it tonight. That's the nine of us. In a lot of ways, I guess we actually act the town meetings today. We are what you guys would be. These guys have presented us with a budget, and we have to decide whether it will be thumbs up or a thumb down. Let's start with some questions. Only one thing, I don't know where we are with the union negotiations, but that topic is absolutely out of bounds. There will be no questions asked about that; negotiations are still going on.

A. Fowler: That's right; there are two unions that we are still negotiating with.

B. Sneed: That topic is out of bounds. With that in mind, questions?

R. Lee: At some point, I'm going to want to know just where we're at.

B. Sneed: This is the public part, Roger. We'll get to that. Ask anything you want of us, and the Commissioners will take questions? Will you?

Commissioners: Yes.

A. Fowler: Mr. Chair, will you allow questions during the process; or is this the only time?

B. Sneed: This is the public meeting part of it; this is when the questions from the public will be taken. Yes, sir?

J. Slocum: I don't have a question, but may I make a public comment?

B. Sneed: Sure.

J. Slocum: My name is Joe Slocum; I work for the City of Belfast. I came during your budget to talk about economic development. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to address you. I look at your whole budget, and I do think the County has probably had a history of saying, "Economic development is not a County issue." Last year, the request that was made for development, this year for \$5,000.00. It looks like you approved \$3,000.00 out of a 7.4 million dollar budget. I don't like people who show up at budget time, and that's the only time you see them, so I'm going to go through this year and kind of try to keep up with the different members of the Budget Committee and let us know what we're doing on economic development in Waldo County. I think it's important we work together; I'm pleased to work with any town; I'm pleased to work with any county on this issue. I'm hoping that at some point in time that the County does see it more as a countywide issue and not a municipal issue here and there. We're working on a project right now that probably 90 percent of it is going to benefit County and 10 percent is going to benefit the City of Belfast. Thanks for your time. I really hope that you think about funding Eastern Maine Development Corporation for the whole \$5,000.00 they've asked for. I work with them every week, and they are trying to help this whole region. I really do believe that. Thank you very much.

R. Desmarais: Joe, may I ask you a question? Are you on K-RAD?

J. Slocum: Yes, I am; I'm in Knox-Waldo Economic Development Corporation working on that.

R. Desmarais: Does K-RAD have a website yet?

J. Slocum: Yes, it does.

R. Desmarais: Are you listing the projects as they are taking place on your website – what you are seeking? PV-COG just did that; they're building a website now to let the towns know what they are doing and what they have access to.

J. Slocum: K-RAD's website, more or less, tells you what K-RAD is and what K-RAD does. We have one staff person, so we don't always have the ability to update what's happening. Please call me at City Hall any day, and I will tell you what K-RAD is working on. We work on business attraction to bringing new businesses to the two-county region. We work on business retention. We work on labor force growth, so you can have the employees we need to serve the businesses. We work with high schools to try to get them aware of the types of opportunities that are out there right now without a college degree, so people can live in their home and raise their families.

R. Desmarais: Thank you.

B. Sneed: Yes, David?

D. Parkman: I'm David Parkman; I'm the County Treasurer. Since I've been County Treasurer in 2002, I have three items that have constantly been a problem. The boarding cost at the Jail, I think, has been taken care of. Two or three years ago, this Budget Committee helped us out on the court appointments in the Probate, and I'm happy to report that with the Probate restitution we're getting on the revenue side and what you people increased a couple of years ago, that is no longer a problem either. We do have one problem that is constant, and that is on the Communication Center part-time personnel. It has been about \$10,000.00 that I hope, from previous meetings, you have increased to \$40,000.00; and I think that's a much more believable figure. We're running out of \$10,000.00 in that account about February or early March, so I hope that you stick with that, I think its \$40,000.00. Bill, you asked me what happens if it

goes over – it comes out of the rest of his budget, and his budget has been really in the red for, at least, the last two to three years. If that budget is in the red, it comes out of the County overall end-of-the-year surplus. I think \$40,000.00 is much more believable and that you agreed with at an earlier meeting, and I hope you'll stick with it. Thank you.

B. Sneed: Sheriff? What surprises do you have in store for us?

S. Story: No surprises; but I did, more for the public than for the Budget Committee, want to [explain] the Jail situation, and I just wanted to let everybody know. If you're looking at these budgets, you're going to see that there are increases in the Patrol. When you look at the cap for the Jail number, that number is higher than what the Jail actually was; but as you go through other parts of the budget, you are going to see that things were taken from other parts of the County budget that go into that Jail cap number: things like facilities, maintenance, some employee benefits. The bottom line is that it really was nothing more than a shuffle from a few different lines over to the Jail cap number. The bottom line on the Jail is that it was capped at 2.8 million, which was the amount that was appropriated out of last year's budget when you reach out into all those other parts. Just briefly on that, this is all that the County taxpayers will ever pay again, as long as this thing continues forward the way that it's heading for the Jail. That is capped; we can't appropriate any more money. Neither the Commissioners, myself or the Budget Committee can dig into your pockets any more for the Jail. That doesn't come without some ramifications - there will be changes to Corrections in Waldo County. You'll probably see that in the upcoming year – some positive, some negative. It's one of those things where it's been a big balancing act. I do sit on the Board of Corrections in August, and certainly I'm trying to look out for the best interests of Corrections in Waldo County, but also on a State level. So, there's going to be some changes; I would certainly advise everybody to take a look at that. Again, if you see changes in other line items; for example, if you take a look at the Sheriffs' budget, you'll see that for the first time since we've been doing the budget, my and my Chief Deputy's entire salaries are now borne by the patrol side, where other salaries and benefits were shuffled over into Corrections that were more appropriate for there. The bottom line is that the Jail is not costing you any more this year than it did last year. That feels awful good to stand up here for the first time in my tenure as Sheriff to say that it's not costing you more money. Thank you, folks.

B. Sneed: Can I ask a question as a citizen? I saw you in the paper saying that there is a possibility that the Jail might either be downsized in some way or closed altogether. What happens to this cap? Do we continue to give money to the State of Maine, regardless of whether we have a jail?

S. Story: Well, you could say it goes to the State of Maine; that would probably be accurate. There is going to be somebody over there tallying it up. What happens is that as the Board of Corrections looks at different facilities, and Waldo County will be one that will be looked at, we'll determine if, in fact, it is efficient to keep Waldo County Jail opened up as a full-service facility, which is what we do now. We're grossly inefficient providing full services. When I say full service, we handle all classifications of inmates (medium, minimum, maximum, mental health inmates, people with physical problems). We do all that at great expense, because of our linear construction of the facility. It will make more sense for those inmates to go elsewhere in the State's system where perhaps they can get better services for mental health, or better services for medical. Perhaps there will be a specialty facility that's going to deal with all of the maximum security inmates. The options for Waldo County are pretty much narrowed down to three. We would either be completely closed with all of our services going elsewhere – I don't believe that will happen because that, actually, would put an undue burden on a lot of municipalities. I think the Board of Corrections recognizes that. Other options are we would become a 72-hour hold – we would

book and bail inmates here, keep pre-trial inmates here up until the time that they either can go to court or make bail. Lastly, and what I'm pushing for, is to become a specialty facility. Although we are inefficient as a full-service facility, we could be very efficient housing minimum security inmates. We could be very efficient doing a pre-release here. I know we've been questioned, even as recently as a recent editorial, that maybe we should be doing more. I can tell you that Waldo County is probably one of the two most progressive counties as far as dealing with alternatives to incarcerations. We have a very aggressive program with our Restorative Justice, with the Volunteers of America, with programming, day reporting – we're doing a lot of work here that actually makes us very attractive as a pre-release center. So, the jury is out on what we're going to become. I'm fairly comfortable that they just can't close the doors and send us packing; it would leave too big of a void. It would also create a pretty undue burden on the municipalities that have police departments. Having said that, we'll know more probably in the next two or three months.

R. Desmarais: Scott, I don't know if it was during the Jail Study Committee, or what, but there was advantages to the State taking it over as far as a mental facility, a substance abuse facility – is the State trying to work in that direction, to take these people who need medical and need substance abuse presentation, and get them what they need.

S. Story: Keep in mind, I don't want to use the word "State," because if it wasn't for the counties stepping into this game, a lot of.....the State's original plan had the doors of this place closed; it had City Manager Slocum's police officers transporting inmates to Two Bridges Jail, taking officers off their streets – the State's plan was a mess. The counties got together with them, and we are now taking the best of what the counties had to offer. Some parts of the State plan, which very much go to what you're saying about specialization in certain facilities, we're putting all of that together on a State-wide basis to see where we can provide the best services the most efficiently. If ultimately we're able to provide a service in Waldo County that costs a million dollars less than the 2.8 million cap, then the difference will, in fact, go to some other facility to house our maximum security inmates, perhaps our mentally ill patients. There are parts of Corrections that cost a lot more. It's very inexpensive to do a pre-release, or it's inexpensive to keep minimum security inmates – you don't require as much staff in terms of supervision. However, maximum security people, people with mental illness, people with physical disabilities or with injuries, that costs a lot more money to incarcerate them. If you have a specialization unit somewhere, they can do that a lot easier. There are some down sides to this. One of the hardest things we're trying to get passed is that a huge rehabilitation component - just like we really messed up with mentally ill over the last hundred years: removed them from their communities, institutionalized them, centralized them somewhere. We realize that was the wrong thing to do; so we've now brought them back into our communities and didn't provide services. Therefore, we have people with mental illness wandering around aimlessly. I'm a little concerned that we may be heading back in that direction with Corrections, in that one of the key components for rehabilitation is to have people in their communities for their rehabilitation, for their re-entry back out of the system and back into the communities. That's going to be a tougher challenge if we're moving people all over the State.

R. McLaughlin: If you say it probably won't happen, what if they do close the whole facility? What happens to the employees in Waldo County? Will they be relocated?

S. Story: There's a possibility they could be offered jobs in other parts of the State system. Remember, if we close the doors, if they completely shut down the facility, somebody has still got to transport the inmates from the time they're arrested to wherever they're going. And, remember that a lot of our transports aren't just from the time they're arrested to where they're going – we now have to go pick them

up the next morning to bring them to court. After that, we may have to bring them back for a probable cause hearing. Then, we have to bring them back to meet with their lawyer. There are certain things that you can do with electronic teleconferencing, but on the same hand, there is still a lot of traveling to do. We would probably have a pretty good sized transportation division that would utilize some of the employees; there's no question there would be unemployed corrections officers. The question is, how many? My contention is if we can offer a specialization unit up here – my turnover up at the Jail ran almost 50 percent last year. If I have time to transition into something that requires less staff, I could probably do it through attrition and not have to hand out any pink slips.

R. Desmarais: One more thing, Scott. Judges – they were going to ask for a reduction in a judicial department. Have they put that on hold? It seemed that this extra judge that we had floating around did a lot for the County last year.

S. Story: Yes, that's absolutely correct, Mr. Desmarais; and that is probably one of the biggest components to what drives our Jail population. We have a District Attorney's office that's ready to go to work when the judges are sitting here. We have police officers that are ready to show up for court. We have a court system here that's ready to do the job. If you don't have a judge sitting in that building, the inmates back up at that facility. Last year, we were very, very fortunate to have a strong presence of the judiciary in Waldo County, and it moved our populations through. As I sit here today, this time last year we probably had 20 or 30 inmates being boarded in other places – I think tonight we might have two or three at the most. If they cut back on judicial resources, that could drive those numbers through the roof again. We could be sitting here facing a several hundred thousand dollar shortfall next year on boarding. The nice thing is that the State is going to have to figure out what they'd do in that situation under the cap. So, there is a direct impact, and it's one of the things we're trying to ring home in Augusta loud and clear with the Board of Corrections: if you make cuts to the judiciary, make cuts to other parts of this system, (There was talk about cuts to district attorneys' offices.) remove prosecutors, remove judges, slow down these courts, and you're going to pay double that when you start stacking inmates up in this state. That's finally starting to hit home with some people in Augusta.

R. Desmarais: I remember one day I came down here for a court session with the Commissioners last August, I believe. We came upstairs here, and we have three full-time officers in our town, and all three of them were here waiting to get in here to do their thing. One of them was on their day off, getting time and a half from the time they left their house until they got back home.

S. Story: Now, you're going to crank me up.

R. Desmarais: The entire department was represented out in that hallway.

S. Story: That is a huge problem. I have here every time we have a court day, I have at least four or five of my police officers that sit across – as a matter of fact, I don't allow them to sit out in the hallway anymore; I ship them up to the office. They do other things; they catch up on paperwork, but the sad part is isn't the fact that these guys are sitting down here and 90 percent of the time never testify or never go to court, the sad thing is that these guys probably just worked an all-night shift and are now sitting down here all day when they should be sleeping. Then, we're going to throw them back in a cruiser at 4 o'clock and tell them to go work another 10 hour shift. We write summons to truck drivers for operating equipment that long a period of time, yet we expect it of our police officers. It's very frustrating for me, not only from a fiscal aspect of the overtime costs, but for the actual, potential danger it puts my officers in for not having enough rest and then having to go back to work.

R. Desmarais: But, it's very necessary to follow through with what brought them to this court, too.

S. Story: It is necessary, but I contend that there are alternatives other than for defense attorneys to sit here and wait to see if the officer shows up before they decide if they're going to make a plea or not.

R. Lee: Could you just continue in a short speech to continue to give us an idea what those alternatives are. Do they do better things in other counties or other states?

S. Story: You can sit here and listen to my suggestions, and then District Attorney Rushlau will have some different suggestions, and then we can run it in front of a judge and he's going to tell you why it will or won't work, and he'll have some different suggestions. It's a very frustrating thing, and it would be an endless circle of suggestions that never seem to come to fruition.

B. Sneed: Does anybody else have any questions for anybody?

R. McLaughlin: I have a question. When we go through this, whatever we go through, we're not going to be hearing any more from the department heads?

B. Sneed: We can decide that when we get it.

R. McLaughlin: Someone asked if they could say something later, and you said, and I thought you said, "No, this is the time to say something."

B. Sneed: If no one has any questions, I guess we'll end at 6:25, take ten or fifteen minutes, and come back with the joint part of this. The Budget Committee will start going through the various budgets. If anybody wants, they can stay; unless you've got a wife.

(BREAK)

FINAL BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING FY 2009

B. Sneed: For reasons best known to the gods of the Internet and so forth, a lot of us have gotten a basically completely revised budget, to a large extent. I didn't get it until quarter after of five this afternoon.

A. Fowler: Were you the only one, Bill; I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman?

R. McLaughlin: I got mine at 3 o'clock this afternoon.

R. Desmarais: Around 2 o'clock.

B. Sneed: My preference is, and you guys can put a vote on this, is to go through the easy ones, which are the ones that haven't undergone much change since the last budget, and we'll come back the week after Christmas, the 29th or the 30th. I don't want to be rushed through this budget. I got this thing, literally, at quarter after five this afternoon; and to use the phrase beloved by stock brokers and lawyers, I'm going to do pillages on this damn budget. I won't be rushed through it.

R. Lee: It might be good to just touch lightly on each one so we can see where we're at, what the changes are.

B. Sneed: But, I don't want to vote on them, not the ones with the changes.

J. Bennett: If we start touching on everyone of them, we'll be here until morning. You've got the two budgets and you can see what they are, what the changes are.

J. Hyk: Bill, over here we can't here a thing you're saying.

B. Sneed: I don't know what to do about it.

A. Fowler: That's good, right there. Just speak at that level right there.

T. Biggs: Well, maybe we can get some feedback from the Commissioners on why these numbers are different, if that's possible.

B. Sneed: Don will speak to that, I think.

D. Berry: Thank you very much. The significance of the changes that you see in the budget itself relate to the fact that two of the contracts now have been settled. So, the settling of those two contracts means, and the support group is one of those two; the settling of that contract means that spread out through every department there is some support person or persons, with the new contract in place, all of those new numbers come into play; and the contractual obligation is now between the County and these groups. That's why in every department where you see this change in increase, that change is there. I'd be glad to answer any other questions with respect to that for you.

R. Lee: Are there any other changes other than the results of union contracts?

D. Berry: Basically, I don't believe so. Dave? The other one was the suggestion by Dick McLaughlin that we create a pay scale for our office staff, and we did that. So, that would be the only other change that's there. The changes that you see are those changes that exist within either the Commissioners office or the change of increases within the support staff.

T. Biggs: So, we have one person here that got a 15.6% raise?

D. Berry: That's correct.

T. Biggs: Wow.

D. Berry: That is correct.

T. Biggs: So, it's not just a percentage over all the employees. Every one was negotiated differently.

D. Berry: That percentage is different for every employee, and the reason for that is this: there was a study done several years ago that laid out the pay scales for people in the given positions that they actually should have occupied. They weren't occupying those positions. In the process of negotiations and mediation, this was the agreed upon scale system.

T. Biggs: So, you brought it up to state levels, a comparison of state levels?

D. Berry: We brought it up to the recommended levels within the original pay scale that existed here in the County. Some of these people were not in the correct slot as far as their job descriptions.

R. Lee: You say we haven't yet concluded negotiations.

D. Berry: We have two that we have not concluded yet.

R. Lee: They are?

D. Berry: Communications and the Corrections officers.

R. Lee: The Corrections officers though won't change the County's budget.

D. Berry: No, it will not. The Communications Center will be a slight increase; we are waiting, at this point in time, waiting for ratification by that group.

R. Lee: So, you're close?

D. Berry: Yes.

T. Biggs: So, there's no way we could have finished the budget tonight anyway without concrete numbers.

D. Berry: The total difference there would have fit within, I believe, their budget very closely. It would have fit within it. I can't give you numbers sorry about that.

R. McLaughlin: I wanted to see the pay scales investigated and put into practice, but I'm not sure we meant this year's budget.

D. Berry: That's what we understood – to generate a scale, and we did that.

R. Desmarais: If we were to look at, I'll call it "the easiest ones," the ones that are pretty cut and dry and make a decision after looking at that department whether to close it out or whether to come back next week. I'm thinking of these people that have an interest in that department having to come back out, possibly in stormy weather, as we run out of time. If we can cut them loose tonight, they get their answers tonight, they know where they stand. I think that decision can be made after we get done going through that department's budget, whether we want to close out and say, "This is your final figure;" or whether we want to hold it until next week. To give these people a break.

R. McLaughlin: Can you legally finalize part of it without finalizing the whole thing? Anybody know?

A. Fowler: What are you talking about, the meeting tonight, the public hearing tonight?

R. McLaughlin: No, not the public hearing. If we decide tonight on, oh say 1010, and we finalize it, we're done with it, and then we come back later to do the other ones.

D. Berry: Then, what would be required would be a motion to accept all of them.

R. McLaughlin: Afterwards.

A. Fowler: At that time.

D. Berry: Right.

R. McLaughlin: I make a motion that we go through the departments that can be dealt with tonight and deal with the other ones on the 29th and 30th of December.

N. Nelson: I have a question. If we go through the ones we can do now because they haven't changed, but we aren't going to have new numbers and have to go through them again?

B. Sneed: I certainly hope not.

R. McLaughlin: The intent would be that these are the final numbers tonight, if we're going to close it out tonight.

N. Nelson: What unions are still negotiating?

B. Sneed: What Roger said, one of them is going to fall under the Jail cap thing, so it's basically moot anyway. As long as they don't exceed 2.8 million, the whole thing's done. The only other one is the one is the one that is going through, so. Dick McLaughlin made a motion; I'll second it. All in favor of doing it this way?

R. Lee: Are we voting on the meeting?

B. Sneed: We'll just do the simple ones tonight and come back the week after Christmas.

R. Lee: It doesn't make sense to use the available time. If we get through the simple ones in half the time, you don't even want to talk about the others?

B. Sneed: I haven't even read the thing, Roger.

R. Lee: It does seem to me though that, if what he says is correct, the change is the result of a union negotiation.

B. Sneed: But, that doesn't forestall us from making other changes to try and make up for that.

J. Bennett: If we postpone it, will it be a public hearing or will it just be for us? The public hearing is already over, so would it be just for us [Budget Committee].

B. Sneed: That's an interesting question, but I think we can probably get by without it. Given the amount of public participation we had tonight, I can't imagine a day or two before New Year's we're going to have any more.

R. Desmarais: I think we have covered ourselves with a public hearing, and we just had it. It stopped for lack of any more questions.

J. Bennett: In that case, if we're going to stop with half, then we ought to stop with the whole thing. We'll take a look at it – we have all new figures – then come back and it'll only take a minute to run down through the few.

R. Lee: I don't like that. I just went to an enormous effort to make this meeting. I would to at least, get something done.

R. Desmarais: That's what I'm saying – get something done – but, we're not going to finish it.

R. Lee: Of course.

B. Sneed: I'd like to do what Dick suggested – cut the folks that are sitting out there with the easy ones – cut them loose so they can enjoy their day after Christmas, or whatever.

R. Lee: Except that, if the majority feels compelled to reduce this budget to some number, we may have to cut what you're calling “the easy ones.”

R. Desmarais: The easy ones are going to be gone over with a fine tooth comb; nothing is cut and dry. We have to look at the easy ones, and are we going to total it out or not, one by one. When we either run out of time or whatever, but we can cut some of these people loose.

N. Nelson: I have an interesting idea, but it would, at least, help me understand what we're trying to get to. If we went around the table and said what we all envisioned in the back of our mind what we're trying to get to as a total budget. That might not make sense; or what percent we want to see in an increase, so we know what are some commonalities.

R. Desmarais: How about voting on the motion?

B. Sneed: Barb?

B. Arseneau: I don't know if I should mention this or not; I thought I probably should. The statutes discuss the public hearing and it says, “notice of the hearing shall be given at least 10 days before the hearing.” I know you're not sure whether or not you are going to hold a public hearing, but I thought I needed to tell you that the 29th is less than 10 days. If you've decided it won't be a public hearing, that's not an issue. I'm trying to go down through here as your questions have come up to see if I can help you with any answers. Have you decided that it [public hearing] is, in fact, over?

R. Lee: Well, we've had the public hearing. If it takes us longer, as a Committee, to do our job following the public hearing, that seems perfectly ordinary, perfectly understandable. We could have three or four meetings.

B. Arseneau: And, it does say that you can do that: “After the public hearing is completed, the Budget Committee may further decrease, increase and authorize...” I just wanted to let you know that if you were planning to have another public hearing, you have to have 10 days notice. Just letting you know that, that's all.

S. Story: Maybe in hearing all this it may not matter. I certainly will not pretend to speak for the Commissioners or the other department heads, but it seems to me that some of us would be able to quite quickly discuss any changes in our budgets. If you're not prepared to deal with it that way, that's fine.

B. Sneed: I haven't even read the thing.

S. Story: Okay; that's fine.

R. Desmarais: Within the last twelve hours; I think it went out at 5 o'clock last night. I got mine at one or two o'clock this afternoon, but the figures have been changed; and you see paperwork flying at us tonight, too – they changed once again. We need some explanation. We have to go over this. These are not times where the money is flowing freely. These are tight times, and we are trying to do the best we can with it.

S. Story: I totally understand. The only reason I suggested that is that there are some budgets, as you will recognize, that have very little change from where you left them before.

R. Desmarais: Those are the ones we'd like to get to.

S. Story: If you decide you want to do that tonight, I think the department heads and, certainly, the Commissioners, can help you with those minute changes in some of those budgets. There are others that there may be more, and those are the ones you want to look at – whatever you decide, but I just wanted to offer up that some of those department heads may be able to help you with some of those.

B. Sneed: Motion made and seconded. All in favor? Any opposed?

R. McLaughlin: Can I say one thing? This budget that said 0.84 went out to all the town Selectmen, so that's what they think we're dealing with tonight. They don't know about this. Not only the people here haven't had time to go over it, our towns that we represent haven't even heard anything about it. They don't know this. If we were to act on this and go through the whole thing and pass it, we might have to pay.

Discussion about difference in budget bottom lines (0.84% vs. 1.23 vs. 4.61%)

R. Lee: And, what does that one say, the bottom line on that one is

R. McLaughlin: .84 percent; and this is 4.61 percent.

R. Lee: 4.61?

T. Biggs: And, then there's one that's 1.23. What's that?

N. Nelson: I had a 1.23 to 4.61.

R. McLaughlin: These are the ones that when we started deliberations, we were at .84; then another one came out for 1 point something; and now we've got 4.61.

R. Lee: Can somebody show me the sheet that says 4.61?

R. McLaughlin: Here, that one. I don't have the one for 1.2, whatever it is. That might have been the one where they added in the pay scale stuff before the negotiations. Union contracts hadn't been settled. Is the 1.23 what you added in on the pay scale thing before the union contracts were decided?

K. Trussell: The 1.23 is all the cuts that you made and the new personnel figures.

A. Fowler: That is the current, the 1.23, that you were handed, increase is the actual budget now, figuring in two new contracts. The most recent one was signed Wednesday.

D. Parkman: She's absolutely right! It's 1.23. You made these cuts in other meetings, and all that's reflected on the new thing that we sent out that says 1.23 is the union contract; that's it.

N. Nelson: That's what we were just given now?

D. Parkman: Yes; that's because he wanted to go back to the original budget. You've already made your cuts.

N. Nelson: I was told the one stapled to this wasn't the right one; this was the right one.

D. Parkman: The 1.23 should be the right budget because when you go all the way back, you're taking away all the cuts you've already made in the other meetings.

J. Bennett: We haven't voted and done the other cuts, so you've got to go back to the other.

D. Parkman: No, but you've got your notes on where you did cut it, I hope, Jim.

J. Bennett: I have, but we haven't voted on that, David.

D. Parkman: Well, you can vote tonight on the whole budget.

B. Sneed: We're not going to vote on the whole budget tonight.

J. Bennett: And, when we do, you'll have a 4 point something percent increase.

D. Berry: No, we don't.

D. Parkman: No, we don't.

D. Berry: Excuse me. We had a request tonight to show this entire where you started from. That was 4.61.

K. Trussell: Don, that still included the negotiations added into that.

D. Berry: Yes, the negotiations added into that.

N. Nelson: So, we're only at a 1.23 percent increase.

D. Berry: That's correct. You are at a 1.23 percent increase. That is where you're at right now.

J. Bennett: Don, are you talking a 1.23 percent increase from where we got done chopping?

D. Berry: And, adding into the negotiated factors, as well.

J. Bennett: Okay; what we're saying is it's more than a 1.3 for the year.

D. Berry: No, it's 1.23 right now.

T. Biggs: For the year.

D. Berry: For the year right now.

N. Nelson: So, that's '08 and '09 – that's phenomenal.

B. Sneed: That's not right. Look at 1020. What does it say under 2009? Just the summary page.

N. Nelson: Fifty-six five.

B. Sneed: Mine says \$612,884.00.

R. McLaughlin: Mine does, too.

More discussion about percentage, spoken all together.

K. Trussell: You have a number underneath the \$612,564.00 that's what you approved the night you looked at it.

N. Nelson: Which is also different from what's printed on the 1.23.

K. Trussell: The 1.23 reflects the additional personnel from the contract.

B. Sneed: What's the 612,884.

T. Biggs: That's what we first came in the door with.

N. Nelson: That's what we came in the doorway with before we looked at it to begin with. So, the 564,637...

B. Sneed: No, that what we came in the door with.

K. Trussell: The original you walked in with was \$611,670.00.

B. Sneed: Exactly right.

K. Trussell: And, with the negotiations, it went to \$612,884.00. The difference between added to the cuts you made is \$564,852.44.

N. Nelson: I see the logic.

J. Bennett: I don't.

N. Nelson: You see, under the department totals, the small number under the department total number is the number after we did our cuts or additions with the final change. I see what we're doing now.

More murmuring and talking among Committee members.

J. Hyk: Bill?

B. Sneed: Yes, John.

J. Hyk: Seeing as how this is working out to be just as clear as mud, the other day after we completed this one contract with the Support Unit, I asked the question, "What does it cost the taxpayer?" The answer I got was, "Right around \$30,000.00." Is that right?

D. Berry: Yes.

J. Hyk: Right around \$30,000.00 – that's the answer I got. Now, if you take that \$30,000.00, that's what's in this budget in these different departments that these people work in. That's the number we're looking at. That's the increase in the budget. The only other increase in the budget is the amount in the Commissioners' budget for that increase for the workers in the Commissioners' budget. I didn't ask the question how much that cost, but I think it's something like, my guess is \$7,000.00; it's just a guess, right off the top of my head. If I'm right about that, you're looking at about \$40,000.00 total. That's the difference between the budget you're looking at tonight and the last time you looked at it. That's the only money we've put in it - the one contract plus the classification of our own office workers. That's it! So, if you think there's something else in there, you're going to look in vain. Now, if you want to make other cuts, that's your business; but I'm just trying to get you to the bottom line. I know it's confusing – bottom line: \$40,000.00.

N. Nelson: This other sheet, I apologize, but I was under the impression that there was \$400,000.00 added, but I see now that there isn't. Thank you.

R. McLaughlin: Going back with this new thing here and these lines in here, 2025 says \$845,730.00 on our sheet here, but on the caption sheet it says \$854,745.00. That's about \$9,000.00 more.

K. Trussell: Which department?

R. McLaughlin: Under 2025.

K. Trussell: The FICA and the MPCR's went up with the adjusted salaries.

D. Berry: Correct.

R. McLaughlin: I thought you said this figure that was underneath the figure here had all the different increases in it – that was the bottom line figure, with the union contracts.

D. Berry: The contract negotiations give you the approximate \$30,000.00. Above that, you have your other factors that come into play, like FICA, etc., that have to be added to it because of the increase in salary.

R. McLaughlin: And, you didn't add that in when you added what the potential union contracts was added to it. You didn't add the FICA and the other stuff in. On this sheet, you didn't add it in. On this sheet, you did.

D. Berry: Yes.

J. Hyk: I failed to mention that, Dick. I'm sorry. I just failed to mention it. I forgot about it.

R. McLaughlin: Okay; I'm trying to coordinate these.

T. Biggs: So, it went in under Employee Benefits rather than under Commissioners. You said the County Commissioners line was increased due to, I thought you missed FICA.

J. Hyk: No, I did know. I meant the salaries, but I failed to mention FICA because I just didn't think of it.

T. Biggs: So, you stepped up salaries in the County Commissioners budget.

J. Hyk: Yes.

R. McLaughlin: Not the Commissioners – the Commissioners' personnel.

J. Hyk: That would be reflected in the personnel in the Commissioners' budget. That's it; that's the sum total of the changes that have been presented to, and we had to present them to you because we had to.

N. Nelson: I guess, given this new light, I have much less of a problem – I would like to say I don't have a problem – going through this whole budget tonight. I don't see that the changes are so significant; we're only at a 1.23 percent increase.

R. Lee: I must say that I feel the same way; I mean, there has been some confusion. Why don't we just get started?

B. Sneed: Harry, do you have any thoughts on this?

H. Potter: Yeah, let's get started.

B. Sneed: Jim?

J. Bennett: Let's go for it.

R. McLaughlin: May the record state what time it is, because we said we'd start this at 7:10 p.m.

1010 – E.M.A.

B. Sneed: It's 7:10. Let's start with 1010 [EMA].

****J. Bennett moved, N. Nelson seconded to fund the EMA Budget (1010) at \$95,772.00.**

R. Lee: Can we have discussion?

B. Sneed: I'm sorry; you're right, Roger. Go ahead.

R. Lee: What is the increase in pay scales for those two guys? Are they union?

D. Rowley: There were no changes whatsoever in the EMA's personnel.

B. Sneed: Uh, 4 percent.

R. Lee: Was it 4 percent?

B. Sneed: Yeah. I calculated them last time, and they haven't changed.

J. Bennett: 3.91% overall.

D. Rowley: We don't have any union.

A. Fowler: Wouldn't let 'em in.

B. Sneed: Any more discussion? All in favor?

Motion passed unanimously.

B. Sneed: Let's jump around a bit here and go back to the back to 2050, Grant Writing.

2050 – GRANT WRITING

****N. Nelson moved, T. Biggs seconded to fund Grant Writing (2050) at \$4,000.00. Unanimous.**

2040 – RECORDS PRESERVATION

****R. McLaughlin moved, R. Lee seconded to fund Records Preservation (2040) at \$2,490.00.**

N. Nelson: I will say one more time that I still think it would be nice to do the Jail records over the multiple years instead of all at once.

R. Desmarais: Pass that on to Scott; he's on the committee; maybe he could do the State and not have money left over from the Jail board.

Motion passed with one opposed (N. Nelson).

2035 – WALDO COUNTY SOIL AND WATER

****J. Bennett moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund Waldo County Soil and Water Budget (2035) at \$19,675.00. Unanimous.**

B. Sneed: What's next coming backwards?

T. Biggs: I believe Benefits are, but I'd just as soon take that on at the end.

B. Sneed: Okay.

J. Bennett: How about 2005?

2005 – WALDO COUNTY EXTENSION

****N. Nelson moved, J. Bennett seconded to fund the Waldo County Extension Budget (2005) at \$41,529.00. Unanimous.**

2000 – INTEREST

B. Sneed: I don't suppose we'd have a leg to stand on if we didn't want to pay the interest. Account number 2000, Interest.

****J. Bennett moved, T. Biggs seconded to fund the Interest budget (2000) at \$40,000.00.**

R. Lee: Discussion? I just don't recall – did we satisfy that this is not inflated; this is what they actually need? Do you actually need to spent this much in interest? I've seen a couple of times where things have been generously written down?

D. Parkman: Last year, we got \$4.3 million as a line of credit. We used to - \$3,000,400.00 – out of \$4.3 million. The interest is right around \$40,000.00, isn't it? Forty-two?

K. Trussell: Yes, \$42,000.00/43,000.

D. Parkman: Forty-two or 43 right back. So, that's this year's figures right now. We still get the TAN note to fund the Jail, also. We will be starting, because the Jail is a different account, so this year we're going to borrow on just the Jail at the beginning year, because we're starting with 10 or we're planning on at least \$10,000.00 in the checking account.

T. Biggs: Two things come to mind: lower interest rates than a year ago and we're not responsible, are we, for the Jail?

D. Parkman: We're responsible for the first six months to run it anyway.

S. Story: No, you're responsible to appropriate \$2.8 million.

B. Sneed: In answer to your question, if you look at the sheet from the 19th meeting, they've only spent \$41,600.00 of the \$53,000.00 that we appropriated last year.

T. Biggs: Do you have another payment to make this year?

D. Parkman: No, we're all paid up this year.

T. Biggs: So, that could probably be cut.

R. Lee: I just think it could be cut, but I don't know by how much. It just seems to me that it probably could be cut.

D. Parkman: Whatever the interest is going to be, we're going to pay it, I can promise you that. Whatever you people approve, we're going to pay whatever the bank is going to charge us. I can tell you that much.

Discussion among Committee members regarding figures/calculations of interest.

B. Sneed: I've forgotten. Have we made a motion on this?

J. Bennett: I made a motion, but I can withdraw the motion.

T. Biggs: Can I ask Dave one more question? Dave, do we owe less money now than last year? We appropriated \$53,000.00 last year for interest, and we've only spent \$41,000.00 so far. Do we owe, actually, less money this year, less of an interest payment? Next year, do you anticipate us borrowing less?

D. Parkman: Well, yes, that's why it went from \$53,000.00 down to \$40,000.00. It's really kind of a guess. Whatever you people approve or something, it's either your guess or my guess. It will be paid.

R. Desmarais: Dave, you paid \$41,000.00 this year?

D. Parkman: I believe it was \$41,000.00.

K. Trussell: Yes.

R. Desmarais: \$41,000.00 this year? And, you asked for \$53,000.00, paid \$41,000.00? Now you're asking for \$40,000.00; do you think \$35,000.00 would be a safe figure? I mean, you're going down.

D. Parkman: Yes, we are going down.

R. Desmarais: Do you think you'd go down another \$4,000.00?

D. Parkman: I think the limit has gone down, too. You might try it; sure. As I said before, it's going to be paid. If you want to budget \$35,000.00, we can try it at \$35,000.00. The limit has gone from \$4.3 million down to \$4 million.

R. Desmarais: Okay, but do you feel we would be close at \$35,000.00, right?

D. Parkman: Yes.

R. Lee: Well, he comes in 20 percent below, so you can go 20 percent below 40. I make a motion we fund it at \$32,000.

J. Bennett: That wouldn't do it.

B. Sneed: Jim withdrew his motion.

A. Fowler: What's the figure?

****R. Lee moved, T. Biggs seconded to fund the Interest Budget (2000) at \$32,000.00.**

B. Sneed: Yes, \$32,000.00 is the number being bandied about at the moment. Tim seconds the motion.

N. Nelson: It seems like \$35,000.00 is a middle-of-the-road approach, but I don't know.

B. Sneed: Well, there's been a motion made and seconded for \$32,000.00.

Motion passed with two opposed (H. Potter and N. Nelson).

R. McLaughlin: Barb, do you want names of those opposed?

B. Arseneau: That would be helpful; thanks.

B. Sneed: Harry Potter and Nakomis Nelson are opposed.

1095 – DEBT SERVICE

B. Sneed: Debt Service, 1095. This is debt on the Communications Center? This is what it is.

****B. Sneed moved, J. Bennett seconded to fund Debt Service (1095) at \$66,800.00. Unanimous.**

1090 - AUDIT

B. Sneed: My notes say, from the last meeting, that the reason this has been increased is because we're now doing three audits – one for the Jail, one for the County, and one for health care.

K. Trussell: This one reflects the County and the health care; the Jail one is in the Jail section.

B. Sneed: Oh, it is?

K. Trussell: Yes.

B. Sneed: So, that's just for the County and the health.

B. Sneed: Okay.

****N. Nelson moved, R. McLaughlin seconded to fund the Audit Budget (1090) at \$8,000.00.**

R. Lee: Could somebody quickly tell me how we've done so far this year? Did they spend it?

R. Desmarais: 109%.

B. Sneed: Yeah, they're in the whole \$575.00. It's a moving target. In 2007, they actually spent \$7,300.00.

Motion passed.

1080 – ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION

R. Lee: Why did that go up? I've forgotten. They've only spend 41 percent of our \$8,500.00.

R. Desmarais: That's because they didn't pay the EMDC, and this year we have Time and Tides, or one of those, came back on. I make a motion we fund it for \$10,353.50.

N. Nelson: Second.

B. Sneed: Any discussion?

R. Lee: I'll just make the observation that if one of these is not to the liking of someone in the public, the job, I think, is to persuade the Commissioners; because we are approving what the Commissioners have asked for.

J. Hyk: I can't hear a word.

B. Sneed: Roger says that if anybody has heartburn over this, they ought to be talking to you guys, because you're the ones.

J. Hyk: Are you talking about Eastern Maine Development here?

R. Lee: Or, some other group.

J. Hyk: Well, the guy came in and said, "I wouldn't pay me either." He came in and said, "I wouldn't give us the money either." So, we didn't fight with him, but we didn't give him the money.

A. Fowler: The whole purpose, if you remember, last year at the Budget Committee meeting, we had argued what he had done for us. We asked what he had done, and he impressed upon us that he was going to get us some money to do the handicapped ramp. Remember? That was huge! So, we thought, okay, fine and then it turns out that we weren't even qualified for that grant. He admitted that.

J. Hyk: He should have known that he couldn't have gotten us the money. It was that bad; he should have known that he never have gotten us the money; it was that bad.

A. Fowler: He did; he sat at one of our meetings and said..

J. Hyk: He said, "You're right; I shouldn't get anything." So, that's what happened.

R. Lee: I'm sympathetic to Mr. Slocum's point that the County ought to consider investing in economic development for the County, but I don't think we're the audience. I think you're the audience. He should come to you and persuade you, and next year, if you're persuaded, the budget will show that.

J. Hyk: I don't disagree with you. The history of the thing is that back in the day, when they wanted to bring corn by boat for chickens, instead of by rail, Waldo County was huge in getting economic development started and getting EMDC off the ground. Over time, different regimes, different Commissioners, different Budget Committees, different this, different that, Waldo County kind of went out of the economic development business to the point where people said, "It's not our job; it's not our

business;” and nobody wanted to do it. That’s where we sort of are now. If you think it should change, I happen to agree with you.

R. Lee: I think it should, because I think economic development does more for the citizens of Waldo County.

J. Hyk: On this I agree with you and unfortunately, I won’t be around to help you.

R. Lee: Right; think about it. What people want are jobs and income; if KWRED can bring more jobs to Waldo County, it’s a small investment to accomplish that. Our Budget Committee can’t change this; it has to come from the Commissioners.

B. Sneed: We should change it, but they didn’t ask for any more.

R. Lee: That’s my point – we can’t be writing it up.

B. Sneed: All right, where are we? 1080.

****R. Desmarais moved, N. Nelson seconded to fund the Advertising and Promotion Budget(1080) at \$10,353.50. Unanimous.**

B. Sneed: I’m going to ask your indulgence just for a second – let me catch up on my paperwork.

Discussion among various individuals while Chairman Sneed looks through his paperwork.

B. Sneed: Well, this is interesting – do we have to vote on the Jail, Barb?

J. Bennett, D. Parkman, etc. all say, “No, it’s part of the budget.”

B. Arseneau: I think it’s just part of the budget.

A. Fowler: You can’t touch it.

B. Sneed: You can’t touch it.

S. Story: Actually, they kind of took that authority away from you with the statutory language. You can’t change it, move it up or down; you can’t vote to appropriate. The law says the County will appropriate it.

R. McLaughlin: Like the school budgets, then.

B. Sneed: Like the school budgets; there’s just no way around it.

S. Story: The only nice thing is that this thing don’t go up like the school budget.

R. McLaughlin: We’d have to take that two million, eight hundred and thirty-two thousand out of that last figure, but we’re not going to vote on it; but when you do the school budget, you vote on the caps.

J. Bennett: The school budget is not in the cap. County budget is not in the cap.

R. McLaughlin: My point on the two million, eight hundred and thirty-two thousand is part of the seven million, four hundred seventy-one thousand.

B. Sneed: The thing is the taxpayers are going to pay it.

R. Lee: How about if we give that twenty forty-five....

B. Sneed: Did I skip one? Where did we leave off? 1080?

N. Nelson: Yeah, so we're at 1076?

B. Sneed: Let's see if there's others that are simple.

R. Desmarais: 1070, Probate?

1070 - PROBATE

B. Sneed: So, Probate – this appears to be –

N. Nelson: It's up \$2,000.00.

J. Bennett: No, it's more than that.

B. Sneed: See, that's the problem with it, Nakomis – it's not.

N. Nelson: Why?

B. Sneed: Because it was originally –

N. Nelson: In 2008, it was \$182,000.00; in 2009, it's going to be \$184,107.95.

B. Sneed: You're right; my mistake; I'm looking at the wrong column. Right you are.

****N. Nelson moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the Probate Budget (1070) at \$184,107.95.**

Discussion:

N. Nelson: This is an overall increase over last year of 1.16 percent; it's less than inflation; it's less than the budget total we're looking at.

B. Sneed: If you look closely at this, one of the employees' salary actually down. I would agree with Nakomis; we're not talking about....

R. McLaughlin: About \$5,000.00 more.

B. Sneed: I don't see that, Dick – \$182,000.00 to \$184,000.00?

T. Biggs: We originally said \$178,653.00.

R. Desmarais: Yeah, we did – 178,653.00.

B. Sneed: No, we said \$178,000.00 because they came in with estimated just for the top two; the other ones, if you look back, they had reduced one, two, three employees by a lot of money from 2008 to 2009. Then, they gave two of them a bit of a raise; so that's the difference.

J. Hyk: They got put into a different classification is what happened.

B. Sneed: Alrighty – I shouldn't say a raise, but whatever pigeonhole they went in, they ended up with more money. One of them ended up with exactly the same as we saw – no, actually, that's not true either – a little bit more, \$400.00 or something.

R. McLaughlin: That first one there, the Register of Probate, she's getting a 4 percent.

B. Sneed: Yes, the 4 percent increase is for the judge and the Register of Probate. The rest are what they are. Did somebody make a motion?

N. Nelson: Yes, and you seconded it, in fact.

R. Lee: It seems to me that if you want to justify your cut, you have to find something that's not employee cut; or you'd have to say, "Well, we don't think you need that many employees."

J. Bennett: The department requested \$178,000.00, and the Commissioners went to \$184,000.00.

N. Nelson: I think the department request was before the union.

R. McLaughlin: So, there's nothing in 1070 to cut anyway.

B. Sneed: I guess we take away their refrigerator and let them eat semi-rotted food.

R. McLaughlin: They're at 86 percent.

N. Nelson: We already know we're going to make money with the passport/photo camera.

T. Biggs: That will make it up.

R. McLaughlin: Yeah, let's go with it.

Motion passed unanimously.

1065 – REGISTRY OF DEEDS

N. Nelson: I move we fund 1065 at \$217,518.00

J. Bennett: We'd already cut her back to \$214,000.00.

N. Nelson: That's before the union.

B. Sneed: I'll second it just to get things moving along. The bottom line really is that's basically 10 percent less than last year for this department overall.

T. Biggs: They've got to be doing 30 percent less deeds; there has been a reduction in volume. Real estate has not been moving.

N. Nelson: Except for foreclosures.

B. Sneed: Tim was wondering whether you guys are processing a lot less deeds and stuff like that these days given the...

D. Page: Well, although we have fewer deeds, we still have a lot of work to do; we don't just record deeds. We do a lot of other things.

B. Sneed: I know the lien work has gone through the roof with you guys, huh?

D. Page: Yeah, there's a lot of liens, a lot of foreclosures, tax liens, report documents, foreclosures.

N. Nelson: This seems like a fine number; it's what we agreed on before with the subtle changes of the union contracts.

D. Page: I took out one position.

R. McLaughlin: Yeah, she cut one position.

****N. Nelson moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the Registry of Deeds Budget (1065) at \$217,518.00. Unanimous.**

1030 – FACILITIES

****N. Nelson moved, H. Potter seconded to fund the Facilities Management Budget (1030) at \$298,228.80.**

R. Lee: Up for discussion?

B. Sneed: Oh, sure; go ahead.

R. Lee: Am I right that this figure is the same as what it was at the conclusion of our first session?

B. Sneed: Yes, exactly. Again, if you look at the first page, this is actually down a half a percent from the preceding year. I don't remember who was here for that discussion. Was everybody here when we did 1030 originally? We also took on a lot of the stuff of....

K. Nealley: University of Maine Extension.

B. Sneed: Yeah; stuff that's been consolidated under their umbrella rather than scattered all over the County. So, a motion made and seconded to fund department 1030 at \$298,228.80.

T. Biggs: It looks like they've only spent \$216,000.00 out of their \$295,000.00 last year, \$299,000.00. Now, I realize some of that's wages. Oh, wait a minute; I'm wrong. They still have an unexpended balance of \$21,600.00. Their wages are less than the year - \$5,000.00. Okay, I'm just bringing that to your attention; I'm not trying to make a point.

J. Hyk: You have two more warrants yet, too.

T. Biggs: Yeah. Carry on, Bill.

R. McLaughlin: May I ask a question? What would have happened if we would have finalized this budget before the union contracts were over, at 4 percent?

B. Sneed: What would it have been? I actually worked that out.

R. McLaughlin: I mean what would have happened because they would have had to pay the wages, and we hadn't appropriated them. If we hadn't finalized this budget before we got the union contracts, any of them, settled before these new figures got put in here, and we did it on the basis of approximately 4 percent and we finalized it; and then the union contracts came through at a different percentage, where would the money have come from to pay them?

B. Sneed: Well, they do have a \$100,000.00 contingency. That would have been more than enough, given John's back-of-the-envelope calculations earlier, to do it. That's where it would have come from. If you look at the statute, that's what has been defined as an emergency.

R. McLaughlin: Right, okay.

Motion passed.

1025 - TREASURER

****R. McLaughlin moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the Treasurer Budget (1025) at \$57,629.00.**

Discussion:

H. Potter: There's a \$3,000.00 raise?

J. Bennett: That's a 6.9 percent raise.

B. Sneed: Yes, it is.

H. Potter: That's what I asked: was that the same as we approved before?

T. Biggs: Six point nine?

B. Sneed: Yes.

J. Bennett: It's a 6.9 percent.

T. Biggs: I've got 35.25 down on this sheet anyway.

N. Nelson: What's a six percent raise?

B. Sneed: For the Deputy Treasurer.

R. McLaughlin: Six point nine percent. That's the one we were going to look at after tonight, wasn't it? I withdraw my motion.

B. Sneed: I'll withdraw my second.

Motion withdrawn.

B. Sneed: No, let's just leave it there for a second, Dick. I'll tell you why. Barb, you sent out a letter to us on the 17th of October telling us that, you know, constituting the Committee for the year. At the end of the first paragraph, you wrote that, "You may be aware that union contracts haven't been signed.." so there's a lot hanging out there. When by saying, "Commissioners have set for non-union employees at 4 percent for 2009."

B. Arseneau: That's what it had been to that point, I believe.

B. Sneed: So, you've changed it? So, 4 percent is no longer enough for the non-union employees. It's been changed.

D. Berry: The change has been in our office, the 4 percent applies to all others that are non-union. The only change we're talking about is the staff in our office.

B. Sneed: But, if you do the calculation for the Deputy Treasurer, that's 6.9 percent, Don.

D. Berry: I know that. She's in our office, also.

B. Sneed: So, 4 percent is for everybody else outside of your office?

D. Berry: Other than the union people, yes.

B. Sneed: Other than the union people, 4 percent is for everybody outside of your office.

D. Berry: Yes.

B. Sneed: Okay. What do you want to do, Dick?

R. McLaughlin: I withdraw my motion; let somebody else do it.

J. Bennett: I make a motion we leave that until the next time when we figure out the salaries and stuff for the other people.

N. Nelson: I think we should do this all tonight. I think we can do it, and I move that we fund the Treasurer at \$57,629.00.

R. Lee: I don't know why we're going to put this off to another night.

N. Nelson: We don't need to.

J. Hyk: We can't hear you.

R. Lee: I don't know why we're going to put this off to another night.

B. Sneed: Well, maybe we don't have to.

R. Lee: I mean, I would just like to see if we can or can not; I don't think we have to, necessarily, have to do it. I think we should consider working through whatever we think is a reasonable quitting time. It may already be pre-ordained at eight. I'm just talking about possibly a little later.

B. Sneed: A reasonable quitting time would have been August first.

N. Nelson: We're on track for moving right through this.

R. McLaughlin: Going back to what Nakomis said a little while ago, what's everybody favor looking at as a percentage increase for the bottom line? Are we going to work towards that, or are we just going to go with what's there?

N. Nelson: Four point six one took me off guard; 1.23 doesn't.

B. Sneed: I think there's still some things to move around in here, too.

N. Nelson: But, 1.23; when you figure that the Jail, which is part of this 1.23 number, even though we can't touch it, is up 15.76 percent. To have the County budget up 1.23 percent, really, we're looking at reducing the County budget considerably.

T. Biggs: Not really. We're still paying for the Jail; we just don't set that amount anymore.

N. Nelson: Exactly; but if you have this line up that much to have that line up that much, something gives; something is reduced.

T. Biggs: Actually, if you look at this budget, the big drop is in Employee Benefits. If it weren't for the fact that they have dropped Employee Benefits by \$500,000.00, down 36 percent, you wouldn't see this one percent increase. Across the board, actually, there are much larger increases.

N. Nelson: Reserves.

T. Biggs: Seriously, there are lots and lots of large increases in this budget.

R. McLaughlin: It's easy to say 1.2/3 percent, but .23 percent of seven million dollars is..

N. Nelson: We're at 1.2 percent increase.

R. McLaughlin: I'm saying that if you held it at 1 percent and cut it .23 percent, what would that be? It would be a quarter of a percent.

T. Biggs: I guess I'm coming from a different end of Nakomis, being on the poor side of the County; and I see the State cutting their budget by 5 percent – or, a lot more than that, 10 percent, at least – I see our town faced with SAD costs that are going to increase by 10 percent. How can we justify having the County at a 1 percent increase?

N. Nelson: Well, we went through this all for a couple of weeks, and we came up with.

T. Biggs: But, things have worsened since then. I mean, the County does not look good.

N. Nelson: So, what we're talking about is going back through this all over again; unless you're thinking in these remaining items we're going to come up with some serious cuts.

B. Sneed: I think we can.

R. Lee: That's what I'm thinking.

R. Desmarais: I don't think we should be blinded by a percentage at the bottom of the page; let's go by department, what their needs are, what we feel we can afford in these times. This is not good times.

R. Lee: I don't feel that the 1.2 percent is a reflection of the County holding down its expenses. As I said earlier, it's largely because of the Employee Benefit line falling by \$500,000.00.

R. Desmarais: I don't think it fell; I think about \$400,000.00 moved over to the Jail, was added to the Jail.

B. Sneed: It's a one-time move.

R. Desmarais: It's a one-time move, but it's still there.

N. Nelson: But, this is the County budget – it's up 1.2 percent over what it was last year – however you want to put it, whatever department you put it in, it's up 1.2 percent, when inflation is somewhere close to 4 percent. So, you are giving each department that much less buying power, spending power and working power.

R. McLaughlin: And, the economic picture is going down the hill.

N. Nelson: I could not agree more with that.

****N. Nelson moved, H. Potter seconded to fund the Treasurer Budget (1025) at \$57,629.00. Motion passed with three opposed (T. Biggs, J. Bennett, R. Desmarais).**

1020 – COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

****N. Nelson moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund County Commissioners Budget (1020) in the amount of \$565,852.44.**

Discussion:

B. Sneed: I want to see; I would like to see line 7001...look at the budget; we have to look at these sheets here. The original ones that we had, Jim broke this thing out, and he included \$31,000.00, of which

\$25,000.00 was to replace laptops. Now, we have capital reserve accounts just to replace old equipment; and I think that \$25,000.00 ought to come out of capital reserve and not be in this line. I also think that line 7000, \$12,900.00 for wireless cards for those laptops, should come out of capital reserves.

R. Lee: How much do we usually have in capital reserve?

B. Sneed: \$123,000.00; one point some million all toll.

R. Lee: Can I ask a question? I wasn't here the night – the age of the laptops we're replacing – age and the average configuration of a laptop.

J. Arseneau: Aw, those laptops are 2001/2002; they're running Windows 2000; they won't support XP; and they take 15 to 20 minutes to boot up. We have rebuilt with the operating system to make sure that they're cleaned out. I just have one question with regards to the wireless cards: Bill, I understood that, originally, you folks had set up the Technology Reserves, and that was not to be used for monthly, recurring fees. There is a monthly, recurring cost for the data cards of \$9,000.00. So, are we setting a precedent to go ahead and use the reserve to cover the monthly charges, or are we going to buy just the equipment? Just a question.

N. Nelson: I have a question, too. With the wireless cards, are those for wireless Internet? Don't those come in computers nowadays?

J. Arseneau: No, those are Wi-Fi cards; these are cellular data cards that allow the deputies to be anywhere in the County, not beside a building that has a Wi-Fi.

B. Sneed: So, the \$12,900.00 is actually two things bundled?

J. Arseneau: Right; and if you look at number six, it's broken out: one-time equipment costs of \$3,400.00 and a monthly, recurring cost of about \$9,500.00. That's on page two of that explanation under item six. That was that separate sheet.

B. Sneed: That monthly cost of \$9,500.00 is for how many cards?

J. Arseneau: You have the five new cards, plus there is an existing five cards that are also in use at this time; so it's supporting existing cards that are being used, as well.

N. Nelson: So, it's \$9,500.00 a month or a year?

J. Arseneau: That's for the entire year.

N. Nelson: So, \$100.00 a month per card, something like that?

J. Arseneau: No, the actual cost of the card per month runs about \$55.00 when you're done with some of the extra surcharges that everybody's required to pay. They don't pay tax, but there is some surcharge that gets collected. Just so you folks know, too, if you use the data cards and use a very conservative figure for what it will save in trips to the office; and the officers that use them will attest to that, there is a potential savings of several outwards of \$10,000.00 possibly in gasoline and maintenance fees because the officers can stay in their patrol areas instead of coming back to do paperwork. It's a soft number; we can't say specifically that you're going to save definitely \$11,000.00, you're going to save \$9,000.00, but

there is a savings. As you talk to the officers, you'll see that is the case. It keeps them in their patrol area; they don't have to turn around; their respond time is better, too.

R. Desmarais: Our town is going for some laptops, and their doing it through a grant.

J. Arseneau: That's the grant that I wrote for the County.

R. Desmarais: Okay. Why are we paying what we're paying? Are we going through a grant here?

J. Arseneau: This number 6 is for the existing cards and for the seven laptops that we have. In the other side where you have the additional laptops, that is in a grant, along with the cards. If we don't get the grant, you folks had said that we could go ahead and lease the combined charge of \$31,000.00 a year – I think it was five years.

B. Sneed: I'd still like to see that line, then, reduced by \$3,500.00.

R. Lee: Which line by \$3,500.00?

B. Sneed: 7000.

J. Arseneau: For the one-time equipment cost?

B. Sneed: Yes.

J. Arseneau: Okay.

B. Sneed: And, I'd like to see 7001 reduced by \$25,000.00 That's \$32,000.00. Take it out of capital reserves. That's why we got it. I'm going to withdraw my second of the motion.

Motion Withdrawn.

R. McLaughlin: That's taking how much off, Bill?

B. Sneed: \$32,000.00.

R. McLaughlin: So, \$3,500.00 and \$25,000.00?

N. Nelson: I don't get \$32,000.00.

B. Sneed: \$28,500.00; I'm sorry; you're right.

R. Desmarais: You do have a motion on the floor, then, for \$28,500.00; or are you going to keep looking?

T. Biggs: That comes pretty close to the amount; he's right about the 30. It's \$28,500.00

R. McLaughlin: I just got \$30,000.00.

B. Sneed: You want to do that, Dick? Make it an even number?

R. McLaughlin: Yes, \$35,000.00.

T. Biggs: Is that the total number here? We're not going to look at anything else?

B. Sneed: Go ahead. Keep looking, Tim.

R. McLaughlin: I move that we appropriate \$535,852.44.

R. Desmarais: I still want to discuss the stipend for \$8,000.00. We had voted to take that away, and it appears again.

T. Biggs: How did that come back?

R. Desmarais: I don't know. Barbara, why does the...

B. Arseneau: Do you want to answer this, Karen?

K. Trussell: That \$565,852.44 does not include that \$8,000.

B. Arseneau: We should probably have had a striking through it.

R. Desmarais: You're sure, now?

K. Trussell: On that cover page, it does not include that \$8,000.

B. Sneed: Okay. Thanks, Karen.

****R. McLaughlin moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the County Commissioners' Budget (1020) at \$535,852.44. Unanimous.**

1015 – DISTRICT ATTORNEY

R. McLaughlin: That was all union stuff?

B. Sneed: Dick McLaughlin asked is this mostly union stuff, and I think the answer is clearly yes. There is \$7,159.00 just in increases in the personnel line from when last we visited to the current.

****R. McLaughlin moved, R. Lee seconded to fund the District Attorney Budget (1015) at \$168,816.00. Motion passed with one opposed (J. Bennett).**

BREAK

2045 - RESERVES

B. Sneed: Dave, you gave us an explanation the last time we met about there's been a lot of money deposited in Reserves this year, and it was because some Jail account was closed or some State account was closed out?

D. Parkman: To run our County Jail over the years, the State has helped us out every year to the tune of, I think, \$140,000.00 to \$175,000.00, depending on the year. It has risen up, and you'll see that on the Revenue sheet, if you will, you should have a \$166,000.00 paid this year – the Revenue sheet, where it says "Revenues." It says \$166,000.00 on there, whatever we got – \$175,000.00. That is when the State pays the County that amount, it's County money free and clear. We have a different account up in Bangor Savings that we keep, what I call, the Jail account. We have used it on the Revenues, so the taxpayers are taking advantage of that figure. We have saved the money up, and the \$300,000.00 that we took this year came out of that account.

B. Sneed: And, you put those into the reserves.

D. Parkman: We put those into the reserves. It's County money, and it's been in the revenues to lower the taxes right along.

B. Sneed: So, it's basically the accounts closed.

D. Parkman: Right; so every year we've just saved that money, we didn't spend it or didn't authorize the spending of it, so it's in that account. We decided to put it into the Reserves.

B. Sneed: At the moment, there are only three lines funded under this \$134,000.00 for employment security, \$154,000.00 for severance and \$50,000.00 for Technology.

N. Nelson: I vaguely remember there being some insecurity that the employment security and the severance number was enough, but maybe we decided it was. I guess I don't see how there's anything to cut here.

****N. Nelson moved, H. Potter seconded to fund the Reserves (2045) at \$82,500.00.**

B. Sneed: Motion made and seconded. I should, I guess, mention that there is almost \$124,000.00 in the Technology Capital Reserve.

N. Nelson: We just took \$25,000.00 out of that though, right?

B. Sneed: No. That's what they're going to spend it on if they don't get a grant. There's \$124,000.00 in that account at the moment.

N. Nelson: It seemed like there were some pretty big future needs pitched to us.

B. Sneed: Yeah, there always are. Between June 30th and December 31st, that account has grown exclusive of expenditures out of. It has grown by \$30,000.00.

N. Nelson: Money in the bank.

B. Sneed: There was a motion made and seconded. All in favor of funding Reserves at the current level? I'm not; I'd like to take \$10,000.00 out of that Technology.

Motion failed with R. Lee, T. Biggs, R. McLaughlin, B. Sneed, R. Desmarais and J. Bennett opposed.

****B. Sneed moved, J. Bennett seconded to reduce Technology line 0162 to \$40,000.00, reducing the Reserves bottom line to \$72,500.00. Motion passed with two opposed (H. Potter and N. Nelson).**

B. Sneed: Who haven't we done?

N. Nelson: Seventy-five and seventy-six.

1050 – JAIL

B. Sneed: Dick Desmarais suggested, just to cover your posterior move, I think we ought to vote on the Jail, 1050. It's moot; it's moot, but it's part of the budget. I just think we ought to get it on the record that we recognize it's there and vote on it.

****B. Sneed moved, J. Bennett seconded to fund the Jail Budget (1050) at \$2,832,353.00. Unanimous.**

B. Sneed: What's left?

R. McLaughlin: Sheriff and dispatch.

B. Sneed: Pick one.

1076 – COMMUNICATIONS CENTER

N. Nelson: It seems like we went through this before.

B. Sneed: Oh, yeah. I guess this is where I sort of fall apart on the logic we've been pursuing tonight. When we last left this, it was budgeted for salary increases of 4 percent, and we left the bottom line at \$726,325 and some change. It is now up \$70,000.00.

N. Nelson: How? It's up to \$727,000.00; you said it was \$726,000.00. It's up by a thousand dollars.

R. Desmarais: Yes, it's only up a thousand.

B. Sneed: Okay; I'm looking again; I'm looking at this sheet where it says \$809,000.00 on the actual detail.

N. Nelson: No, no, it's what is below that, plus benefits.

B. Sneed: My mistake, my mistake; right you are.

T. Biggs: It looks like their union negotiations came out at pretty close to 4 percent.

N. Nelson: So, I guess I move that we fund 1076 at \$727,669.91.

****N. Nelson moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the Communications Center Budget (1076) at \$727,669.91.**

Discussion:

B. Sneed: Is Owen here?

T. Biggs: The motion is for the figure on the sheet.

B. Sneed: Yeah, the motion's for the figure on the sheet. Again, I come back to; Owen, I take it you're not a union employee, and your pay increase is 6.4 percent this year. You're not in the Commissioners' office.

O. Smith: I have a step increase coming in June. What happens when you have a 4 percent across-the-board increase, that 4 percent across-the-board increase doesn't take into effect step increases. Unlike 5 or 6 people, and I can't tell you the exact number, it's 5 or 6, most of the employees of Waldo County have a graduated pay increase based on longevity, which is very common in public service. It always has been based on longevity. It runs something like six months one year, two years, five years, eight years, twelve years, so everybody has that. Five or six people don't have that. What the five or six people have, including myself, is that have two increments of pay raises – they have a 4 percent at seven, and a 4 percent at 15. Down in the ranks and file, you have several people that are going to get pay increases this year; and personnel longevity just kind of happens to be a pretty big load in the fifth year. It's not an even step. We tried to change that three years ago, Scott working on the pay scale, we tried to even it out, but we didn't. So, in addition to the 4 percent, they get step increases.

B. Sneed: I take it Mr. Stevenson is in the same boat, then.

O. Smith: Yes, he is.

B. Sneed: Okay. Thank you. Dick Desmarais?

R. Desmarais: I want to talk about line 3001, overtime, and 3100, part-time. You're asking for 100 percent increase in the overtime; you asked for over a 500 percent increase on the part-time, and we cut it down to \$40,000.00, which is about a 400 percent increase. I think that is; I know you talked quite awhile on it, but I still think that in this economy, that's quite a stretch. I'd like to see that reduced; I don't to what level; I feel very comfortable around \$40,000.00. I'm going to put it on the floor and make motion.

J. Bennett: We cut it to \$40,000.00.

R. Desmarais: We did cut to \$40,000.00; cut line 3001 and 3100, between the two of them, we dropped the two figures, which is around \$56,000.00, down to \$40,000.00.

A. Fowler: For the two?

B. Sneed: That doesn't make sense, Dick.

R. Desmarais: It doesn't?

O. Smith: The budget figures for 2009 reflects what we spent in 2008 with the increases. That was the number that we had when we started this thing, because we've had several payrolls since then. That's the number that we had. We projected what it would be at the end of the year and multiplied by the 4 percent to come up with a real number, instead of the false number that we worked from last year.

R. Desmarais: Where I'm coming from, Owen, on this is that you're asking for part-time to be increased in the 2008 budget from \$10,000.00; you were given \$10,000.00 in 2008. You asked for \$52,000.00 in 2009; we cut it back to \$40,000.00. Okay? Now follow me on the other line, 3101, overtime. In 2008, you asked for \$18,883; you're now asking for \$35,000.00 for 2009. Those are big increases.

N. Nelson: That's because we spent that money; that's what it's costing us.

O. Smith: It's what we spent this year. If you look at what we spent to date this year, it wasn't enough.

N. Nelson: It's 911; you can't have somebody call 911 and have the phone ring.

R. Desmarais: You haven't been over there; there's somebody there to answer it. If the first person can't get it, the second or third one can.

B. Sneed: I guess I have a question – how did you fund the negatives?

O. Smith: It came somewhere else out of the County budget. Everybody kind of scoffs at this, and I don't understand it. This is public safety. You hear from Scott [Sheriff Story] that his business is up, and it's going to go up. Roger Lee heard from the Chief of Police Belfast that his business is up and is going to go up. You have a proactive Chief in Searsport now; that business is up and it's going to go up. Crime is not going to decrease in Waldo County; it's going to go up because of the circumstances. You need people to answer the phone twenty-four, seven. This is what it cost. In 2000, the people of Waldo County voted to put in a 911 center. We combined Belfast with Waldo County into a regional communications center, with the dispatch we have, plus one. Why would we take last year's figures, which we know is off by \$44,000.00, and continue to perpetuate that? We don't have any excess people up there; we go three during the day and two over night. We always fill the seats. We answer the phone for Waldo County Sheriff's Department, Belfast Police Department, and for every other emergency that comes in – fire, ambulance – anything that comes is, we answer the phone. There are not people sitting around twiddling their thumbs.

N. Nelson: How long, when a serious call comes in, how long does somebody stay on the phone with the person that's called in?

O. Smith: When you take the shooting incident in Stockton Springs, we had two people on the phone involved in that for the entire incident.

N. Nelson: So, an hour?

O. Smith: An hour, an hour and twenty minutes. The shooting, the homicide the other day, we had two people tied up with that for 45 minutes.

N. Nelson: To say the second or third person will get it, if the first person doesn't, is foolish! If we have two people and two people are on the phone for an hour dealing with a serious crime, to try to cut part-time, they're going to stop that position and the money is going to come from somewhere else in the budget. It's going to get spent. It is absolutely beyond me why this is even a point of discussion.

O. Smith: An ambulance call that requires EMD, you could dispatchers on the phone for up to an hour just keeping people doing pre-arrival instructions until an ambulance gets there. That is mandated by the

State of Maine that every dispatcher be EMD certified – full-time and part-time. EMD changed the whole thing, part of it, for our ambulances, because now you have to perform EMD services.

R. Desmarais: Owen, I'm withdrawing my motion.

A. Fowler: Thank you.

R. Lee: Could I understand? What did we do to the budget the first night? I wasn't here. It looks like we struck the ergonomic consoles – did we do that?

B. Sneed: Yes.

R. Lee: And, we struck something else over here – we trimmed it down already. I want to be sure we know where it is. Oh, training?

R. McLaughlin: We did trim it down, but they've got the original up.

R. Lee: Well, only by the union contract, no.

B. Arseneau: Yes.

N. Nelson: By the union contract and by what it went over last year because we didn't have enough staff hired to staff it.

R. Lee: What I'm driving at is did the overtime and the part-time get lowered at all in your first round?

N. Nelson: Yes.

R. Desmarais: Yeah, it did. The part-time got lowered by \$12,000.00. He had a lot of people in training.

J. Bennett: How about the overtime?

R. Desmarais: The overtime never got lowered the first time; it did not. It stayed at \$35,000.00, according to what I have in my notes.

J. Bennett: That's what I got, too.

R. Desmarais: The one that got lowered was the part-time to \$40,000.00.

R. McLaughlin: If we lowered it the first time, how did it get in here the second time? They just put it back in?

R. Desmarais: I have it here.

R. McLaughlin: I know, but why did they put it back in?

R. Desmarais: I don't know what they have over here.

R. Lee: Why do you say they put it back in?

R. McLaughlin: Because it was \$40,000.00 the last time.

K. Trussell: It's still in at \$40,000.00, if you look at the number – \$726, 325.86 reflects the \$40,000.00.

R. Lee: \$40,000.00 for part-time?

N. Nelson: We're down from \$809,000.00 to that.

K. Trussell: It was increased to \$727,669.91 because one employee of his [Owen Smith] is under union contract. So, that amount went up that amount.

R. Lee: So, the rest of the employees in the Comm. Center are non-unionized?

S. Story: No, no; there's one support staff employee that he and I share.

R. Lee: I see, and the remainder are another union that you haven't concluded yet.

D. Berry: Yes, that's correct.

B. Sneed: Has anybody made a motion?

B. Arseneau: I was going to say something, but you already withdrew your motion. You had a motion on the floor from before. Nakomis Nelson moved and you seconded for discussion - \$727,669.91.

R. McLaughlin: I move that figure for 1076 – the number she just said.

B. Sneed: \$727,669.91.

N. Nelson: Yep.

B. Arseneau: That motion was still on the floor, the first one.

Motion passed with two opposed (T. Biggs and B. Sneed).

B. Sneed: What's left?

R. McLaughlin: The Sheriff and Benefits.

1075 - SHERIFF

B. Sneed: I guess people have questions about this deputy.

S. Story: Fire away.

B. Sneed: Somebody's going to ask you. Step up; who's going to ask.

J. Bennett: I make a motion that we cut it.

R. Lee: Second that.

A. Fowler: Could you repeat the motion, please?

B. Sneed: To reduce the hire of a new deputy to zero.

R. Lee: What does that save us?

T. Biggs: \$33,917.00 plus benefit package.

N. Nelson: What's it cost us in overtime for the employees we already have?

R. McLaughlin: He's got \$40,000.00, roughly \$40,000.00, put in there for overtime.

A. Fowler: So, you're taking the deputy away that you had given us last meeting?

B. Sneed: That's the motion at the moment, Amy.

A. Fowler: That's the current motion?

R. Lee: I was going to ask, because I wasn't here the other night, just a really quickly – where is the \$155,000.00? This has gone up from '08 to '09 by 155.

T. Biggs: It's one cruiser additional from last year? I think we replaced two last year, or three?

S. Story: If I can, you have two salaries that were moved from the Jail, two half salaries, that accounts for about, almost \$55,000.00 there. Plus, we had asked for a fourth cruiser, and we had asked for two new deputies.

R. Lee: You asked for a fourth cruiser – that's just replacing.

S. Story: Well, three handles our rotation right now with our existing staff level. The fourth one we asked for in anticipation of two new officers; we were going to need the fourth cruiser to start into that rotation.

R. Lee: So, we can get rid of the cruiser and the deputy.

S. Story: Well, you have already removed one cruiser and one deputy, and tonight when we came in you had left me with one deputy. Now, make no mistake, I'm not going to jump and down here and start screaming and hollering, "You cut this other deputy." I do recognize the economic times we're in, but here's the other thing: the call share agreement with the Maine State Police has changed; my staff, right now, is going to be asked to increase their amount of work by nearly 18 percent of what they're doing right now. Eighteen percent of my staff was a little bit more than two deputies; that's why I had asked for the two deputies. When you read today in the newspaper that the State Police reduced their presence because they only had six troopers, and I've got 12 deputies, or whatever they put in there, that's a little misleading. They have 300 and some odd troopers; they just choose not to put that many in Waldo

County. The troop they are out of here have 24 some odd troopers. Again, they choose to dedicate six to Waldo County. They have left us with an 18 percent increase in services. As Director Smith has said, our calls for service are going up every day. The seriousness of the calls that we're getting are increasing every day. Quite frankly, some are decreasing every day. My officers are being asked to do way more than they ever were. We're going to houses now when people's seven year old children are out of control and they don't know how to deal with them in the morning to get them to school. The kitty cat up a tree thing seems to have slowed a bit, but, believe me, there's everything else that you can imagine under the sun that we're being asked to respond to. Tough economic times? I totally understand that, but when we have tough economic times, we're also going to be asked to do more. We've been fortunate; we have some good municipality police departments; Belfast does a great job; Searsport is doing a great job; Lincolnville is; but the calls for service are still going up. For the same reasons that the Director has increased work load in his Communications Center, I'm seeing it in the field. And, I know it's going to increase 18 percent next year.

R. McLaughlin: Scott, if we cut line 4200 by \$20,000.00, do you think you could live with that?

S. Story: 4200 is.....

R. McLaughlin: Maintenance, gas, tires.

S. Story: You want to cut it by how much?

R. McLaughlin: Twenty.

S. Story: You know, that's always a roll of the dice. If the fuel prices stay down where they are right now, that's going to be very comfortable. I'm not comfortable that the fuel prices are going to stay down where they are - if somebody's got a better crystal ball than I do.

N. Nelson: Yeah, that is a good point.

T. Biggs: I think they'll stay down.

B. Sneed: Scott, 300,00 gallons – I've forgotten. You did it last time; you told us, I think, it was 300,000.00 gallons at \$3.00 a gallon.

S. Story: No, I don't use that much fuel. It's bad, but it ain't that bad. Hang on; my fuel consumption – I figured 30,000.

B. Sneed: 30,000? I'm off by a factor of ten. Okay.

Many Committee members speaking at once about the amount of gallons.

S. Story: 30,000 gallons.

T. Biggs: At how much a gallon?

S. Story: When I originally calculated it at \$4.50 because, remember, when I did my budget back in August, it was \$4.00 and change; that came up to \$135,000.00 for fuel, \$50,000.00 in repairs. That was the \$185,000.00 that I originally recommended.

N. Nelson: Who's got a calculator?

T. Biggs: \$75,000.00.

N. Nelson: Is the savings; if we do it at?

T. Biggs: At \$2.00 a gallon, it would be \$60,000.00.

S. Story: I think you had already cut that line because we all agreed that probably \$4.15 or \$4.50 was high. The fuel prices have come down since the day I did that budget, so we actually cut it back; I think we used the \$3.50 number. Bill? Somebody?

B. Sneed: I think that probably works out.

J. Bennett: \$150,000.00.

B. Arseneau: Yes; you reduced it down to \$150,000.00.

S. Story: Right; and I think we did that by going to the \$3.50 a gallon.

N. Nelson: From \$4.50.

S. Story: What's that? Yeah, from \$4.50.

N. Nelson: I could feel in my heart safe in saying that I think, over next year, fuel will average at something around, or less, than \$2.50 a gallon.

T. Biggs: I went by a station outside of Boston and they were selling gas at \$1.57.9.

N. Nelson: I think I heard; I mean, oil was at \$36.00 a barrel last, and that's the lowest it's been in a long time.

A. Fowler: But, they have cut how much they're producing.

N. Nelson: Yeah, but the Russian's didn't, the second largest. Anyway, all I guess I'm getting at is that would be \$30,000.00 that could come out of here. If you've burned 30,000.00 gallons; so I guess I would move that we cut that by another \$30,000.00.

R. Desmarais: The other thing that was mentioned by Mr. Arseneau is these cards should save you there, too. Am I correct?

S. Story: Again, it's a tough thing to put a number on; but, no question, they are saving us some. The other thing, just so that you know; and believe me, I'm not sitting here begging you to take money out of my gas line; but we've instituted a new program with Right Express who does some deductions on federal

taxes for us. We're managing our fuel consumption a little bit better with that. We can keep a closer eye on it. It's a nice program we just started. I can't tell you how well it's going to work in the long term, but in the short term, we're optimistic.

B. Sneed: Just, and this has no effect on the money, just whoever's keeping track of making typographical changes and so forth, in line 7000 – cruisers – the number should be 3, not 4; and the same with Warranties – the number should be 3, not 4.

N. Nelson: Why's that?

B. Sneed: Because we had already reduced one cruiser and one deputy.

A. Fowler: Sorry.

B. Sneed: That's all right – it's just a typo.

R. Desmarais: I think we have one motion on the floor and Nakomis, I think yours was the second one before the first one's been voted on.

N. Nelson: Okay; what was your motion?

J. Bennett: To cut the deputy, not hire the deputy.

N. Nelson: Was that seconded?

J. Bennett: Yes.

B. Sneed: Any more discussion on that? All in favor of doing that.

A. Fowler: Of doing what?

B. Sneed: Reducing the deputies hired to zero.

A. Fowler: Can I just say, for whatever it's worth, we all know exactly where we're going to stand with the State. The State is going to look out for the State or whatever. I guess my thought is that we probably need to take care of our own, that's Waldo County, and not assume that the State is going to hold up on their end of the deal. I really hope that you don't take that deputy away that you had given us. Respectfully, do as you will.

R. Desmarais: I'm not against hiring another deputy.

A. Fowler: But?

R. Desmarais: But, not in 2009.

A, Fowler: But, statistics don't just show the facts, Dick, when the economy is bad, especially during the holidays and the economy's bad. The crime is going to go through the roof.

N. Nelson: I think we can cut some money in the gas; I hope that we can maybe take a middle of the road approach here.

B. Sneed: All right; there's a motion made and seconded. All in favor of reducing the number of deputies to zero; all in favor of doing that? All opposed? This is the problem with being only eight of us.

N. Nelson: This is the problem we had when we were talking about two deputies before, wasn't it?

B. Sneed: Yes, it is; and there were only eight of us that time.

Laughter.

A. Fowler: Yes, a tie vote's a no vote.

B. Sneed: Tie vote's a no vote.

R. McLaughlin: Can we go on to the next motion, then?

****B. Sneed moved, R. McLaughlin seconded to reduce line 4200 by \$30,000.00 to a total \$120,000.00. Unanimous.**

R. Desmarais: You're getting that extra deputy, Scott. You're asking for over \$20,000.00 increase in the overtime. You're going to have a man who is going to give you 2,080 hours worth of labor. I'm going to make a motion that the overtime stays at the 2008 level, \$93,622.44, in light of picking up over 2,000.00 hours worth of labor.

S. Story: Is it appropriate for me to speak, or should I sit here and shut up?

B. Sneed: I'll speak first, I think; I'll second it, just so I can speak. They're already \$5,300.00 in the hole in that account now.

R. Desmarais: They're picking up 2,080 hours; that's where I'm coming from.

B. Sneed: Okay. Now speak, Scott.

S. Story: The 2,080 hours is going to account for, and this is really thin numbers, but I'm going to play it somewhere out about a 10 percent increase in my manpower forces. I've got to find a 10-speed bicycle for him to ride, because you took his car away. If we do manage to scratch him into an older car somewhere, you've just reduced the fuel down, and remember, my calls for service, I know, I know without anything else happening, are going to increase by 18 percent. The overtime number that you're looking at this year, our utilization that covers everything extra that we do. That covers the man we put on Islesboro all summer; that covers the backfill for vacations, sick, comp time. That's a hard number; that's not an estimate; that's a hard number that we know what it looks like. To go back to last year's figures, you're completely ignoring what the additional cost is for covering those individuals, based on even just a cost of living increase.

R. Desmarais: Scott, if we wouldn't have given you this man, you would have gotten by with no problem with that \$20,000.00. You would have gotten by with the \$20,000.00 increase in your overtime. You

would have made do. Now, you're picking up 2,080 hours; that's the hang up. It's like, we're getting it on this end and we're getting it on that end. We're giving you 2,080 hours.

N. Nelson: What we did to get by this year was go in the hole on that account.

S. Story: I've given you justification for that by 18 percent increase in calls for service. If we're going to ignore the 18 percent calls for service increase, if we're going to ignore that we're getting more calls, then, yeah, cut it. Cut the new officer; whack the overtime; but you know what? At the end of the day, you will have a deputy come to your house for your emergency. The difference might be that he might have three more ahead of you before he gets to your house. That's the decision that you're making – not me. I'm not going to jump up and down; I will do with what you give me.

R. Desmarais: I can't look past the fact that you're asking for it both days, when you're picking up 2,080 hours; that's why my motion's out there. I think I'm justified in saying what I'm saying, and I understand what you're saying. So, let's air it out.

S. Story: Okay; sure.

R. Desmarais: Okay.

R. Lee: Can I just ask a question? You mentioned overtime, and in the same breath, you mentioned that's how where you get the money for Islesboro. Could you explain yourself?

S. Story: Sure. Islesboro is a little bit of a unique situation in that we don't have a person over there all the time.

R. Lee: Yeah, I know; it's in the summer.

S. Story: Right; so in the summertime, I send an individual over there; it's usually a full-time officer, and I have to backfill his slot on the mainland when I ship over to the island.

B. Sneed: Just one more sort of typographical thing, I think: if you look under the department total, on the detailed sheet here, it's \$1,191,669.00; but if you look at the summary sheet, it's \$1,193,000.00.

K. Trussell: Patrol has ratified; so that's the increase in patrol union.

B. Sneed: So, we should change that one over here to \$1,193,000.00, Karen? Just on the detailed page; just so I keep the details straight.

N. Nelson: These don't have the union contracts on that detail page.

K. Trussell: Right; I took what you guys already approved and took the difference in the ratification, and that's where the \$1,193,000.00 comes from.

B. Sneed: But, if we were to vote right now without considering what Dick's talking about, without considering the \$30,000.00 gas, the number we would be voting on is \$1,193,000.00.

K. Trussell: That's correct; yes.

B. Sneed: Okay; thank you.

N. Nelson: So, we have a motion about..

B. Sneed: Yes, the overtime.

R. Lee: A question about tie votes – so, we're just talking about a particular line in the budget is at a tie, so I guess we don't change anything. If we felt strongly enough about something and there was a tie vote at the end on the whole budget?

B. Sneed: I'm too tired to follow that.

N. Nelson: Don't even suggest such things.

R. Lee: Well, you see, somebody said a tie vote is a no vote. A tie vote would be non-approval of the budget, so how would we handle that?

B. Sneed: Not well.

Laughter.

B. Sneed: I mean, of all the departments you don't want to fund, it's probably not this one at Christmas. I get my share of tickets and things like that, so I would like to see the Sheriff go away forever, but it ain't going to happen.

N. Nelson: So, we need to vote on that.

B. Sneed: Yes, we do. All in favor of reducing the overtime – oh, go ahead, Dick, sorry.

R. McLaughlin: Scott, if you have so much in your budget for overtime and you get to that point (You've already done it; you've overdrawn it.), you're going to put the person on the road anyway. Right? If you need them.

S. Story: Dick, I've been Sheriff, now, since 2000, and I've never run a patrol budget over. I've been over a few pennies here or a few pennies there, but I take a lot of pride that I don't run a budget over from what you people approve.

R. McLaughlin: But, you might run a line in the budget over.

S. Story: I might run a line over in one place and scratch it out of another place, but I take a lot of pride that I've never gone over my budgets.

R. McLaughlin: I know you hadn't done that, but I meant on the lines.

S. Story: No, I can move things from one side to another; but I've got to be honest with you, we're starting to cut a little thin here. You know, I'm not saying this at the expense of any other employee of this County or any other place, but these deputies put together a contract with an increase in their salaries,

which is not a heck of a lot more than the cost of living. My senior staff, anybody else that's non-union, is looking at a 4 percent cost of living increase. There's no huge personnel increases in this thing other than that new person. All of my employees now are contributing towards their health insurance. There's been a lot of changes.

R. McLaughlin: I understand that.

S. Story: What I'm asking you for isn't, believe me, I'd be just as tickled to death if I only had to manage six patrol officers. I'm putting this in front of you; and again, I keep telling you I'm not going to jump up and down; and please, I'm not. You folks are making this decision for our constituents. The State Police are telling you that they're not going to be here 18 percent as much as they were before. If you're comfortable with an 18 percent gap in services, then go ahead. If you're in the least bit uncomfortable with it, my staff is ready to step up to the plate and cover that.

R. McLaughlin: I guess my question was: you're going to put a patrol officer on if you need them, somehow.

N. Nelson: I think what he's telling you, though is, he isn't going to take money that he doesn't have; and if you don't give him the money he needs, he isn't.

R. McLaughlin: You don't have to tell me what he's telling me – I know what he's telling me.

S. Story: No, I'll put them on the road as long as I've got money for them somewhere, Dick; but if at the end of my budget, I'm sitting there looking at a month left or two months left and I'm out of money, I'm going to pull them off the road.

R. McLaughlin: That's what I wanted to know. Thank you.

B. Sneed: Motion made and seconded. Any more discussion? All in favor?

T. Biggs: How much are you asking to cut?

R. Desmarais: Go back to last year's.

B. Sneed: Which was roughly..

R. Lee: Ninety-three six twenty-two?

B. Sneed: Yes.

N. Nelson: And, which is already overdrawn this year.

J. Bennett: And, they're getting a new deputy, so that will take care of

R. Desmarais: 2,080.

B. Sneed: All right; motion made and seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor of Dick Desmarais' motion to reduce overtime? Here we go again. All opposed? Tie vote. Motion fails.

N. Nelson: So, I move we fund the Sheriff at \$1,163,014.02, minus \$30,000.00 in the payroll.

B. Sneed: I'll second it. Any discussion? All in favor of funding the Sheriff at \$1,163,014.02?

R. Lee: How about if the vote is opposed to it.

B. Sneed: Well, if it's opposed, we'll be back here next week, Roger, because I'll adjourn. Of all the departments you have to fund, this would be the dumbest one not to fund. I'm sorry.

R. Lee: Here's the problem I have: I think in this climate, we shouldn't be increasing this budget.

T. Biggs: I agree.

N. Nelson: But, you're increasing the services.

J. Bennett: I don't think that we're not funding him; it's just, I think that instead of taking fuel away of him and overtime, we should be doing away with two deputies and let him have his fuel money, etc.

H. Potter: I can support a deputy next year, not this year.

B. Sneed: We've got to do something. We can't just do nothing.

S. Story: Guys, if you're going to scratch – let me throw this out. If you're going to scratch my overtime and you're going to scratch my fuel, I'm telling you right now that I'd rather you scratch the officer; because one officer is going to me do no good if I've got no money to pay him and if I've got no fuel to run him on the road. Keep in mind, this new guy has to go to the Academy; I've already got one guy that's got to go to the Academy next year that I haven't pushed through yet. I just had one graduate today; I've got another one that starts in January; and this guy would start. So, there's two guys that won't be on the road for 18 weeks each next summer. Again, in thinking of this, if you're going to whack my overtime and my fuel, you might as well take the officer and give me my fuel and overtime back, so I can at least get the biggest bang for my buck out of my guys that I have now.

R. Lee: In all fairness though, the fuel we're not cutting back – we're just being more realistic about what it's going to cost.

S. Story: My guys are going to be doing a whole lot more driving chasing around these calls.

A. Fowler: And, they have less coverage by the State.

S. Story: And, we've just picked up a bigger geographic area to do it; instead of covering half of the County, we're now covering two thirds of it.

N. Nelson: I like the number, I guess, still. I'll say again: \$1,163,014. I think that gives you the other deputy; it gives you a realistic fuel estimate; it doesn't cut any overtime; and I think that is a compromise. If I could vote on this at 1,193,000.00 I would; but I think that this is a compromise, and I'm hoping that somebody can come to that same conclusion in their mind.

T. Biggs: If we do cut the patrolman, we're going to save an additional, possibly, \$20,000.00 in benefits.

N. Nelson: What's \$20,000.00 over the tax base of Waldo County per \$100,000.00 of health coverage?

T. Biggs: Which would bring the total up to \$50,000.00; so when you cut the patrolman and give him all the gas money and the overtime, ultimately we'd be saving money.

R. McLaughlin: It would give him a line that he could move, too.

N. Nelson: So, this is 55 cents; each person in Waldo County; 55 cents!

R. Desmarais: Scott, how serious are you about what you just said?

S. Story: I'm very sincere – I'd much rather you take the officer, than whack the overtime and fuel the way that you're getting ready to do.

N. Nelson: We haven't whacked your overtime, though.

S. Story: I know, but the fuel's gone; and please, I really do appreciate your advocacy here, but I do think the other way is going to be better for my agency.

R. Lee: So far, we haven't cut the overtime, right?

S. Story: You know, I've got this sinking pit in my stomach the way these votes are going that when I leave here tonight, I'm going to have to go up the hill and give them 27 pink slips. I'd much rather we get this thing pushed through and do something here tonight than nothing.

R. Lee: But, so far, the only thing that's been cut tonight is the fuel.

R. Desmarais: Another thing that you're saying, Scott, is this deputy we have given you is going to end up spending a great deal of time in school. You've already got one in school; it would probably be easier for you to take him next year than next year.

S. Story: He's going to go to school the following year, too. That's kind of a wash either way.

R. Desmarais: But, you wouldn't have two of them in school this year; you would have one this year and one next year.

S. Story: That's correct, hopefully.

R. Desmarais: If he was given back to you next year.

S. Story: Correct.

N. Nelson: I think what you have to remember is what Scott's also saying, though, is if we cut the deputy, he's going to want \$30,000.00 back in fuel.

R. McLaughlin: Yeah, that's what we said.

N. Nelson: What's the salary of the deputy going to be?

T. Biggs and A. Fowler: \$33,000.00.

N. Nelson: So, we're looking at saving three or four thousand over what we're hung on?

R. Desmarais: That's why I asked him if he was serious about where he wanted to go.

N. Nelson: Scott, I have another question. Would you rather keep the deputy, lose the money in fuel, and keep the overtime where it's at?

S. Story: Yes.

N. Nelson: So, that's my motion; that's the compromise; it's three or four thousand different than what you guys are talking about doing.

T. Biggs: You're forgetting employee benefits. Every time we add an employee, we add \$20,000.00 or \$25,000.00, depending on whether they have a family, or not. That's almost doubling the salary.

N. Nelson: But, that's already in this Employee Benefit line.

R. Lee: That's true; it is in there, but it could be taken out.

R. Desmarais: It comes out if you don't take the deputy.

R. Lee: We take it out. I don't know; I'm probably going to switch sides here.

B. Sneed: Nakomis made a motion; I seconded it; all in favor of funding the Sheriff at \$1,163,014.02. All in favor? All opposed?

T. Biggs: That was interesting; so that was a tie.

R. Desmarais: This is not closed. We can go back and make another motion elsewhere.

A. Fowler: Can we take that count again?

R. McLaughlin: We can make another motion now?

B. Sneed: Yes, sure, go ahead.

D. Parkman: What was the last count?

A. Fowler: What was the count?

B. Sneed: Four to four.

A. Fowler: I thought it was five to three.

D. Parkman: Who voted against it; the same four?

R. McLaughlin: Two people switched their votes and made it a tie.

R. Lee: Yeah, right, we switched. It was unexpected.

A. Fowler: I guess it just behooves me that these other departments, nobody has ever asked anything; and this is your public safety.

J. Bennett: I make a motion that we give the \$30,000.00 back in the fuel and remove the new deputy.

T. Biggs: I second that.

B. Sneed: Any further discussion?

R. Lee: I don't understand that, because this budget is inflated by, on an assumption of price of fuel. He admitted that he did his budget with two added deputies; he had so many gallons of fuel times \$4.50.

J. Bennett: But, if he doesn't, he'll have that savings, too, along with that, you know. He budgeted \$4.00 a gallon.

R. Lee: I don't like the sound of it.

R. Desmarais: Roger, put a different way, if he redlines one line, he can turn to the fuels and cover it with fuel money.

T. Biggs: It's a slush fund.

R. Lee: Meaning he can use the fuel money for the deputy?

R. Desmarais: If he pulls it from another line.

N. Nelson: Can I say one more thing? If we hire a new deputy and you hire somebody in Waldo County, you have somebody living here, what you've give them in benefits is helping the family that's living in Waldo County. What he gets in salary is going to be spent in, some of it, in Waldo County.

R. Lee: That argument carried through to its logical extension would have us hiring hundreds of people.

N. Nelson: Well, look what happened in the Great Depression. I don't think the New Deal was a bad deal.

R. Desmarais: Come the twentieth of January, we're going to go into that scenario.

T. Biggs: We can't afford it right now.

N. Nelson: No, we can't, but I think that this \$1,163,014.00 is a good number; it gives Scott what he needs to do the job; it's a realistic fuel estimate; and it satisfies the need of this Sheriff's Department with reasonable cuts.

R. Lee: It was a tie vote, so it didn't pass.

T. Biggs: Well, we're voting on the deputy now.

J. Bennett: We've got a new motion in there.

B. Sneed: Did anybody second it?

T. Biggs: I did.

J. Bennett: Yes.

R. Lee: And, the motion is to put the fuel back and take the deputy out?

R. Desmarais: I would support it next year. I'm not supporting it this year. I think we give him the flexibility with that money.

R. McLaughlin: Does the school run all the time?

S. Story: Twice a year.

R. McLaughlin: What are the dates?

S. Story: This year, it starts January 15th. When does the next class start, Sergeant?

Sgt.: It would be mid August.

S. Story: Mid August.

R. McLaughlin: I was just wondering if we could get him trained this year and have him ready to go next year.

T. Biggs: Pay for the training but not to hire him?

R. McLaughlin: Yes, that's right.

S. Story: No, I have to pay him when he's training.

R. McLaughlin: I thought it might be at the end so we would be running one budget into the other one.

S. Story: If you guys go to a fiscal year, we could do that.

R. Lee: I have to ask this question again; I don't understand why we're putting \$30,000.00 back in the fuel, taking the deputy out. What do you think he has gained by putting the \$30,000.00 into fuel?

J. Bennett: Because you get rid of the deputy; then you get rid of the benefits and...

T. Biggs: That's going to give him \$30,000.00 as a slush fund, Roger.

S. Story: I know where he's coming from; that calculation is based on our consumption, okay? Hang on, hang on.

R. Lee: It's a raw deal for you, because you're not going to be able to have your deputy, and I don't know if you're really going to need the money for the fuel.

S. Story: Well, no, the problem is that we're still going to have to answer the calls. The difference is just that my sergeant back here now is going to have to go on the road and do more work chasing those second and third calls.

R. Lee: You could, if you had to, use the \$30,000.00 in fuel money for overtime.

S. Story: Oh, I'm going to use it. I'm not uncomfortable with that. We've still got to put the miles on the road to answer the calls; it's just now we're going to have one guy running twice as much as two guys running half.

T. Biggs: It's just in employee benefits that we're going to save.

R. Lee: Okay, if he wants it.

T. Biggs: He wants it.

J. Hyk: Bill, can I just? I'm a little confused by exactly – I understand you're trying to cut money out of this budget, but on the other hand, what we're being told is – 18 percent is pretty close to 20. We're going to have 20 percent more work to do because the State Police are leaving. How do we get it done? That's the Sheriff's job to figure out how to do that, but it seems as though he's going to have some help to do 20 percent more work. If it's gas, it's gas; if it's overtime; if it's another person. When this came before us, when it came before the Commissioners, we thought that it was pretty important because of the public safety aspect of it. It's not like you could say, if it was the Registry of Deeds, nobody's going to get dead at the Registry of Deeds; but in this department, in this situation, somebody could get dead. That concerns me. It rises to a higher level of responsibility, in a way. It's not much help to you, but I think you've got to keep in mind 20 percent more work – how does it get done.

N. Nelson: I understand this \$1,163,000.00 number is great and will be very similar to the number if we do it with the motion that's on the table now, and I understand that it's employee benefits we're going to spend more if we do that; but it's pennies, it's pennies. I think if you went around, certainly to the people I represent on Islesboro, and you said, "Would you give 50 cents to have police coverage, the police coverage that our Sheriff thinks you need?" - I think you'd find that most people would give you a dollar. I think if you expanded that to Waldo County, you'd find something similar.

J. Bennett: I think people are having a hard time and there's probably a lot of people right in our County that don't even have 50 cents; they live on three and four thousand a year.

R. Lee: It probably is the wrong place to cut.

N. Nelson: When they call 911 and they need somebody to come, they are going to sure hope – and it doesn't matter if they have 50 cents or \$50,000.00 in their bank account – they'll need the service.

A. Fowler: And, they still have to come.

J. Bennett: And, if you call the State Police, even though they're cutting back, they have to come. I've already talked to them.

A. Fowler: That's if a cruiser is in your area, because they've gone to one zone. Jim, it's one zone versus the two that there were when they were splitting it.

N. Nelson: If someone is breaking into your house and you're in the closet....

A. Fowler: And, that's only assuming that the State sticks to the budget they proposed because, remember, their fiscal year comes up in June where more changes are going to be made.

T. Biggs: How does the State get away with cutting the State Police budget by so much?

A. Fowler: I don't know. How does the State get away? You're right; how do they? I don't know. That's really good.

T. Biggs: Don't we feel like we almost have to follow what the State's doing?

A. Fowler: Who do you talk to, Tim; you're crying to the wrong choir.

T. Biggs: I don't know – Carol Weston?

A. Fowler: I agree with you, but my point just is that I'm not going to hold my breath and hope that the State comes through. Public safety of the people in the area, when somebody calls 911, I want somebody to answer the phone and I want somebody to go. That's my concern. As I say, no, I'm not waiting; I'm not assuming. The State wanted to come in and call share and play with us a year and a half, two years ago, and we did. They were the ones who brought it up, and now the ones going, "Whoa, hang on." Just think of your own.

S. Story: With all due respect, Mr. Bennett, if you call for the State Police and you're in our zone, there are going to hand us the call.

J. Bennett: They do now, but...

A. Fowler: Exactly!

S. Story: And, they will continue; that is the plan. That is what will happen. If you're in their zone, they will respond.

N. Nelson: So, can we vote on the motion that's on the table?

B. Sneed: Just let me finish doing my thing here, Nakomis. Just give me a second.

N. Nelson: No problem.

A. Fowler: Nakomis, what is the motion on the table? At this point, I'm confused.

B. Sneed: It's to put back the \$30,000.00, do away with the deputy. If we leave the deputy and do away with the \$30,000.00 in gas, we'll end up with a budget that has increased 0.4 percent over last year.

R. Lee: I think we need to go back in a couple of places and correct for the price of fuel oil.

B. Sneed: Do you want to do that tonight or do you want to come back?

R. Lee: I want to do it tonight.

N. Nelson: Can we get the Sheriff's done? I think we're really close; I think we've corrected the price of fuel here, and I think we need to vote on the motion that's on the table; and I think we need to vote again on the Sheriff.

B. Sneed: The bottom line is that if we went with the figures that Nakomis has proposed, the County budget, without any further corrections, would be up 0.4 percent over last year.

N. Nelson: Which is less than when we stopped what we were doing and agreed on a budget that we were going to come here tonight to review again.

B. Sneed: It's about half of what it was.

N. Nelson: So, when you take all of these increases that came from the now-completed union contracts, we have not only made up for those, but we have gone back below where we were at before.

B. Sneed: There's a motion made and seconded to replace the \$30,000.00 and do away with the deputy. All in favor of that? [Again, there is a tie vote.] This isn't getting us anywhere, gentlemen.

****N. Nelson moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the Sheriff's Budget (1075) at \$1,163,014.02.**

N. Nelson: And, in discussion, I just want to say for the sake that it may fall on deaf ears and we could be here all night, this is a compromise; it's something that's endorsed by the Sheriff; and it's realistic.

Motion passed with 3 opposed (T. Biggs, J. Bennett and R. Desmarais).

S. Story: Okay; could somebody tell me what's happened? Do I have a deputy or do I have a gas can?

B. Sneed: You've got a deputy, but he has no gas.

2025 – EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

B. Sneed: That has gone up a little bit from whence we last met because of the increase in Maine Public Employee Retirement System and FICA, which goes hand in hand with pay increases. It's just that you pay your people more, the government gets more.

****R. McLaughlin moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the Employee Benefit Budget at \$854,745.00.**

J. Bennett: How much did you say?

T. Biggs: Whatever it says on the sheet.

B. Sneed: \$854,745.00.

J. Bennett: All right; I got it.

R. Desmarais: Don't?

D. Berry: Yes?

R. Desmarais: Employees are paying 5 percent now, right?

D. Berry: That's correct.

R. Desmarais: When this budget was figured, I don't think it would have been wise to figure that 5 percent out of it. Is there a 5 percent cut here?

D. Berry: Yes, there is. We figured it in. Yes.

R. Desmarais: You figured a 5 percent cut in before you had any....?

J. Hyk: We figured that all employees would be contributing 5 percent. That's how we figured it.

R. Desmarais:before any contracts were?

D. Berry, J. Hyk, A. Fowler: Yes, yeah, that's correct.

J. Bennett: If you go with that figure there, that figure is for two deputies, and we've taken one out; so you're giving...

N. Nelson: I thought that's been corrected.

T. Biggs: Was that taken out?

B. Sneed: Yes, it was.

N. Nelson: That's been corrected.

R. Desmarais: That brought it down to 845?

B. Sneed: One thirty. Motion made and seconded; any further discussion?

T. Biggs: Well, what about increasing, since the employees all got a 4 percent raise, why don't we increase their contribution to 10 percent? Is that unreasonable?

N. Nelson: That's negotiated by the union.

T. Biggs: That's negotiated?

D. Berry: Yes, sir. You can not touch that.

T. Biggs: So, we can't vote on this line at all?

J. Hyk: You can't touch that.

T. Biggs: Huh? At all?

R. Lee: But, we could vote on it.

D. Berry: You can vote on it, but the contractual agreements are done, and it is 5 percent this year.

J. Hyk: That's what you guys agreed to – 5 percent this year, 10 percent next year.

T. Biggs: You're not union; you get benefits. We could cut yours.

R. Lee: That's true.

J. Hyk: You can't cut people's benefits; you can't cut people's salaries.

T. Biggs: Well, we can drop the bottom line, John.

J. Hyk: Well, then do that, if you'd like.

T. Biggs: Well, you're leaving office; you don't care anymore.

B. Sneed: Now, let's get this over. Motion made and seconded on the amount of \$854,745.00. All in favor of funding it at that rate?

R. Lee: I wanted a little more discussion.

B. Sneed: All right – discuss.

R. Lee: I just wanted to take a look at that and make sure that there is nothing we can take out of it.

N. Nelson: I think we did that - two weeks ago?

T. Biggs: I don't believe we touched it last time, did we?

R. Desmarais: We did take one out; we took \$15,000.00 out.

T. Biggs: Oh.

R. Desmarais: That was for that deputy.

R. McLaughlin: How do you think we can cut it?

B. Sneed: Well, Roger, how do you think we can cut it?

R. Lee: Maybe we can't.

R. McLaughlin: Other than the Commissioners?

R. Desmarais: There's going to be terminations, so there will be no medical benefits for the terminations, until they replace. If you really scratch, that's at \$10,000.00.

R. McLaughlin: What did you say? You could do what?

R. Desmarais: I said that if you really wanted to scratch, I would say \$10,000.00; I wouldn't go much deeper than that. I don't know how the "nays" feel about that.

R. McLaughlin: I would probably pass, I think.

R. Lee: We took out the second deputies benefits; that's how we got it down.

B. Sneed: Yes.

R. Desmarais: The only other wiggle room is going to be at terminations and a time lapse between terminations and replacing them – stuff like that. So, go with this figure or maybe \$10,000.00.

N. Nelson: I move that we fund 2025 at \$854,745.00 and no cents.

R. Desmarais: That already went and got hung up.

N. Nelson: Well, let's try it again. I think it's a realistic number.

B. Sneed: Where are you going to cut it, Dick? Be specific.

N. Nelson: That's a realistic number.

B. Sneed: How are you going to cut it? Calculate it.

T. Biggs: We could ask the non-union employees to contribute more to their policy.

J. Bennett: No.

Other murmurs of "no."

S. Story: You know, I have bit my tongue...

Lots of comments.

R. Desmarais: Scott, I don't you even have to say anything.

S. Story: I hope not, because this would open a whole can of whoop ass!

R. McLaughlin: No, you don't have to say anything.

B. Sneed: I second the motion.

T. Biggs: Jim, you must have something to say here.

B. Sneed: Where are you going to take it? Dollars and cents – how are you going to calculate it?

R. Desmarais: Dollars and cents – are we talking \$10,000.00?

B. Sneed: Figure it out.

R. Desmarais: Take it off of there and make him maneuver the lines, just they're doing in any department.

B. Sneed: How do you justify taking \$10,000.00 off this budget?

R. Desmarais: I can't justify it – we don't know what the year is going to bring?

N. Nelson: You have to justify it; that's what we are charged to do. We are charged to look at this budget and justify to our constituents the cuts we do or don't make.

B. Sneed: John?

J. Hyk: I'd just like to point out that two years ago, when the costs on the health insurance were rising dramatically, we committed to holding the line. We held the line. We have done a great deal with this problem, and we have reduced, when everybody else's insurance is going up, we have reduced it dramatically. I don't think that to do that shows any good faith on the Budget Committee's part - to live up to their end of the bargain, when you look at how much we've reduced that health insurance thing.

A. Fowler: Mr. Chairman, if I may really quickly, two years ago when our rates were going through the roof and high, you asked us to form a committee to do a study to find out the best deals. We did, in fact, we included Budget Committee members on that committee; and it's because of that we became the self-insured county that we are. We were the first county in the State of Maine, and it's because of us that two other counties have followed our lead. Then, you asked us to have the employees begin to pay a portion; we've done exactly what you asked. We have taken into consideration everything you have said, and we have implemented it. Just please know that.

J. Hyk: And furthermore, the only way we can continue to make this successful is if we can build up that fund for a time when we have a bad experience. We have had very good experiences these last two years, and that's why these rates are down. A year of bad experiences, and that is going to go up; and we have to continue to add to this fund. We should have a million dollars in this fund after 10 years. That's adding \$100,000.00 a year, so that you can be self-sustaining into the future. To cut this fund, I can't think of a worse cut you could make anywhere in the budget than to cut the health insurance.

R. Desmarais: I think you have done a wonderful job, and like Amy said, you have done everything that we have asked. Our concerns have been answered; you've taken them and you've done it. I have no

problem; you've done a great job. All I'm discussing here is, "Do we have any wiggle room?" A motion is on the floor once again to put this figure back on, so that's where we stand.

A. Fowler: So, what is the figure you want to put it to, Dick? I'm sorry.

R. Desmarais: No, I haven't made a motion to put it to a figure. I'm thinking out loud, that's all.

A. Fowler: Okay. Think louder on that.

Someone asked what the motion was.

B. Sneed: He [N. Nelson] made a motion; I seconded it. Roger, you going to dip your oar in this?

R. Lee: I'm in support of the motion.

B. Sneed: Then, let's vote on it.

Motion passed with one opposed (T. Biggs).

R. Lee: I would like to revisit the \$59,400.00 in fuel under Facilities Management. I'm guessing that is based on the very high price of fuel when that budget was done.

K. Nealley: Contractual agreement with the oil company that we are currently locked into.

R. Lee: So, that covers the entire fiscal year that we're voting on right now? You don't lock for a heating season, from summer to summer; you lock in from January 1 to January 1?

K. Nealley: No, we lock in in June.

N. Nelson: So, this comes up again this June. This June, you may potentially lock in at something lower.

K. Nealley: We may, yes.

N. Nelson: What are you locked in at now?

K. Nealley: \$3.80 a gallon.

R. Lee: So, it's half a year, basically.

K. Nealley: Well, no, because I'm paying for up through from June to December, as well. Well, actually it's not half a year; I've got to pay for the whole year somehow, but I've got to pay up until June 1st at this higher price.

R. Lee: It's true because of the heating is in the January/February/March months, more than in November/December.

N. Nelson: Where are you at; what number did you use in this budget?

K. Nealley: The contractual agreement.

N. Nelson: So, this is in at \$3.10.

K. Nealley: I know how much oil I use in the course of a year: 26,000 gallons.

N. Nelson: And, you budgeted this at \$3.80 for all of next year.

K. Nealley: Three dollars and ten cents – that was the bid price.

B. Sneed: Barbara and I have to put our heads together to make sure we're going to tell the same lie. We have different numbers. Amy, do you have a calculator going?

A. Fowler: I don't. That's the number I've got; check it to yours.

B. Sneed: You and I are closer than Barbara and I, but we have three people with three different numbers.

Chatter among all while B. Sneed and B. Arseneau go over the figures.

T. Biggs: So, before we do this, we'd like to revisit 1030, Facilities Management.

B. Sneed: Okay.

R. Lee: Where are we at, right now, for the total?

J. Bennett: We just gave it to you.

R. Lee: Oh, yeah.

T. Biggs: That's the real thing?

B. Sneed: Yeah - \$7,393,053.62.

N. Nelson: \$7,393,053.62.

J. Bennett: That's what I have.

B. Sneed: That's what Jim had?

B. Arseneau: Karen did it on the calculator for me.

B. Sneed: That's what Karen had. Point one seven percent. Who wants to revisit what?

T. Biggs: Facilities Management.

B. Sneed: And, your question is?

R. Lee: Well, here's the thing – you've got \$59,400.00 in the fuel oil, and it was arrived at by assuming it would be \$3.80 for the whole year. I did a little math; I think it's something like 16,000 gallons – I might be wrong – but about that. I think it's reasonable to assume that the price of fuel oil for the following winter, as they're only locked until at \$3.83 until June 1st, would be considerably lower than that.

R. McLaughlin: \$3.80 they're locked in?

R. Lee: Through June 1st, this winter. For the following winter, which maybe forty percent of the following winter is in this coming fiscal year, January 1st through December 31st; so I think you could cut \$13,000.00 out of it.

B. Sneed: Speak up.

K. Nealley: I think your guess is as good as mine as to what the cost of fuel is going to be come June the first, but I didn't want to play roulette with the taxpayers money, so that's why we locked in at what we did.

R. Lee: I'm not criticizing that; a lot of organizations locked in. I'm just saying that after that lock-in period, it seems likely to me that it's going to be – I mean, it's all guess work.

R. Desmarais: If it gets locked in for \$2.05 and in 2009 and 2010, \$2.11..

R. Lee: Right; so if you assume that, the \$13,000.00 is reasonable.

T. Biggs: A reasonable cut, yeah. I would second that.

****R. Lee moved, T. Biggs seconded to reduce the Facilities Budget (1030) by \$13,000.00.**

B. Sneed: Discussion? Dave Parkman has his hand up.

D. Parkman: Point of order, Mr. Chairman: You've already voted on this once; you passed it; I don't know whether you can lower it again; I don't know what your procedure is.

T. Biggs: Or, we can subtract it from the bottom.

B. Sneed: Don, do you want to throw in your expertise?

D. Berry: What has to happen here, if you're going to reconsider this, someone of you who voted in the affirmative has to make the motion and have it approved for reconsideration, and it has to pass for reconsideration.

R. Lee: Because, actually we do, in fact, vote on these line by line; it's not the overall final vote.

D. Berry: That's correct.

R. Lee: I take your word for it.

R. McLaughlin: Did you vote in the affirmative in the beginning?

R. Lee: I definitely voted in the affirmative.

T. Biggs: Yeah, I did.

R. McLaughlin: You can do it.

B. Sneed: Then, you can do it.

R. Lee: I'd like to move to reconsider.

T. Biggs: I would second that.

D. Berry: Did the second on that motion also vote in the affirmative?

T. Biggs: I did vote in favor, yes.

D. Berry: Okay.

T. Biggs: Would you like to vote on that? Any discussion?

B. Sneed: Yeah, we can have a discussion, sure; it's the same crapshoot as with the Sheriff and his gas.

H. Potter: We're voting on a reconsideration motion, right now.

B. Sneed: Yeah, we are; geez, you're right, Harry. I'm sorry. All in favor of reconsidering this budget department? All right.

****R. Lee moved, T. Biggs seconded to reconsider Facilities Management budget. Unanimous.**

****T. Biggs moved, R. Lee seconded to reduce Commodities in Facilities Management budget by \$13,000.00. Unanimous.**

B. Arseneau: Is that \$285,228.80?

B. Sneed: \$285,228.80.

J. Bennett: I think the total of the budget, then, is \$7,380,053.62.

B. Arseneau: That's what I have.

N. Nelson: So, we're down.

B. Sneed: Barbara, can you work your magic with that thing?

B. Arseneau: Are you asking me what the total is?

B. Sneed: Yeah.

B. Arseneau: That's what Jim Bennett read: \$7,380,053.62.

B. Sneed: Do you have anything for a percentage it will decrease?

B. Arseneau: The percentage of decrease is .01 negative.

B. Sneed: Point oh one negative.

B. Arseneau: Or, negative point oh one, I should say.

T. Biggs: We've actually decreased the budget for the first time ever.

More general chitchat about figure, comments about windmills in Freedom, etc.

B. Sneed: I made a motion earlier at the beginning to meet the week following Christmas; I'd like to rescind that motion.

R. McLaughlin: I second it.

B. Sneed: Dick seconds it; all in favor of NOT meeting the week after Christmas? All opposed? All right.

B. Sneed: I've forgotten, Barb; did we vote on a total bottom line?

A. Fowler: You have to vote on the bottom line and then the cap.

J. Bennett: I make a motion that we approve \$7,380,053.62.

B. Sneed: I'll second it. All in favor? All opposed?

****J. Bennett moved, B. Sneed seconded to fund the total FY 2009 Budget at \$7,380,053.62. Unanimous.**

B. Sneed: Now, with Barbara's calculation, this puts us down -0.01 percent, which is way under that LD-Cap, so the third part of this does not have to take place. Does anybody want to make a motion to adjourn?

****J. Bennett moved, R. Lee seconded to adjourn Budget Committee meeting at 9:40p.m. Unanimous.**

Respectfully submitted by Veronica Stover
Veronica Stover, Deputy County Clerk