

MEETING NOTICE

The regular monthly meeting of the Ellsworth City Council will be held on Monday, May 19, 2025, at 6:00 PM in the Ellsworth City Hall Council Chambers

Meetings will be broadcast live on:

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/ellsworthme>

YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofEllsworthMaine>

Spectrum Channel 1303

AGENDA

1. Call to Order. *M Beal absent*
2. Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Rules of Order.
4. Adoption of the Ellsworth City Council minutes from the following meeting:
 - April 21, 2025, Regular Meeting

Move to approve, T White, seconded by J Stein, passed 5-1 (N Smith abstain)

There was a discussion whether the executive session and budget were moved up, the concern with that was that everything would be out of order. It was decided to bring the public hearing and discussion part of the budget brought up so citizens could be part of the conversation.

Move to create a 12a and have a discussion about the budget before voting on it. Passed 6-0

5. Presentation of Awards.
 - Pride Month Proclamation
 - Deputy Chief Shawn Willey – Commendation Award
 - Sergeants Chad Wilmot and Kelvin Mote – Commendation Award
 - Corporals Rob Angelo and Shawn Merchant – Commendation Award
 - Officer Erick Skinner – Commendation Award
 - Game Warden Eric Rudolph – Commendation Award
 - Cory Michaud-Kidder and Caleb DiDonato – MMA's 7th Grade Essay Contest Winners

6. City Manager's Report.

Big thanks to both students for sharing their essays, that was the second time getting to hear them. They also spoke at the School Board meeting, hopefully there are a few items in the budget that can touch on issues they each mentioned.

High Street paving – does know that this has caused some frustration in the community but wanted to note that our teams are working very hard with the state and Northeast Paving, who is the contractor for the job. Originally this project was scheduled for last year and the contractor couldn't make the timeframe, so it was rescheduled for the spring. It is night work that happens from 9pm-6am but it does affect some daytime operations. They lowered the manholes and water boxes and went to State DOT standards with the grinding, which resulted in some sagging cold patch formation and the formation of potholes. In spots they milled all the way through the

pavement and ended up exposing the gravel base, so our team has been working on an emergency basis to fill potholes as much as possible, and the weather has also not been cooperating. The temperature has also not been up to MaineDOT specs for paving, if the temps are lower than 50 degrees the night before they can't pave. The contractor is preparing to do an emergency shim to get it back to where it was this winter.

Recreational Cannabis – the workshop is May 29th at 6pm. This will be to discuss the regulatory framework for the process and get the Council's guidance and community feedback on how many, where, what the process should be with the framework.

School Budget is being voted on June 10th. Absentee ballots are available now.

Big employee thanks first to Deb and Lea from the Finance Department. They are processing paperwork and payments and keeping things moving along while Nate and Ashlie put all their efforts into the budget process. Brittany the assistant planner, she has been doing so much work as they have been in the process of hiring a new planner. She has helped get several projects over the line and lead an after hours art class for employee to help build culture.

7. Committee Reports.

- Planning Board: Request to appoint Lisa LaRue as an alternate with a term expiring 6/30/28 and Matthew Outhier as an alternate with a term expiring 6/30/2027.

Move to approve both nominees for the Planning Board Alternate positions, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 6-0

J. Stein – Rec Commission meeting tomorrow morning (5/20) at 8:30 in Council Chambers. They would like to invite everyone to the Play it Forward event at Knowlton Park. It will be a fun and informative event focused on Knowlton Park; it is Saturday May 24th from 9-11am. It is to raise awareness about ongoing playground upgrade, maintenance and highlight the work of the Recreation Commission and learn how they can get involved in supporting playground design and projects. There will be a variety of hands-on and family-friendly activities including touch a truck.

N. Smith – Cemetery Commission held their first meeting last week, there are a lot of plans in the works for how to manage the cemeteries the city has. Elections were held during the meeting, Dotty Vachon was elected chairperson, Albert Scott aka Scotty is vice chair, and Tiffany Tate is secretary. The commission will be meeting bi-weekly for the next three weeks to get up and running and then they will decide if they want to go to monthly or keep bi-weekly.

T. White – it is Maine Arbor week in the State of Maine. Tomorrow (5/20) the Second-grade class from EEMS will be at the Jordan Homestead Nursery planting eighty (80) trees. It starts at 10am if anyone is interested in joining them.

8. Citizen's Comments.

Gordon Workman – he has three items he would like to speak about. First, when people come up to have a discussion about open topics or agenda items, he believes that they should be able to do that freely without interruption. They have concerns and they see it more than others and should have the right to speak and voice everything they want to talk about without interruption. Second, there was supposed to be something on the agenda this month that was brought up in February at a Finance Committee meeting about Kerry Karst's property and the funds from the sale. He is disappointed that it wasn't brought up and was wondering why that was. Third, the courthouse road project and looking for alternative funding, he believes our Senator and Representative have gone to the state to try to get funding for half of the project. He didn't know if the City Manager

had tried to work with them to get additional funding. He thought that would be good to know because it shouldn't all fall on the citizens of Ellsworth. It is the Hancock County Judicial Center, which is run by the state, and he believes that the Hancock County Commissioner should also be part of this project. Also, since it is the Hancock County Courthouse, he believes that the towns of Hancock County should be involved with it.

9. Councilor Comments.

N. Smith – there was a public hearing regarding funding and both her and Charlie testified, Charlie in person and hers was written. It sits on the appropriations table, and if it passes, she has heard that there won't be much money left, if any, at the end of the session.

J. Stein – he has been to a couple county commissioner meetings over the last year. He has found it difficult to get a lot of back and forth with the commissioners. He has let them know about the courthouse project and that it is a county project and that we are working on various things that involve the entire county, and maybe in the future they would like to chip in or at least be part of the discussion. He would encourage anyone to go and speak at one of their meetings to try to get the point across that it isn't just an Ellsworth project.

S. O'Halloran – he had a different topic he was going to discuss, but Mr. Workman brought up an item that is very close to him. The Karst property was foreclosed on by the city for non-payment of taxes. The overdue amount was just under \$20,000, and the city sold it for \$150,000. There was a 10% fee to the auctioneer which brought the city total down to \$135,000, he feels the city owes the equity to the family that lost their property. Two items were brought up at a Finance Committee meeting in February and it was agreed at that meeting that the first item would be on the April agenda and that the Karst discussion would be on the May agenda.

It was explained to Councilor O'Halloran that we have put the tax foreclosure discussion on the June agenda because the Tax Collector was on a previously scheduled vacation and there is a lot of information that she would like to share herself rather than trying to have someone else explain it. Also, we have reached out to MMA Legal to get their most recent guidance on their full taxing policy. The City Assessor Larry just gave Charlie a very comprehensive list of parcels owned by the city in either tax acquired status or some that are owned outright. This isn't an individualized issue, there is a whole list of all the property owners that could be in this category.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

10. 207 Collectibles LLC d/b/a Ellsworth Candlepin Alley, 25 Eastward Lane Suite 6, for a new City Class B License (Victualer, Liquor and Amusement).

Move to approve, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 6-0

CONSENT AGENDA

CONSENT AGENDA: All items with an asterisk (*) are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a Council member so requests, in which event, the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the agenda.

11. Council Order #052500 Request of the Deputy City Clerk to appoint Wardens, Ward Clerks and Election Workers for the June 10, 2025. *

Move to approve the appointment of the Wardens, Ward Clerks and Election Workers as described in the memo provided for the June 10, 2025 City of Ellsworth School Budget Validation Special Municipal referendum election, J Stein, seconded by T White, passed 6-0

NEW BUSINESS

12. Public Hearing and action on the application(s) for renewal for the following license(s):

- Shinbashi Inc d/b/a Shinbashi, 139 High Street, for renewal of a City Class C License (Victualer and Liquor) and renewal of a State Restaurant (Class I, II, III & IV) Malt, Spirituous and Vinous Liquor License.
- Primary Organic Therapy Inc d/b/a Curaleaf Maine, 3 Myrick Street Suite B, for renewal of a Medical Marijuana Dispensary License including a City Victualer License.
- Brian Langley d/b/a Union River Lobster Pot, 8 South Street, for renewal of a City Class C License (Victualer and Liquor) and renewal of a State Restaurant (Class I, II, III & IV) Malt, Spirituous and Vinous Liquor License.
- Cresswell Investments LLC d/b/a Airline Brewing Company, 173 Main Street, for renewal of a City Class B License (Victualer, Liquor and Amusement) and renewal of a State Restaurant (Class II and IV) Malt and Vinous Liquor License.
- Scott Kenny d/b/a Jordan's Snack Bar, 200 Downeast Highway, for renewal of a City Class B License (Victualer, Liquor and Amusement) and renewal of a State Restaurant (Class I, II, III & IV) Liquor License.
- Giri Ellsworth Inc d/b/a Hawthorn Extended Stay by Wyndham, 215 High Street, for renewal of a City Lodging License.
- Zeppas NY Pizza, 92 Water Street, for renewal of a City Class C License (Victualer and Liquor) and renewal of a State Liquor License (Class III and IV).
- LJJN LLC d/b/a Forest Ridge Campground, 40 Flockamoosen Way, for renewal of a City Lodging License.
- Corporate Chefs, LLC, 21 Kingsland Crossing, for renewal of a City Class C License (Victualer and Liquor) and renewal of a State Restaurant (Class I, II, III & IV) Liquor License.
- Melvin Lambert d/b/a Charlie's Pizza, 18 Hancock Street, for renewal of a City Class C License (Victualer and Liquor) and renewal of a State Off Premise Beer Only License.

Move to approve all licenses, J Stein, seconded by T White, passed 6-0

12a. Discussion and public hearing on FY2026 Budget.

City Manager Pearce – all of the information is on our website ellsworthmaine.gov/budget for anyone who would like to see it. They have had nine meetings this budget cycle for a total of about twenty-three hours, which is down by eighteen meetings from last budget cycles and he believes that we can do even better next year. We have landed at an increase in net spending of 2.9%, which is the CPI inflation rate, it was our initial target coming into the budget season. It is a more reasonable rate of growth than in the last few fiscal years, FY25 was a 7.3% increase and FY24 was a 16.8% increase in the net municipal budget. Some breakdowns, the municipal net appropriation is down about 4%, the school appropriations are up about 5.1% and the county appropriation is up 9.3%, but the total net of those ends up to a 2.9% increase. We are estimating

a mill rate of 16.84%. which is down from last year's 17.45%, it may vary some depending on the property valuations. We are moving forward with the Parks and Recreation Director, that was prefunded in the last budget cycle, to lessen the impact on this cycle. Very much looking forward to that person and doing a service upgrade for a Parks and Recreation area. We also have an additional \$50,000 for Knowlton Park this year, to upgrade some very heavily used community assets. We will also be adding a city janitor, this adds approximately \$22,000 because we will be canceling the contracted cleaners for Knowlton Park, the harbor, City Hall and the Police Department. It will also create a year-round position so places like Knowlton Park could stay open longer because we have someone to take a little bit better care of them. We are adding two additional firefighters to complete the cycle on the shift upgrades, especially after we went to a full-time ambulatory care service. We are also adding an additional dispatcher and police officer. For Capital Improvement, from the general funds, we are adding a dispatch radio console, Knowlton Park splash pad resurfacing and the Police Station sign. Some other things in this budget are wayfinding signage, a website redesign, a citywide phone system, some expanded workforce professional development and tuition reimbursement programs. He is very proud of our Budget team and all the work that everyone put into the budget process this year and is hopeful that we can streamline things even further. Also, a big thank you to all the Councilors for their time and efforts spent on this process.

There were no public comments on this item.

Councilor O'Halloran – this has been the best process in the four years that he has been on the Council. Prior to Charlie's arrival and the current Finance team, they were in the dark and didn't even know how bad it was until they started getting real numbers. Thank you to them because he knows there has been a lot of work that has gone into this. Maybe we don't like that it is down to the 2.9% but after the 17% jump two years ago, which was a "rude awakening" for people, and the 8% increase from last year, which was much more manageable, but none of it would have happened without all that went into getting the numbers.

13. Council Order #052501 Ratification of the appointment of Twila Fisher as the incoming Economic Development Director.

City Manager Pearce – is very excited to have Twila, she will be starting June 9th. One of the reasons we went with her was they just felt that she was right for the city, she brings over 20 years' experience in the public and private sectors. Most recently as the Director of Community and Economic Development for the Hill School in Pottstown, Pennsylvania, where she also leads the Hobart's Run Neighborhood District as Executive Director. She has handled big thriving community initiatives that we're on track to get here in Ellsworth that could be game-changing, once in a generation, tens of millions of dollars in Federal funding for the High Street corridor. Also helping with the Village Partnership Initiative with the Deputy City Manager to get potentially tens of millions of dollars invested in our Main Street and downtown corridors. She was also their top candidate both in the resume and interview rounds and also came up twice in person. She has been coming to Maine for many years, and she really felt like this is where she wants to be.

Move to ratify the appointment of Twila Fisher as the Economic Development Director, as an administrative employee reporting to the City Manager and Deputy City Manager in accordance with the city charter and applicable personnel policies effective immediately, N Smith, seconded by P Lyons, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

14. Council Order #052502 Discussion on the Brae drive utilities issue.

City Manager Pearce – this is our third discussion as a Council on this item. Brae Drive is a private drive that has had a water leak that they were looking for the city to address. They don't have a homeowners association and there are some serious concerns about how the developer had other roads in the area accepted as public ways but this one wasn't. We had a long discussion as a Council at the March meeting on whether it is appropriate for the Council to pay for the fixing of a private utility. During the Council meeting in February, Councilors requested more information and some history to be brought back to the March meeting. The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) weighed in barring the city from using its own water personnel to work on private roads. It wouldn't necessarily bar the Council from allocating funds to have other city staff, non-PUC regulated staff, fix it, however.

Adam Gibson – was nominated by the residents of Brae Drive to speak on everyone's behalf. He has three main points he would like to make, first, Brae Drive which was constructed in 1976 by Robert Ray of Ray Builders Inc, was always intended to be a city road. Second, the City Council unjustly denied the adoption of Brae Drive as a city road on at least two occasions based on road standards that shouldn't apply to the road. Third, evidence shows that Ray Builders Inc, established in 1964 and still in business today, owns the road and associated utilities of Brae Drive. The residents goal for this meeting is to have one of two things happen; the residents hope that Brae Drive will finally be accepted as a city road by the Council and if not, they expect the Council to outline a plan to work with Ray Builders Inc to ensure a sustainable path forward for the residents and the city.

Brae Drive is located north of the elementary school and connects Forest Ave with Holt Drive. It was constructed in 1976 by Ray Builders Inc but was originally conceived as part of the subdivision of land owned by Earl and Charles Holt in 1949. In 1976, Robert Ray went before the Planning Board with a proposal for what would become Brae Drive. In his initial proposal, it was a road with a 33 foot right of way, similar to Holt Drive and Argonne Street. Mr. Urquhart, a resident of Forest Ave, spoke in opposition of the idea in an attempt to avoid the problems that came with the narrowness of Holt Drive. Mr. Ray was instructed by the Council to prove that he could construct an adequate road on the 33 foot right of way. Intending to do that, he continued with construction of the road and in a good faith effort, he improved upon the construction of Holt Drive and Argonne Street by increasing the width of the road. Brae Drive has a 20-foot-wide paved surface, which is 7 feet wider than Holt Drive and 5 feet wider than Argonne Street. Later in 1976, when Brae Drive was completed, Mr. Ray went before the Council to have the road accepted as a city street, it was acknowledged at that time that Brae Drive was grandfathered under the old subdivision ordinance, nevertheless his request was denied on the basis of the 33 foot right of way and the 4-foot ditches would "not be ample for runoff". It is the residents opinion that this initial rejection of Brae Drive as a city street was unjust and has precipitated this almost 50-year conflict in which they find themselves. In 1991, the issue of making Brae Drive a city street was again revisited, but no action was taken, even though it was declared that Brae Drive meets all the standards for acceptance under the 50 foot right of way requirement, which it shouldn't have been held to since it was built before the standards were established in 1977. In more recent meetings with the City Manager and City Council, ownership of the road and utilities was unclear. However, based on documents provided by the city, it's now clear that Ray Builders is the owner of Brae Drive and the associated utilities. There are at least two examples of this being affirmed by the City Council. In 1996, Mr. Steven Joy went before the Council protesting a proposed \$7,500 utility hookup fee, levied by Ray Builders, to try to hook up to the utilities on Brae

Drive. In his building permit, it stated there were public water and public sewer supply, so believing that meant the utilities were public, he intended to pay a \$350 hookup fee. However, this was contested by Robert Ray and was unanimously determined by the City Council, at that time, that the utilities on Brae Drive were owned by Robert Ray, thus requiring Mr. Joy to pay the higher fee. In 2009, Miss Alicia Card was quoted \$10,000 by Ray Builders to connect to Brae Drive utilities. Instead, she obtained a variance from the city to connect to utilities on Holt Drive because she owned the adjoining parcel that connected to Holt Drive's utilities.

In the fall of 2024, residents of Brae Drive and Ellsworth Water Department staff became aware of a water line leak in the proximity of 16 Brae Drive. Residents approached the city about repairing the leak, as has happened in the past on at least one other occasion when the city addressed an issue with the sewer utility line. However, the city now take the stance it would be illegal to fix the utility since it is not owned by the city. When asked what the city would do in the event of a catastrophic break in the line, the city responded that they would repair the damage and then pass along the repair bill to the current owner, which at the time was assumed to be the Brae Drive homeowners. However, now it is clear that the city would be responsible for recovering the cost of the repair from Ray Builders Inc. Residents also approached the city about finally accepting the road as a city street and in addition to meeting with the City Manager, this is also their second City Council meeting on the issue.

They now ask if the Council is willing to correct the mistake of their predecessors of nearly 50 years ago and finally accept Brae Drive as a city street as it was always meant to be? If not, what plan do you have as the administrator of the public utilities for the city to work with Ray Builders, the owner of the road and utilities, to ensure the adequate transmission of utilities to the residents of Ellsworth.

Gordon Workman – the first time the residents came, the Council told them that they couldn't accept the road because there wasn't a big enough turnaround for fire trucks or plow trucks to turn around, and that they would have to build a connecting road so they would be able to get out. Mr. Ray connected to the next road and went back to the Council, and they didn't accept it again. Back when the road was built, there was a lot of animosity between the city and the contractor, so he believes that it was part of the issue.

Jack Frost – there is so much history here and he would like to thank Adam and Lauren and everyone on the street. They have had meetings and emails and have lost a lot of sleep over this. There was a tremendous amount of animosity between Mr. Ray/Ray Builders and the city, and this was a breaking point. They don't have another option; they have been told that they can't put in their own septic systems. He would encourage the Council to take the time that they put into research this after six months and starting to work with Charlie. He has always followed up, which they greatly appreciate because that hasn't always been the case, to get them the documents so they can see what really happened. The unwritten piece to this is the level of tension between the city and Ray Builders at the time. When Mr. Ray walked away from the project, no one took the initiative, they had meetings and talked about it, but there was no consensus on how to move forward. They were given two other examples in the city to say that these are private roads, one of them only has one unit there, it isn't a residential area in the sense of having many houses. The other is behind the hospital, which he believes is a dirt road, and has maybe two houses on it. They are on at least quarter acre lots with fifteen homeowners. He believes that clearly their road was built at a time when it was up to code but there was just enough tension to leave this unresolved.

City Manager Pearce – there have been many hours spent on this as well and the residents have been very patient. On a personal level he would want the Council to authorize him to spend up to \$5,000 to fix the leak but from a professional level there is a precedent here. He would like to research the Ray Builders ownership piece a little more, but we will continue to monitor the leak and if it does get to be an emergency to the system then we could fix it and then bill either Ray Builders or the residents of Brae Drive.

Councilors asked the residents if they had been in contact with Ray Builders to let them know that after some research it was discovered that they own the road and utilities? Adam responded that no they have not. They felt it more appropriate to come and have the discussion with the city first to try to come up with a plan to move forward.

Councilor Smith asked what changes if we confirm that there is a specific owner and it goes back to the developer who created the issue? How is that different than when it was the collection of homeowners who had shared responsibility? City Manager Pearce responded that from the leak piece if it is catastrophic we could fix it but from the other side of it, he doesn't think the city could get involved, it would have to be the homeowners who reach out to Ray Builders. That is an answer without talking to legal counsel.

Mike Harris, Public Works Director - he believes that unless Ray Builders has a specific warranty on the infrastructure, that they can say they will fix it but will charge the residents like they would for anyone else. He doesn't know that we as the city could compel Ray Builders to fix it. Since it isn't ours and if it isn't under warranty anymore, what legal right does anyone have to tell Ray Builders to go fix it and eat the cost of it?

Several Councilors agreed that it is a legal question, and we should reach out to our legal counsel for guidance.

Councilor Stein – he said that it sounded like the road at the time of the 1976 Council meeting, was already 20 feet when it was requested to be widened to 18 feet, is there anyway to prove that? Also, was the requirement before the increase to 50 feet, an 18-foot pavement and a 33 foot right of way, and did the road at the time meet that, is there anyway to figure that out? It sounds to him like those are the three numbers they are discussing. City Manager Pearce responded that he believes that the Councils have done this in the past and we can read it now and say we think it is unjust, and we need to move forward, but that doesn't make it so he can accept it as a public road now without the Council weighing in.

Councilor Lyons - he said it was very helpful to see the history on it and is sympathetic to the residents, but he still doesn't see a legal avenue for us to 1) do the work and 2) for us to accept the road. Right now, if there is a private road owner that's not a resident, the residents and the private road owner should start talking to see what the owner is willing to do and the city could be part of those conversations. It is his opinion, unless otherwise convinced, that we don't have the legal authority, we have been told by the PUC not to touch the water infrastructure, and the road doesn't satisfy our road standards to accept it. It could be widened, which would have to be figured out between the private landowners and the owner of the road. If we can work out a way to do that where we can bring it up to standards, the city would be happy to work with them.

City Manager Pearce – he is happy to look into the Ray Builders piece, obviously the original builder is deceased, but there might be a legacy piece to it, but he has a very strong idea that we are going to end up back to where we are now. The Council could authorize funding for this specific purpose, and we can move forward, or we need to go towards the acceptance of a public way so the city holds this in perpetuity, and we can give a one-time exemption and when a bigger issue hits we go through this again. We would be setting a precedent with this and then what are

we going to say to the next private road that may be in a similar circumstance, how would we say no to them?

Adam Gibson – he finds the precedent setting argument extremely weak, he believes it is very easy to avoid that. Are there other roads out there like Brae Drive, no, it was admitted by a Councilor how unique their situation is.

Councilor O'Halloran – he is going to say what people haven't dared to say, and that is, he doesn't know the conflict that went on, but certainly Mr. Ray had some troubles meeting compliance in many areas. He believes that anyone who has lived in Ellsworth in the last 50 years knows that there was compliance issues with Mr. Ray. He was a wonderful guy and was very skilled. He built a lot of homes and put people in homes that never would have owned homes. He guesses that there may have been some burning issues from other roads that were accepted and that a line was drawn in the sand and they said we've had enough. Therefore, if you look through all the documents and if you know the history, the city did not want to adopt that road. It didn't meet the specifications, and he thinks there were probably other roads that didn't meet specs that did get adopted. So here we are today, and his thought is that this is a unique situation, but if the city accepted one penny from the utility line, then the city should be responsible for fixing it. He isn't in favor of adopting the road, that decision was made by a previous Council and he doesn't think we should change that. He hopes that every owner today knew that it was a private road when they bought their property and if they didn't he believes they should bring it up with whoever they bought the property from. We have spent a lot of time on this subject, and he doesn't believe that it would be beyond the scope, if we are going to accept fees from this infrastructure and it is in the main trunk, for us to get this taken care of. If it isn't in the main trunk and it is from the main to the home, then unfortunately they are on their own. The problem comes, he believes, from the fact that no one has come forward and found exactly where the leak is coming from.

Councilor Lyons – he would like to clarify one thing, he believes it was mentioned during the last discussion, the city isn't making money off of them. They are paying to have their water and sewer hooked up to them, that is a service. The city pays to have the sewage treated or pays to have the water treated for them to drink it. We aren't taking money from them but providing them a service. The issue is that their street is private, and their infrastructure is private until it meets the city line. If it is the city side then we could fix it but if it isn't then it isn't our obligation and legally we are not supposed to do it per the PUC. He also lives on a private road and he has to pay for his septic by having it pumped and treated, and he has a well so had to pay for that service.

Councilor O'Halloran – he isn't saying anything about profit and making money, what he is saying is that we are accepting the revenue from water and sewer. Therefore, comes some responsibility for the main line.

Councilor Stein – he believes that it sounded like the hookup fees originally went to Mr. Ray not the city, at least from more recent items.

City Manager Pearce – if we applied the accepting money standard citywide, that would be a very big bill for us to manage the trunk that goes to all the residents. The problem with the trunk here is that it comes off the city's line and then is in joint ownership with the homeowners or Ray Builders, it is broken in a private area. To Councilor Lyons point, we are taking money for treated water as it connects to our system and then the equivalent legally from the PUC we cannot use our water resources because it is private. It's not as simple as saying we will fix it and then send a bill. To Councilor O'Halloran's point, if we just wanted to fix it, we could authorize the City Manager to work with the Public Works Director for no more than up to \$5,000 in local road funds to fix the leak on a one-time basis, it is a possibility.

Lauren Gibson – she knows it has come up a couple times about where the leak is, so there is a new homeowner that recently bought the house in the proximity of the leak. It is her understanding that the Real Estate Agent knew about the leak and had someone from the city come out and test the water to make sure it wasn't just groundwater and to see if it was coming from the utility itself, which she says it is and it is on the main trunk. It happens to be on the corner of her property but is on the main line.

Mike, PWD – so we are now saying that it could be Ray Builders responsibility, which means that we can't touch it anyway because it is private and he owns it.

Lauren Gibson – they are looking for a way forward, not just in terms of the leak, but how to move on.

A gentleman (unsure of his name as he didn't state it) – he grew up on the Bayside Rd, and one of the first people he knew in his life was Robert Ray. His father was also good friends with Mr. Ray, it was almost a closed community on Bayside at one time. Everybody took care of everybody. This is the second meeting he has been to that he has heard his name "besmirched." Mr. Ray was a wonderful man, and he provided a lot of jobs for the people who lived on the road, his neighbors, he gave people houses that they never would have been able to afford. He was not the only contractor in this town that, as was said cut corners, whether that was true or not. Since he is no longer alive and he is, he wanted to come up and make that point.

15. Council Order #052503 Public Hearing and action on the request of the Deputy City Clerk to amend the fee schedule for the City of Ellsworth Code of Ordinances, Chapter 14, Licenses and Permits.

Ebony Kramp-Dowling, Deputy City Clerk – the last time the fee schedule for Chapter 14 was amended was in 2007, with inflation and the cost of doing business rising it seemed like an appropriate time to look at everything and make some changes. Currently public hearing notices are \$80 and the cost of printing in local papers has gone up, so we are losing money. We would like to raise the fee to \$100, which would overall even out because they typically range from \$90-\$110 per notice. There are also some business licenses that we would like to raise to cover the cost of inspections, it takes approximate an hour for Fire and Code to go out to these locations. Last month, Council approved the tree ordinance, so the tree permit fee has been added to the list after working with Casey. The other biggest change would be to a Class C Establishment; we wanted to vary that some because you don't want to charge a place like Walmart the same as you charge a smaller store.

Councilor Stein – he has a business in town, it has a lot of different parts and pieces and food and alcohol, and dancing and it is unique in Ellsworth. There is nothing else that fits their particular structure. They have been through the ringer with Code, Fire and the Clerk's office over the last 8 years, and would rather pay a little bit more in fees knowing that the departments are well funded, organized, and well-staffed because the most important thing he has found is to be able to get someone on the phone, get an email back or have somebody do an inspection quickly and you need to be able to make rapid fire changes, especially during the summer. Ellsworth has been that for the most part over the years, so he believes that funding these to at least break even through fees is reasonable and positive for the business community.

Move to approve the request of the Deputy City Clerk to amend the fee schedule for the City of Ellsworth, Code of Ordinances, Chapter 14, Licenses and Permits as presented effective immediately, T White, seconded by P Lyons, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

16. Council Order #052504 Public Hearing and action on the request of the Code Enforcement Officer on repealing Chapter 26 “Plumbing and Septic System Permit Fees,” amending Chapter 41 “Electrical Installation and Inspection Ordinance” and amending Chapter 56, Article 2 “Plan Approval and Permitting Procedures” to create Chapter 67 “Unified Building Fee Ordinance.”

Robert Grant, Code Enforcement Officer – he discovered that the fee schedule for any of the fees in the Code Office have not been updated in at least 20 years. They are also in four different locations, spread across three different ordinances. So, he decided for simplicity, to put them all into one ordinance and update the fees. He used a couple different metrics to do that, one was using the inflationary cost from 2005, which is the last time he knew of it being updated. Current building residential permits are .17¢ per square foot and with inflation for today’s dollars it is .28¢ per square foot, so he was confident with .25¢ per square foot being the minimum he would need to ensure that we are not losing money.

Councilor Mote – shared several examples of other towns that were on the list saying that we are still significantly lower. We are currently at .17¢ per square foot and looking to go to .25¢ per square foot when Bar Harbor charges .41¢, Bath charges .40¢, Brewer charges .50¢ and Rockland charges a \$60 application fee plus .50¢ per square foot.

Councilor Lyons – he asked, to confirm, that the math with the fee increases helps the Code Office break even as far as revenues versus costs? CEO Grant responded that he did a lot of math trying to recreate statistics that were never kept in the office, but yes he believes the .25¢ for residential single-family permits plus the other increases on the list gets them to where they will be able to break even for a few years. The Code office has been running at a \$40,000, roughly, deficit year over year, which means that every time someone takes a permit out, the general fund is subsidizing \$40,000 worth of their operating costs.

Councilor Smith – she would like to reiterate what Robert said about it not increasing costs, it’s that every bit that isn’t covered by the person who is getting the service is covered by the taxpayers. It is appropriate to bring it up, even though she is hearing that it will only bring us to breaking even. She likes that he included that it is required to be updated at a certain time, so that we aren’t going through this again in another 20 years. She supports the direction we’re going with this and thank you for recognizing that we need to build it into the system that we are evaluating it. We have worked so hard on keeping the cost down for property tax owners, and she remembers two gentlemen who come regularly to the Finance Committee meetings, and one of them said “you’ve got to find other ways to make money.” This is an appropriate way to bring more revenues in so that it’s not all on the property taxpayers.

Councilor Stein – wants to echo the same thing he said on the previous item, and he is in favor of it. He wondered if CEO Grant had an average example of what someone would pay with these new fees. CEO Grant responded that he found the average size home in Maine in 2023 was 1675 square feet and if we were to have charged a permit fee for that home, we would have charged a \$284.75 building permit fee but with the proposed fee it would be \$418.7, which is a \$134 increase. For commercial, he took the average 5,000 square feet for a building, which would be a \$1,000 permit fee at .20¢ per square foot and if it goes up to .30¢ it would be a \$1,500 fee.

Move to recodify the building fee schedule contained in Chapter 56, Article 2, Chapter 26, Plumbing and Septic System Permit Fees, and Chapter 41, the Electrical Installation and Inspection Ordinance, into Chapter 67 of the Ellsworth City Code to be called the Unified Building Ordinance, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 5-1 (S O’Halloran opposed)

17. Council Order #052505 Public Hearing and action on the request of the Fire Chief to amend the fee schedule for the City of Ellsworth Code of Ordinances, Chapter 4, Fire Protection and Prevention Ordinance.

Scott Guillerault, Fire Chief – prior to 2020, the Fire Department and Life Safety Inspector, did have a fee schedule assigned to article two of chapter 4. He did plans review for commercial businesses and multi-family dwellings, and there was a pretty significant fee schedule that he used. In 2020 when he retired the fee schedule was removed from the ordinance. His understand was it was because the incoming Fire Inspector didn't have the qualifications and instead of us just not assessing the fees until he met the standard, we removed it. We now have a qualified Fire Inspector again and he works very closely with the Planning Board to review all fire and life safety components for the commercial industries that come into the city. There is a lot of time and effort that goes into the work that he does, and he is of the strong opinion that he doesn't feel that 8,400 people in the city should be paying for the Fire inspector to do plans review for the commercial industry, when they aren't the ones building the building. When they started going through this process, he had directed then Deputy Chief Low and Fire Inspector Canavan, to put us right in the middle. FI Canavan went before the Finance Committee earlier this year, presented the fee schedule, and was asked to make some adjustments. What is in the packet is the updated version with the adjustments.

Councilor Lyons – as part of the Finance Committee, they have come a few times, and it's been good dialogue. He fixed the things they suggested and came back and for the same reasons they voted for the other two fee schedule updates, he thinks they should vote to approve this one.

Councilor Mote – asked if Chief Guillerault knew the average size commercial building that he is looking over as the inspector? The Chief responded that they vary, they have seen proposals that are upwards of 12,000 square feet or smaller ones that are 2,000-2,500 square feet. That is why the fee schedule is based on square footage as part of the calculation.

Move to approve the request of the Fire Chief to amend the fee schedule for the City of Ellsworth, Fire Protection and Prevention Ordinance, Chapter 4 fee schedule as presented, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

18. Council Order #052506 Request of the Fire Chief to sole source purchase an automated chest compression device.

Scott Guillerault, Fire Chief – he is looking for permission to purchase two CPR devices, called Lucas devices, they are an automated CPR device. Given their short staffing, they supplement leaving a firefighter doing CPR on an individual. Since they are automated that means there is little to no interruption during CPR. The funding for this comes through a Maine State Sustainability grant, from the Maine EMS office. Two years ago, he sat on the committee that was in charge of doing a financial evaluation for sustainability in Maine EMS, and it was determined that there was a huge disparity as far as reimbursements and funding. So the state has been trying to reinvest back into some of these EMS systems. The grant specifically targets this project for the CPR devices. We were awarded a \$35,000 grant to pay for these; the remaining funds would come out of a revenue account they have.

Councilor Lyons – said that Scott presented this last week to Finance Committee and the devices sound really cool and they will help them to increase their capabilities.

Councilor White – looked at some videos of theses, not only does it help alleviate, but it also has a better success rate.

Fire Chief Guillerault – the other part of it is that it integrates with some software that we already have. We're able to upload data from the machine at the end of an event so they can go back and review to see if there were things they needed to change, so we are constantly in a state of improvement.

Councilor O'Halloran – is in total agreement with this. He thinks that what they were told at the Finance Committee was powerful, there is not a lot of training that goes to this, it is pretty automated, they would have them in two different vehicles and could save a lot of grievous for people and time. He is thankful that the cost to the city is very low. His question is why is it sole sourced? Chief Guillerault responded that there are other companies out there that make similar devices, however this is the newest technology that is available, and they are the only company that provides it. By design, they are the ones who created this, but this particular model and version is only allowed to be sold by this company. He could go down a model that doesn't have the integration capabilities that they are looking at and get it from another company but wouldn't be able to gain the additional information for continuous improvement.

Move to authorize the purchase of two Lucas device version 31 CPR devices in the amount of \$38,905.54 from Striker Sales LLC, with funding in the amount of \$35,509.12 coming from the Maine EMS Sustainability grant NFD and the remaining \$3,396.42 coming from the FD Training site revenue account 15-210-53010, J Stein, seconded by P Lyons, passed 6-0

19. Council Order #052507 Public Hearing and action on the request of the City Manager to allocate Tax Increment Financing funds for grant consulting services.

City Manager Pearce – this is one thing we discussed a bit during the budget process, but instead of waiting until FY26 to move forward on the grants management consultant, we can use some surplus TIF funds to get started on it right away. Our Library uses a grant consultant and Heart of Ellsworth also uses one, he used them to get a range of what this could do to help us catalog and track grants that are around. From ones that we currently have and align it to our business attraction plan, comprehensive plan and capital improvement plan, so we can try to mitigate the impact of all the plans and the funding they might require and to the taxpayer. There is a lot of grant funding out there that we should be taking a much higher use of. We will put it out to RFP, and then move forward toward an implementation plan. There will probably be a little more involved for year one, in helping us organize a grants plan, and that doesn't mean that all of our grant are getting outsourced to this person. They are really helping us quarterback how we go after grants that align towards our specific things, with someone who is an expert. We do a lot of research and try to go forward on these ourselves to get as many grants as possible but having someone who is doing this for other cities and towns and is seeing things and can make recommendations and is an expert, would be a good use of funds for the city.

Councilor White – asked for some clarity on what we expect the \$15,000 to cover. If it is the searching for grants and writing the grants for the city to submit or if it is the grant management part of it. Manager Pearce responded that we are still going to have to do compliance through the Finance office and even the grant writing. This person will help us gather them and they will be doing an inventory of all the grants out there, creating spreadsheets and a system for us to keep track of where we are at now and then as new grants come up, have a dedicated process. Essentially creating a grants management process, which is something we don't have. Right now, each department does their own but none of us has the bandwidth and expertise outside of this to how we create a unified grants management process throughout the city.

Councilor Mote – asked if this is a one-time type of thing to kind of get us on track? City Manager Pearce responded that it is a one time at this level and then probably as a maintenance level as well. Councilor Mote followed up with asking how many grants are we overseeing right now? Manager Pearce wasn't sure off the top of his head; the number seventy was thrown out.

Councilor O'Halloran – asked Chief Guillerault how he found out about the grant for the CPR devices? Chief responded that it came as a direct notification from Maine EMS as part of a bulletin they sent out to all the licensed agencies.

Councilor White – said that she had someone reach out to her and point out that we either missed or didn't get a community action grant from the state, through the Community Resilience Partnership and they were giving out the largest amount of money they have ever done. Did we apply for it, or did we get one? Deputy City Manager Devlin responded that we have one for the match to the VPI. We haven't spent down that money yet, so we weren't eligible for more.

Councilor Smith – said that applying for grants is a significant part of her job, it has been for 15 years. She supports this contractor role for the coordination and raising awareness. In response to Councilor O'Halloran's question about how you find out about them, some are direct notifications. She went through two emails today from Senator King's office, with here are federal funding opportunities, and they have them by department and she thought there were at least 100 in each email. So, if you have someone who is already familiar with what might be offered and then recognizes the title of it to be able to go for it, those are generally federal. There are also Maine Philanthropy Center, which puts out notifications for funding and Grow Smart. A lot of our community work is funded through the Community Resilience Partnership, and through the housing opportunity program. At the philanthropic, state and federal levels, there are opportunities, you just need the capacity of someone who's in the rhythm and knows how to do it. The other value this person can bring is having someone with the experience of what is required and can track it for you. This person isn't doing all the work, they are giving the framework and from there staff can tell the stores that will be compelling to get the money and your not missing it because you forgot things.

Move to authorize the City Manager to issue a request for proposals for a grants management consultant with total cost not to exceed \$15,000, to be funded from the FY2025 surplus in the Economic Development Tax Increment (TIF) account, P Lyons, seconded by T White, passed 6-0

20. Council Order #052508 Public Hearing and action on the request of the Finance Director to amend Council Order #112400 to reallocate bond proceeds to additional projects.

Sara Devlin, Deputy City Manager - this came up during the CIP discussion at the workshop on April 8th. Staff recognized some surplus in the BAN from the local roads portion, so they thought they would propose to reallocate some of that to some of the CIP items. Items include an excavator and trench box, which is split between Highway, Wastewater and Water Departments. Highway would be 60% and the other two both 20%. A camera that is split three-ways between Highway, Wastewater and Water Departments. They added the sidewalk snowplow into this based on previous conversations and two vertical balers. They also received additional details in the cost proposal from Woodard & Curran on the Surry Road water main replacement project, the contingency is requested to be increased by another \$107,000.

S O'Halloran – would like to go on record saying that he didn't realize that the city didn't have an excavator. He is disappointed that we have made other purchases when an excavator for the city is a very important tool to have. It is a main tool to work with; he will be the first to agree to

that. The challenge that he has with that is that he doesn't think we should be taking \$486,000 away from our suffering roads and buying these pieces of equipment with it. It was intended to pave roads, and he thinks that is what should be done with that money. If we have that left over, we should be carrying that to future roads. It also says the useful life is 20 years, what is the length of the bond? He doesn't want to be financing an excavator for 20 years. Finance Director Moore responded that we don't have the bond yet. City Manager Pearce said that we will take an average useful life and feather that into our debit service. We don't want to have spikes or drops, necessarily, in the debit service, we want to make sure it is a reasonable amount of debit service to carry.

Councilor Mote – agrees with Councilor O'Halloran that this money should have been used for roads. She does support all of these items.

City Manager Pearce – said that we don't want to do all our roads year one, we want to stagger them. The plan now is once all the roads are paved by the early fall, to have a new road analysis inventory done via data, not just the roads committee. Have a car with LAR go over every bit of road in the city and then produce a report that we can take a data driven approach to the next 10 years of road rebuilding. Like we said last fall, the fall and winter are pencils up so that we can be shovels in, in the spring. He doesn't see this as taking away from the roads. If the Council wanted to allocate roads funding, we wouldn't know until the analysis is done. This is to lessen the impact of things that could be put in the general fund this year, but an additional \$449,000 in this year's general fund would have put us well over the 2.9%.

Councilor Stein – he sees most of these items as tied to roads even though it's not asphalt, aside from the balers and maybe the sidewalk plow, but it ties in his mind.

Move to order amending the current General Obligation BOND to include additional projects and an increase in the original Surry Road Contingency as defined in the original order. The amendment includes the following excavator at \$153,600, trench box at \$14,400, camera at \$42,000, sidewalk plow at \$100,000, two vertical balers at \$32,000 and Surry Road water main at \$107,000 for a total of \$449,000, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 4-2 (T Mote & S O'Halloran opposed)

21. Council Order #052509 Request of the City Manager to accept the bid for engineering services relative to the Courthouse Road project.

City Manager Pearce – this culminates from many briefings, workshops and presentations that were done on the Surry Road to Merrill Lane Courthouse relocation effort. For anyone that would like to see it there is a whole webpage dedicated to it, it is ellsworthmaine.gov/courthouse, and it has all the videos of the workshops. From all of the meetings and workshops came an authorization at the January Council meeting to authorize the City Manager to move forward on the project and work with the state for the purchases of road, easement and fee purchases. Also to work with the state on environmental permitting and looking at different funding options for the project. They came up with a Courthouse Collaboration Agreement, which was entered into a few months ago, it outlines the steps of the process that we would be going through. One of the steps in the agreement was that the city would RFP (Request for Proposals) the engineering and surveying services, to start moving on that quickly to meet state deadlines. We received one proposal for engineering services from Andrew McCullough Engineering, who the city has worked with many times in the past. It is in our procurement policy that we don't have to put out the RFP for engineering services, but we wanted to make sure that we did due diligence and that we were following the collaboration agreement.

Move to authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with Andrew McCullough Engineering for an amount not to exceed \$96,650.00 for the provision of design and engineering services for the Merrill Lane public roadway project, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

22. Council Order #052510 Request of the City Manager to accept the bid for surveying services relative to the Courthouse Road project.

City Manager Pearce – there were two bids that came in for surveying services, we would like to go with the local person for this one as well. Their bid was a little less than the alternative bidder and they have more local knowledge. They also added some alternative items, if we find that we have to do additional things that could put them right at or just over the other bidder. With the local knowledge and being the lower bid, we would like to go with Herrick & Salsbury for \$14,180.00 with additional, optional options up to \$7,055.00 if needed.

Move to approve the selection of Herrick & Salsbury, Inc for surveying services of the Merrill Lane Roadway project in an amount not to exceed \$14,180.00, with optional services authorized at staff discretion up to an additional \$7,055.00, J Stein, seconded by T White, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

23. Council Order #052511 Public Hearing and potential action on the purchase of fee/easement rights to portions of the Adams and Merrill properties off High Street for the extension and incorporation of Merrill Lane as a public way.

City Manager Pearce – this item is also part of the Courthouse Collaboration agreement; we have a variety of timelines and deadline to finish our piece of it. One of which is to secure the fee purchase of the parcels of land connecting to the Wardwell property, where the proposed courthouse will be. The state will be meeting this Friday (5/23) in Augusta with the Wardwells to close on the 17.9 acres, which will officially swap the Surry Road property for the Wardwell property off of High Street. So now our piece is to enter into the contracts with the landowners, we have minimized the total footprint by narrowing the road and straightening it as much as possible. We are also not going to be building the construction road that was going to come off of Long Lane, so there will be a saving there. It will be approximately \$200,000.00 for the land purchases, based on our city assessments. It is about \$175,000.00 for the Merrill parcel directly off High Street and about \$30,000 for the Adams parcel. The Wardwell parcel is being swapped with the state, but they would also be deeding a small land parcel that connects the courthouse to the city, so that the city in perpetuity would have that as a public way. They have finished the environmental surveying of the area. On the map he was given, it shows two circles around the potential vernal pools, that could have limited development in the area, and those areas came back as not being vernal pools. So, to keep moving forward we will enter into these contracts, which will likely happen this week, then give the state what they need on Friday to move forward with their closing with the Wardwells and closing on our parts of the land deals. He could come back later for a Council ratification of the contracts. This will all be funded through our local roads capital account.

Councilor White – is concerned about the storm water if we start building up in this area, where there are already issues with it on High Street, and just wanted to make sure that we are taking that into consideration. DCM Devlin said that with the Village Partnership Initiative it has already been considered.

Councilor Lyons – there has been a lot of time put into this between Charlie and the management team and is very excited for this opportunity for Ellsworth and is appreciative of the staff's efforts on it.

Move to authorize the City Manager to enter into contract agreements for the acquisition of fee interest rights in land for the production of a public way and the extension of Merrill Lane as part of the Courthouse Collaboration Agreement, at a cost not to exceed \$215,000, with funds to be taken from the Local Roads Capital Account. The City Manager is further authorized to enter into easement granting agreements with the Wardwell, Adams, and Merrill families, and the Maine State Judiciary, for access rights, roadway improvements, and utility tie-ins related to the public way, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

24. Executive session to discuss labor negotiations between the City of Ellsworth and the Ellsworth City Hall Clerks Unit Massachusetts and Northern New England Laborers District Council 327 in accordance with MRSA Title 1, Chapter 13, Section 405, Paragraph 6D.

Move to enter P Lyons, seconded by J Stein, passed 6-0

Move to exit P Lyons, seconded by T White, passed 6-0

25. Discussion and action on labor negotiations between the City of Ellsworth and the Ellsworth City Hall Clerks Unit Massachusetts and Northern New England Laborers District Council 327.

Move to approve the collective bargaining agreement between the City of Ellsworth and the Ellsworth City Hall Clerk's unit local 327 of the laborers international union of North America, July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2028, P Lyons, seconded by T White, passed 6-0

After the motion was made and seconded, Councilor Smith wished to go on record expressing concern about the intent to shift to a 4-day work week. She believes that City Hall is a public-facing, public serving entity and is concerned that four 10-hour days will not provide the same amount of service, the same amount of availability of service as even what we have now, with the late evening and then the half day on Friday.

26. Council Order #052512 Public Hearing and action on Budget Resolutions for FY2026.
City Manager Pearce – since we talked about this in detail as item 12a, he will make this short. This does include both the Police Union negotiation increases and now post ratification of the Clerk's Union negotiations. It also includes the pay adjustments negotiated by himself, Councilor O'Halloran, our attorney, the Clerk's Union and City Clerk. As part of the discussion/negotiation, they discussed switching to a 4-day work week, which many other cities and towns have done. It was proposed to do 7am-6pm, Monday thru Thursday, which is a more predictable schedule than what we currently have. There are some pros in terms of cost savings for City Hall not having to be cleaned, cost of energy and heating the building on Fridays and there are some cons like not being able to have a wedding on Fridays or the Friday before Memorial Day, not being able to do a boat registration. We have heard from a lot of staff on the current schedule that we have had people showing up in the afternoon on Fridays. Having the Monday thru Wednesday schedule, a Thursday schedule and a Friday schedule is not hitting the mark very well. A fair amount of other municipalities have gone to this 4-day week, so he wouldn't be able to use it as a recruitment

mechanism on selling our 5-day staggered schedule. Going to 4 days could help in that aspect but is Friday the best day or is Monday the best day.

Move to adopt the following budget for the fiscal year 2026. Be it hereby resolved, that the sum of \$27,155,150 which constitutes the estimated requirements of the various city accounts for the Fiscal Year 2026, based upon the budget submitted by the City Manager as provided by the Charter, be raised assessments upon the inhabitants of the City of Ellsworth and upon the estates on non-resident proprietors with the City for the present municipal year, and that the sums hereby appropriated, in addition to sums as otherwise provided, the amount for each purpose being specified as presented, subject to ratification of the School Budget voted on by the residents on June 10, 2025. It is further resolved that the City of Ellsworth City Council approves the budgets for the following departments in the amount specified as presented. The total Wastewater expenditures being \$2,066,207.00 and the total water expenditures being \$1,737,644.00, P Lyons, seconded by N Smith, passed 5-1 (S O'Halloran opposed)

27. Adjournment.

Move to adjourn P Lyons, seconded by J Stein, passed 6-0