Camden Select Board
Minutes of Meeting
May 3, 2011

PRESENT: Chairperson Karen Grove, Vice Chairperson Deborah Dodge, John French, Morgan Laidlaw, Martin Cates, Town Manager Roberta Smith, and Town Attorney William Kelly. Also present were members of the public and press.

Minutes of Meeting

AS SELECT BOARD

1. **Public input on non-agenda items.**

a. Resident Deborah Dodge made the following statements: "As Camden moves forward on working with the next Tannery prospect, and as we debate any issue in the future, she hopes there is something that all of Camden can come together and agree on. There are standards for public discourse in our community. Now matter whether you were for or against the Tannery/Studio project – no matter how strongly we disagree – deception, ridicule, mockery, and obscene comments are not acceptable.

The commentary that was posted on facebook crossed over the line of decency. On April 25 an image was posted that showed 5 sheep in front of the Camden Opera House. Jack Churchill commented and she quoted: "The Selectboard gather for a group photo after giving the town away". A few hours later this is followed by Leonard Lookner's post and she quoted: "After having sex with _____. (She did not name the principal of the studio project).

She further stated shame on Jack Churchill, Leonard Lookner, and shame on Camden if we do not stand up and say "You do not represent us". This is not how we treat each other and this is not who we are.

b. Resident Don White and representative for Gateway 1 planning process. Members met last week to discuss the future of the Gateway 1 collaboration in light of MDOT's withdrawal from the start up agreements signed in 2009. Committee members reaffirmed the importance of a regional approach to maintain safety, mobility, and unique character of Route 1 in the midcoast and the importance of implementing the Gateway1 corridor action. They voted unanimously to extend the Gateway 1 start up agreement through October to give corridor towns time to develop a new plan for moving forward in light of MDOT's withdrawal. The group has assigned two new subcommittees to look into structure and funding. The moving ahead subcommittee was charged with creating viable options on committee structure, a mission statement, operating guidelines, education and outreach components that will allow every member community to be fully engaged in the future direction and goals of Gateway 1. The funding subcommittee will be exploring both short and long term funding possibilities.

c. Resident Bob Gassett stated it seems like we have an opportunity to look at what went right and what went wrong with the process of the sale of the Tannery and he was wondering if there was any movement to get that discussion happening.

Town Manager Smith stated there has been with CEDAC.

d. Resident Bernice Berger made the following statements: "It appears that Camden has a social media lynch mob also know as cyber bullies. It's great to have citizens who question and raise red flags and investigate. She does appreciate the watchdogs in this town, however, using present day social media to insult and insinuate and make perverted sexual racial anti-sematic remarks is nothing less than a low blow to those of whose believe in the process and wanted to vote. A circus atmosphere has been created but may be the vocal minority also known as the BRAT pack. These folks have bullied and insulted the local citizenry by remarks aimed at our intelligence or our lack of. Camden is perceived as an anti-business community when we all know that we want to create jobs and possibly give our kids an opportunity to stay in their home town and support themselves. She was told today that the Waterfront Restaurant is probably one of the largest employee's well that is not exactly what her kid went to college and grad school for. We cannot survive the competitive world out there with this bullying attitude and she is really sorry that we could have not given this process a chance."

e. Resident Shane Flynn made the following statements: He would like to support what Bernice Berger just stated. As we look across the spectrum in the Town of Camden we see something that is not very pleasant and if we look beyond that we will see the discourse that has taken place throughout the state in recent times and that is not very pleasant either and even further the discourse in the county it's not very pleasant. He thinks that people that live in a community expect that neighbors will behave in a certain way. We hope we don't have people who hide behind the ordinances and use ordinances as weapons but unfortunately that does happen. We hope people who might have a problem will speak to people and be fair and honest and open and use the platforms that are here in the way that they should be used and not to hide behind the mask of whatever it is they may be using to disguise themselves. Camden has a reputation and it's not a good reputation in terms of how it is open for business. There have been a few things in the last few years that have been unpleasant for a business that he represents in town and another business that he represented before. He has been treated poorly by people who have used these tactics. He thinks most people in this community know who is articulating a lot of this. He thinks it's about time that people say let us be neighbors, let us talk to one another in open and honest way. Don't have fun hurting other people and don't have fun hurting other businesses. Whether or not these businesspeople were up to the task, whether they had the financing, and whether they had this or that what relevance is that to a lot of the people who decided to hurt behind the scenes and slander them. There are processes and there is an elected representation in this town and in this state and in this country and we need people to use those things. The economic development of this town has been sorely supported in the last few years. We shouldn't be worrying about who we employ the answer is to have an atmosphere to support things. You have to have something that is open and you need to have discourse that is fair.

Board comments:

Board member Cates stated he would like go on record supporting what Board member Dodge made in her statements and agrees with her wholeheartedly. This has been probably the rudest discourse he has seen in a long time. This is a classic case of cyber bullying. He

would like to thank Deb Dodge, Bernice Berger, and Shane Flynn for saying what needed to be said and for the support it is much appreciated.

Board member French stated he stands behind everything that has been said in this room. He has heard people all around town that are very angry about what happened. He also mentioned that there is going to be a 35,000 square foot sound stage built in Maine. The City of So. Portland offered them a deal of six months free rent, after that $550 month for rent. The comment in the paper said there were 10 or more film production companies looking for places in Maine and there have never been any studios around to accommodate their needs. The film production companies are very happy about this and the Mayor of So. Portland said it was going to be a great economic development for their city. Camden could have had all that.

Board member Grove commented that it is very upsetting to see this discourse on facebook and not to mention how very upset she was at the public hearing about the tenure and tone of what went on but just to move on she wants to say how proud she is of Deb, Bernice, Shane and all the others for being so supportive because when citizens like us stand up and say this does not work here that it a beginning to go in the right direction.

Board member Laidlaw commented partially he is ashamed of what has transpired. He is ashamed that is has represented our town in such a poor way. However, there has been a lot done in the last couple years to work on our perception as a business friendly community. He thanked everyone in the CEDAC group because there has been a tremendous amount of effort and this Select Board has voted in favor of every single business that has come across the desk here. He wants to thanks everyone for that work and he apologizes that this has tarnished that effort.

2. **Consideration of a Mutual Rescission Agreement with B. D'Turman'd Entertainment LLC.** Town Attorney William Kelly stated this agreement serves to revoke the First Amended Purchase & Sale Agreement with B.D' Turman'd Entertainment LLC as a result of their notification that stating they were not going forward with the project. After execution of this document it will essentially terminate the purchase and sale agreement and also serve to release any obligations, rights, and claims between both parties.

Deborah Dodge made a motion that, in light of the April 26, 2011 letter from B. D Turman'd Entertainment, LLC indicating that they cannot meet certain conditions precedent to close on the Apollo Tannery property, we authorize the Town Manager to execute the "Mutual Rescission of Purchase and Sale Agreement and Release of Claims" draft agreement dated April 26, 2011. Martin Cates seconded this motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

3. **Cancellation of the order calling for a Special Town Meeting referendum vote for May 10, 2011**

Martin Cates made a motion that the Select Board hereby Revokes and Cancels its Order of March 23, 2011 calling for a Special Town Meeting referendum vote on ratification and approval of the "First Amended Agreement For The Purchase And Sale Of Real Estate" dated March 23, 2011, as the Warrant Articles for this Special Town meeting have not been posted by the Constable, and therefore said Special Town Meeting has not

yet been legally "called". John French seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

The Board was in agreement to move ahead to on the agenda to the Manager's Report.

13. Manager's Report: Mrs. Smith stated with the Route 1 resurfacing project we have an opportunity to get some crosswalk enhancements. She has been meeting with MDOT project manager Shawn Smith and he is working on getting some prices for crosswalks. She and Public Works Director Rick Seibel met with him last week and Rick has done some research on some of these alternative applications of crosswalks that would hopefully create some traffic calming, would last longer than the paint, etc.

Public Works Director Rick Seibel explained the two different types of application he has researched.

Street Print application is a surface treatment that goes on top of the asphalt. They add sand which is an aggregate and this adds more strength to the product and last a lot longer. Duratherm application is an inlay that the fabric is melted into the asphalt. Both treatments eliminate the risk of heaving and settlement and create a smooth surface. Their durability and low maintenance is a savings in the long term and repairs can be made with minimal disruption. We still need to paint white lines on the sides of either application we choose. The white line is a mandatory state traffic law.

Rick said as far as the aesthetics the Street Print looks better than Duratherm. They did not tell him which one will hold up better than the other they are pretty much the same. The Street Print application is about $13.00 per square foot and the Duratherm is around $11-12 per square foot. MDOT measured the crosswalks along Route 1 and there is 4,034.7square feet total of crosswalks. His main concern is maintenance we don't know if reflective cracking is going to affect these prints. He spoke with someone who installs the street print and most of the reflective cracking he has seen gas been in the joint lines.

Board member French asked what happens after the five year life span. Rick said they would come back and mil it down about two inches and re-stamp it.

Board member Dodge asked how many crosswalks are we considering. Mrs. Smith stated there are 12 crosswalks within the project which is roughly from the Library up to Cedar Crest Motel. It would be cost prohibitive to do all our crosswalks with these applications but we have an opportunity to have MDOT to participate in this because they are doing the project. This is more expensive than just painting so it could be when they get a quote from someone to get this done it may beyond their budget and they would be looking for the town to contribute somewhat. However it has a different look and would certainly be good in higher traffic areas if it does last longer than the paint. The Board needs to consider what kind of downtown district look they want apply it if that is what you want. Depending on the cost we may not be able to do all 12 crosswalks and the Board may need to pick and choose which ones the town wants down.

Resident Ray Andresen stated he realizes we are only talking about crosswalks going across Route 1 which means all the adjoining crosswalks at Bay View Street, Chestnut Street, and Mechanic Street will look different in the future. This may get merchants calling wanting all

the crosswalks look the same so maybe we need to consider what it is going to cost to do all the crosswalks in town.

Resident Tom Filip said he never has seen this type of product before but over this last winter he was impressed with the brick work done over at the high school and middle school that they did not heave and are as flat as the day they were placed so he suggested maybe plain bricks would be another alternate. Rick Seibel said he wasn't sure but he thinks those crosswalks are not brick but the same application we are talking about tonight.

Resident Geoff Scott asked about the numbers for painting per crosswalk. Rick Seibel told him the town spends about $120 per crosswalk twice a year roughly $2800 per year for painting crosswalks on Route 1. Geoff Scott maybe we could contribute the painting of the crosswalks as our source of funding.

Manager Smith stated it's the look, it's the money and it's the traffic calming and the message it sends to vehicles zipping through town that they are coming into something different other than a Route 1 highway and they need to slow down.

Downtown merchants and residents Bernice Berger and Meg Quijano commented in just looking over they think uniformity is important they like the Duratherm samples from Rochester NH and IN. They do think it's important to have them all look the same so people will know they are crosswalks.

Board member Grove said she thinks if we using something that has a really heavy painting it's going to start looking like a barber pole driving through town. It's all very subjective just like art work.

Meg stated she thinks if you are too subtle she does not think anyone will be able to see any difference from the road.

Resident Anita Brosius-Scott wanted to express she thinks the look of bricks would be very appealing.

Resident Nancy Caudle Johnson suggested that the Historic Resources Committee people may be offended if you do not ask their opinion about what they think would fit in the downtown historic district.

The Board took a consensus vote to forward crosswalks examples from Virginia Beach, VA, Kernersville, NC, and Rochester NH to the Historic Resources Committee for a recommendation.

4. **Consideration of appointment of representatives to the Midcoast Economic Development District.** Mrs. Smith reported that she and Development Director Brian Hodges attended the meeting last week at the Knox County Courthouse. At this meeting it was explained about the re-alignment of Maine's Economic Development Districts and Camden's (through Knox County) inclusion in the boundaries of MCEDD. Due to the realignment and the amendment of MCEDD's Bylaws to operate under a governance model similar to a Regional Planning Commission, Camden may appoint two representatives to MCEDD's General Assembly.

John French made a motion to appoint Development Director Brian Hodges as one representative and advertise for those interested in the second appointment. Martin Cates seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote

5. **Camden Snow Bowl:** Jeff Kuller, General Manager of the Snow Bowl was present and shared a statistics report and his summary of the proposed Snow Bowl Surplus Spending Plan.

   a. **2010-2011 season report.** Jeff Kuller, General Manager of the Snow Bowl reported to the Board a statistics report regarding the 2010-2011 Camden Snow Bowl Season (attached)

   b. **Discussion regarding year-end surplus, amount to set aside for future years, and approval to expend a portion.** (see attached) He has worked with the management team of the Snow Bowl to create and prioritize a list of potential uses for these funds. He is asking the Board to authorize him to work with the Town Manager to determine when and how to spend the $78,000 this spring and summer on projects that they determine will best benefit the Camden Snow Bowl and the community.

After further discussion,

Martin Cates made a motion to approve the proposed spending plan as outlined in the 4/27/11 plan. Morgan Laidlaw seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

6. **Discussion and consideration of request from the C/R Pathways Committee to fund the cost of survey work in connection with a riverwalk easement for public access.** Geoff Scott, CR Pathways Committee Chair reported they are continuing to work on the acquisition of easements along the Megunticook River for a riverwalk. (This property is currently for sale) There is an opportunity to facilitate the provision of an easement on the Cotta property, an easement that will be granted by the property owner to the Coastal Mountains Land Trust. The role for Coastal Mountains Land Trust will be similar to the Tannery easement; they will not become the developer or mangers of trail improvements. They will only be monitoring and enforcing the terms of the easement to ensure that the land remains available for public access. In exchange for offering the public easement, the property owner would like the town to cover the cost of the easement survey. Therefore, the Pathways Committee is requesting the Board approve $3,000 for the cost of the survey.

Landmark Corporation will complete a survey of a proposed riverwalk easement approximately 30 feet in width crossing the westerly shore of the Megunticook River. Where the survey line is being proposed nothing can be built because it is wetlands. They had discussion with MDEP and they are okay with Maine Conservation Corp building a handmade boardwalk and this has been done before with wetlands. As demonstrated by the Orono boardwalk.
Board member Cates asked how do we get access to the easement. Geoff Scott said that is another piece of the puzzle. The vision is to have the path go along the sewer treatment facility on Lions Lane, there would be a bridge to cross to the other side of the property and they are not sure from there yet.

Scott Dickerson, Coastal Mountains Land Trust said this is an approval based in concept because they haven't actually seen the flagging yet where the easement would lie. The other piece is that in the interim between doing this project if it comes to pass and connecting it to a public street there will have to be at least a pedestrian access at Rawson Avenue just for purposes of monitoring or they couldn't accept the easement anyways.

Board member Dodge if we are putting in a bridge by the middle school wouldn't we have to anticipate having language in the easement to accept the bridge on that property.

Scott Dickerson, CMLT stated the abutter needs to allow bridges in the easement. In his opinion the Board is being asked if they to agree to the concept with providing funds for this survey.

Town Attorney Kelly stated this is an arrangement where the town has no legal interest involved so the question becomes does the town have the right to invest money in a private trust which may or may not be written in a way that the voters like. No public monies are supposed to be invested in private properties because there has to be town public purpose attached to it. It may be when CMLT finishes with the language it may rise to this but at the moment there needs to be a bit more homework.

The Board raised questions about how would the town maintain this easement if we don't have rights to the property.

Attorney Kelly stated it would be difficult for the town to put money into trails when the town does not have the right to maintain it.

Geoff Scott stated this is done a lot for example in Lisbon Falls - Island Falls Water Trail – this pathway has five property owners and they each have an easement on their land for public access.

Nancy Caudle-Johnson asked what kind of survey it is. She has learned that a conservation easement is different than a boundary survey. Her interest is in protecting what we already have before we extend ourselves other places.

Manager Smith stated what appears to be different about this and building a pathway through the woods over five or six landowners is the fact that you are talking about building a structure and having to maintain it. We need to know who owns, who pays for it, who maintains it, and who is responsible for the upkeep of the structure. There needs to be a vision as to who is going to own it. We keep going around the question does the town need to have some ownership in the easement in order to build and own the boardwalk that it is going to be built. That is a very important question to be answered before we go any further.

Tom Filip is surmised that this topic is even being discussed. There was no budget request from CR Pathways. There is no money in the budget unless money is taken away from leisure services. His other question is liability who is going to be responsible if someone gets hurt. This sounds like a budget question for FY13.

Manger Smith if this is something that the Board wishes to do now the only option would be for the Board to take out of contingency.

Board member Dodge stated she feels like we are approaching this too piecemeal. I know we endorsed a Master Plan that included this but the town has not voted that they want to spend x number of dollars on securing and creating riverwalk access. She feels maybe there should be a town vote to allocate resources to creating this riverwalk. So that there is some sort of long range plan.

John French made a motion to table for more information: (some suggestions)

- *who owns what*
- *who is responsible long term*
- *check to see how other towns have handled*
- *riverwalk – 30 foot width may not uniformaly fit on this parcel*

Martin Cates seconded this motion.

Resident and CR Pathways member Anita Brosius-Scott stated the Pathways Committee has discussed a number of times with the Board the concept of putting money into a fund for Pathways and the Select Board has voted down every time. She wanted to remind the Board that the Comprehensive Plan and the most recent Strategic Plan both assign to the Select Board as a priority item to acquire access for waterfront as those opportunities arise. The riverwalk is a top priority in the Strategic Plan. The vision has been there since 2005 and the Board needs to give a little more clarity to the C/R Pathways Committee of how they should proceed.

Manager Smith stated the Board has never made the determination that they don't support the concept of putting money into the reserve there just has not been any money the last couple of years. There are a lot of things that didn't get funded that does not mean the Board does not support the concept of a reserve fund.

Board member French stated the Board did not say they would not approve the concept we just need more specifics. We are trying to do what we can to keep taxes down.

The Board voted on the motion on the floor.
The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

7. **Approval of the request of the CRL Chamber of Commerce to close Atlantic Avenue for their annual Spring and Fall Harbor Arts shows.** This request is the annual request to close Atlantic Avenue July 16 & 17 and again on October 1 & 2 during the art shows.

John French made a motion to approve the closing of Atlantic Avenue as requested by the CRL Chamber and to work cooperatively with the Library. Morgan Laidlaw seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

8. **Designation of Sunday May 22nd as Arbor Day in Camden.**

Deborah Dodge made a motion to designate Sunday, May 22nd as Arbor Day. John French seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

Nancy Caudle-Johnson announced that the Arbor Day celebration will be Sunday at 1:00 pm at the Megunticook Riverwalk.

9. **Consideration of victualer licenses:**
   a. **Mount Battie Takeout at 247 Camden Road.**
   b. **Zaddick's Pizza at 20 Washington Street.** Manager Smith reported both applications have been reviewed by the Codes Office and the life safety inspections have been completed.

John French made a motion to approve the victualer license as listed above. Martin Cates seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

10. **FY 12 Budget Clarification.** Manager Smith stated she has prepared revised Budget sheets showing the inclusion of the entire amount necessary for the work at Laite Beach. Since the Board's Budget Workshop meeting she has given additional thought to the best way to fund the work, allowing for the potential of donations and/or a grant. She is suggesting that the Board tentatively propose funding the work ($165,500) with the $43,000 in Capital Outlay that we moved from other projects, with the balance ($122,500) coming from Surplus. That will allow the Board to adjust the use of surplus should other funding become available while at the same time avoiding the legal and interest cost of financing.

John French made a motion to approve the revised FY12 Budget with a total in Non-tax Revenues of $2,111,695 and total Expenditures of $6,206,657, for a net tax commitment of $4,094,962.

11. **Review and final approval of the 2011 Annual Town Meeting Warrant.** Manager Smith stated given that we no longer have a purchase and sale agreement on the Tannery site we need to change the wording of Article 6. Attorney Kelly provided a memo with some options for that wording.

Board member Grove asked if there was a reason why were changing this. Attorney Kelly said no it's totally up to the Board. She stated we went through so many hoops last year just wondered if we would be safer going with what we had last year.

Board member French stated it might be a good time for discussion to see if the Town is willing to put it back to the Select Board so the Board can dispose of it because of all the things we just went through and thinks it will put us in a better position to talk to people about this. We do have the guidelines to go by and we are not going to go outside of that. They are pretty well done by a good group of people and voted on by the town. He knows it could become political at town meeting but it is certainly worth a discussion.

Town Attorney Kelly stated the first option is to make clear there is an existing warrant article from November 2008 that says if the town tannery property is to be sold it has to go to a referendum vote which is what we just cancelled tonight. We had to reference the fact t what is left of the Apollo property that would be sold excluding the riverwalk because we own the fee under that and CMLT has its rights across the riverwalk.

The first option he suggested you go back to the old way that says the Select Board has the authority to dispose of tax acquired property and it makes it clear that it includes Apollo property. The other option you would go back to last year's warrant article, which says the Select Board has the authority tax acquired but what is not left of the Apollo Tannery property.

If you choose the first option and it passes then the Select Board is clearly authorized to dispose of the Apollo Tannery as it deems in the best interest of the Town but it could be followed by an article that says" In the event the voters to fail Article 6A immediately preceding this article "Shall the town vote to authorize to dispose tax acquired property excluding the former Apollo Tannery property. This way you do not have to amend anything from the floor.

The first option is the Board gets the authority they use to have and the second option is the Board has the authority they have now which is not to sell the Apollo Tannery property. The second option is a cleanup article but only gets there in the event that first option failed because the voters already have decided they do not want the Select Board to sell the Apollo property in the normal course as they do with any other tax acquired property.

Board member French stated he thinks it deserves discussion on the floor. It is time it has been going on much too long.

Board member Dodge said it has been a couple years. One of the pros is that it reduces the number of hoops a prospective buyer has to go through. It would reduce the risk of politicizing the discussion as opposed to having a pros and cons discussion so it does not become a political football for ex: someone likes widget makers and someone else does not. A con is that it could be perceived as a run around with what the town has stated in the past. If there is plenty of public information and discussion about a proposed purchase and sale agreement and if the public could be convinced at town meeting that there is a process that will still go through then perhaps the town could be convinced to change how they want to do it. It is a different time then in 2008 when we created that requirement for a referendum. There will be an opportunity for people to say whether they have changed their mind or not. If they haven't' then we keep going the way we have been for the last two years.

Board member Grove said she agrees with you sitting here but takes a different point of view out there. People have come forward and said they have a right to make a vote on that decision so the perception of the general public is that they still have their finger on the Apollo tannery decision and if we do this we are asking for a lot of push back. We need to very careful about this.

Board member French said why not put it on the floor and give the people a chance to talk about it. If they vote it down then fine we move on but at least get it out there for discussion on the floor and see where go.

Peter Gross, resident and Chairman of CEDAC, urged the Board to put this before the voters because a lot of people he has spoken with are angry that they were not given a chance to vote one way or the other on a proposal. A number of people he spoke with were very much in favor of what was being proposed. The Purchase and Sale agreement may not have agreed with the actual project but wanted to give them a chance. In his opinion that is part of the discussion we would have on the floor vote at town meeting. Approval one way or the other moving forward with this project. Voters can vote yes for pro-development, pro-new business in the community, pro-new jobs and want to see this property back on the tax rolls or they can vote no we are not going to do this we are going to continue this beauty contest requiring anybody who comes forward to come up on stage and basically convince the voters that they are the prettiest ones in the group. In his opinion we need to have the

discussion now not the next time we have someone come forward with a proposal. As far as he is concerned the citizens of the community are very well protected because the article states the property can only be sold and developed according to the guidelines that were approved by the voters. The voters have already voted on what they want on the property and it has to go through site plan review with the Planning Board. So it has to go meet all our zoning ordinances and it has to go through DEP. Isn't that enough protection? Let's give the voters a chance to say yes or no that we are going to remove that extra hurdle and that we are open for business.

Board member Cates stated he supports what Peter and John have said. It s time and if we don't deal with it now we are putting the dragon back in the closet. Board member Laidlaw agreed.

Manager Smith asked if we have another prospective buyer who does not want to pay the money up front would that trigger the fact that we need the town to approve it if the voters approve giving the Select Board the authority to sell it under that current criteria. Town Attorney Kelly stated they would need to go to a special town meeting vote. If the citizens vote to allow the Select Board to sell the property does make it clear that is shall be disposed of subject to requirement of Article 10 of the June 2008 town meeting. That was the article that had Tannery Redevelopment Group recommendation. If the Board deviates away from that then this article would need to be re-visited by another town vote. This is an extra layer of protection if there is some type of negotiation that goes on if the town does not get the $175,000 up front.

John French made a motion to approve the town meeting warrant with the following changed wording for Article 6:

Article 6-A
Shall the Town vote to authorize the Select Board to dispose of tax acquired property in any manner which the Select Board deems in the best interest of the Town of Camden, provided however that the Apollo Tannery property as described in Book 3148 Pages 278 and 280, excluding the fee interest in the land burdened by the Coastal Mountains Land Trust Declaration recorded in Book 4093 Page 81, shall be disposed of subject to the requirements of Article 10 of the Town Warrant from the Annual Town Meeting held on June 10, 2008?

Note: Approval of this Article shall serve to negate and over-ride Article 12 of the November 4, 2008 Special Town Meeting, which previously required that any sale of the Apollo Tannery property must be approved by Camden voters by a referendum at a Town Meeting. Copies of Article 12 from the November 4, 2008 Warrant, Article 10 of the June 10, 2008 Warrant, and the report from the Apollo Tannery Redevelopment Group, dated February 19, 2008 are available from the Town Clerk's office during regular business hours.

Article 6-B
In the event that the voters fail to approve Article 6A immediately preceding this Article, shall the Town vote to authorize the Select Board to dispose of tax acquired property, excluding the former Apollo Tannery property, in any manner which the Select Board deems in the best interest of the Town of Camden?
Martin Cates seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

12. There were no committee reports

13. Manager's Report: Nothing additional (see page 4 Route 1 discussion)

John French made a motion to close as Select Board and open as Board of Assessors. Martin Cates seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

AS BOARD OF ASSESSORS

1. **Consideration of abatement requests from AHP Camden LLC for several properties for the 2010-2011 property tax year.** AHP Camden LLC has applied for an abatement of four properties for the 2010-2011 tax year. After careful review and recommendation the Assessor's Agent is recommending a total abatement of $15,559.20 on the four properties recently purchased.

   Martin Cates made a motion as recommended by the Assessor's Agent for a total abatement of $15,559.20 for the 2010- 2011 tax year for the four properties (30 Mechanic Street, Mechanic Street, 32 Washington Street, and 36 Washington Street) owned by AHP Camden LLC. Morgan Laidlaw seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

John French made a motion to adjourn at 10:00 pm. Martin Cates seconded this motion. The motion passed on a 5-0-0 vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Janice L. Esancy

Janice L. Esancy
Recording Secretary

Requests		Proposed Spending Plan			
		Source:	FY11 Ops Surplus	FY12 Ops	Capital Reserve	Not Funded
	Mtn Operations					
$ 8,475	Snowmaking Pump Service				$ 8,475	
$ 8,000	Lift Parts		$ 8,000			
$ 26,388	Factory Service for both groomers				$ 26,388	
$ 10,000	Toboggan Chute Repairs (see note * below)				$ 7,500	$ 2,500
$ 9,500	Snowmobile				$ 9,500	
$ 16,000	Slope Drainage Repair					$ 16,000
$ 12,000	3 Snow Guns with Sleds					$ 12,000
$ 1,875	Snow Tubes		$ 1,375	$ 500		
$ 25,000	Tractor with Implements (cost split with Parks)					$ 25,000
$ 1,500	2 Ski Racks					$ 1,500
$ 3,000	Nordic Groomer		$ 3,000			
	Ski School					
$ 3,500	Ski School Software		$ 3,500			
$ 1,500	Adaptive Equipment		$ 1,500			
	Patrol					
$ 500	OEC Books for Patrol Room, or Patroller Allowance			$ 500		
$ 500	Patrol Computer		$ 500			
	Admin					
$ 30,000	Ticketing and POS System					$ 30,000
	Rental					
$ 7,000	4th Grade Snowboards, Boots, and Bindings (20)		$ 7,000			
$ 8,400	Jr. Skis and Bindings (40)		$ 8,400			
$ 7,000	Adult Skis and Bindings (30)			$ 3,500		$ 3,500
$ 2,200	Large Jr. Ski Boots (30)		$ 2,200			
$ 2,700	Adult Ski Boots (30)			$ 1,350		$ 1,350
$ 1,200	Helmets (40) to replace all Marker helmets			$ 1,200		
$ 1,500	New Benches and Reconfigure Rental Shop			$ 1,500		
	General					
$ 5,000	2010-2011 Staff Equipment/Clothing Allowance					$ 5,000
$ 13,091	Held in Reserve for "Rainy Year Fund" (note**below)		$ 13,091			
	Transfer for Capital Reserve Budget		$ 29,434		$ (29,434)	
$ 205,829	**Total**	**Total**	**$ 78,000**	**$ 8,550**	**$ 22,429**	**$ 96,850**
		Available to Spend	**$ 78,000**	**$ 578,685**	**$ 36,054**	
		Balance	**$ -**	**$ 570,135**	**$ 13,625**	

* $3,000 will be used from the Toboggan Chute Reserve Fund

** Holding $13,901 in the Snow Bowl operating reserve will build its General Fund Balance to $100,000

Items highlighted in yellow are changes from the spending plan dated 4/27/11.

Camden Snow Bowl
Statistics for 2010-2011 Season As of 4/27/2011

( ) = comparison to last season, { } = comparison to previous 5 years

- 71 Days (+14%) {+5%} of Operation (601 Hours). Opening Day 12/18/10, Closing Day 3/27/11 Ski operations shut down only one day due to rain .
- 84 Employees (-10%) {+8%}: 25 full-time-seasonal and year-round, 59 part time seasonal.
- $320,813 (+15%) {+26%} Annual Payroll (as of 4/10/11) not including taxes and benefits.
- $672,637 (+9%) {+31%} Annual Operating Budget (as of 4/1/11). *Compared to 4/1/10.*
- 33,749 Skier Days (+11%) {+39%}. *1 skier day = 1 person using slopes for any part of a day.*
- 335 children (+25%) {+43%} in free 4th grade programs from Knox County (1005 skier days).
- $30,150 (+33%) Value of Knox County 4th Grade Learn-to-Ski Program (supported by the Ragged Mountain Ski and Snowboard Club) *Based on weekday group rate: $30/child for ticket/lesson/rental.*
- 1,086 (-3%) {+43%} Children in other School Groups, After-school, and Weekend programs.
- 84 (-9%) {+25%} Children received scholarships for lessons, tickets, racing programs & season passes.
- $21,850 (-11%) {-1%} Value of Youth Scholarships awarded by the Snow Bowl. *Underwritten by the Ragged Mountain Ski and Snowboarding Club ($2,545) and Marcel LaCasse Fund ($19,305).*
- 95 (+30%) {+70%} Children participated in Racing Programs that trained after-school and weekends.
- 115 (+4%) {+77% in 3 yrs} Adults and children in the Friday Night Racing Program. *8 races.*
- 22 (-15%) {+0%} Youth on the CHRS Alpine Ski Team trained at the Snow Bowl.
- 9 (+0%) {+28%} Race and Contest Days were held, with 100+ local and visiting youth competing.
- 1087 (+13%) {+42%} Season Passes sold. 1,369 total active passes
- 282 (+9%) {+43%} Complimentary and staff season passes issued: 48 Seniors >70 yrs, 46 Juniors <6 yrs, 28 Ski Patrol, 11 Mtn. Steward, 10 Race Coaches, 75 Employees, 64 Employee family members.
- 739 (+31%) {+35%} Free Lift Tickets provided for ages 5 & under.
- 85 (-3%) Free Lift Tickets for 70+ years old. 50 free Senior Season Passes provided.
- 3,585 (+3%) {+18%}Total Ski Patrol Hours. 2,456 (+7%) Volunteer Ski Patrol Hours provided (not including training) plus 1,128 (-4%) Paid Patrol Hours. 32 active patrollers.
- $4,498 (-12%) {-10%} Value of donations from Snow Bowl to non-profits for their fundraisers. *Less were requested this year. Nearly every request was provided with a donation of tickets, etc.*
- $60,527 (+43%) {+54%} Net Revenue from US Toboggan National Championships.