

Town Council Meeting Minutes December 9, 2019

Chair Kuhn called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.

Roll Call

Councilors De Lima, Johnson, Cahan, Asherman, Kuhn, and Hemphill were present and answering roll call.

Councilor Trickett arrived during the Pledge of Allegiance.

Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Kuhn led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 1 Resolutions recognizing the 2019 Falmouth High School athletic championship teams and athletes.

Councilor Trickett read Resolution 65-2020 into the record.

Councilor Cahan read Resolution 66-2020 into the record.

Councilor De Lima read Resolution 67-2020 into the record.

Councilor Cahan moved the resolutions; Councilor Trickett seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public comment period; there was no public comment.

Councilor De Lima said this was a wonderful accomplishment for these young people. This is just a start in their lives, but it will take them so far. Her son was on the cross-country team. She praised the cross-country coaches as the best coaches not only in the sport arena but in life. She thanked the coaches and the athletes.

The resolutions carried unanimously.

Item 2 Public Forum

Chair Kuhn opened the public forum.

Lee Hanchett of 21 Stonebridge Road spoke about transparency and inclusiveness. He felt that the citizens of Falmouth need to be the Council's first concern. There is a diverse set of towns surrounding Portland, each with its own unique character. He felt that the surrounding towns do not need to mirror Portland. He felt that the Council should focus on Falmouth first. He felt that the Council and Town staff need to prohibit conflict of interest. He felt that Town Council needs to avoid only listening to people who agree with them.

Marjorie Getz of 33 Old Powerhouse Road said she was one of the applicants for the LPAC vacancies. She discussed the Town's response to Valentine Sheldon's recent FOAA request. She said that the emails that the Town shared with Mr. Sheldon referenced text messages that were not shared. She felt that affordable housing would be an issue taken up by the Council soon. She said that the Council and Town staff need to avoid conflicts of interest. She said that two members of the Council are members of the AVESTA housing

board. She asked that those two people recuse themselves from discussions regarding affordable housing in Falmouth.

John Winslow of Gray Road said that he had not received answers to his November 26 email to Councilor Kuhn regarding the transfer of undesignated funds into the public works vehicle account for what appeared to be the purchase of a street sweeper that was purchased in August of 2018. He was not sure why something from two budget cycles ago came up in a recent transfer of undesignated funds unless the Town has two street sweepers. He did not think that the Town needed two street sweepers if it did have two. He saw in the current bids and RFPs that the Public Works Department is advertising to purchase a SUV. He was not sure if those funds were being filtered over to purchase the SUV? He was unable to find where that item lies in the 2019-2020 budget. He asked why the town would not purchase a two-wheel drive crew cab pickup truck? He expressed concern that there has not been a public comment opportunity related to the revaluation. He expressed opposition to the statistical market analysis. He said that the state recommends a revaluation every ten years and it will be twelve years since Falmouth's last revaluation. He said that surrounding municipalities are in different stages of revaluation processes right now. He read a May 2, 2019 Portland Press Herald article that he found troubling. He felt that along with jeopardizing state funding, the revaluation would provide important information needed to update the current comprehensive plan. He said that dovetails with the US Census that will be conducted in 2020. He had not heard a good reason to delay the revaluation which he felt would happen if a consultant was hired. He felt that the end result would be an unnecessary expenditure of tax dollars and a gamble with losing state tax dollars which would result in higher property taxes.

Valentine Sheldon of Route 88 discussed his FOAA request for information related to the LPAC vacancies. He said that he has not heard from the Town staff or members of the Council regarding his questions. He said that no text messages were shared even though emails that he received referenced business occurring via text message. He expressed concern related to the process by which Paul Bergkamp was appointed to LPAC+. He read information regarding what constitutes as a public record. He asked when the relevant text messages would be released. He expressed concern about Town business being conducted via text message. He if asked all the Councilors and required staff had completed FOAA training. He expressed concern that the revaluation agenda item did not include public comment. He felt that the revaluation would affect everyone's taxes and the more public discourse the better. He discussed his opposition to the market analysis.

Chair Kuhn closed the public comment period.

Item 3 (Consent Agenda)

- **Order to approve the minutes of the November 13, 2019 Town Council Workshop.**
- **Order to approve the minutes of the November 13, 2019 Town Council Special Meeting.**
- **Order to approve the minutes of the November 18, 2019 Town Council Workshop.**
- **Order to approve the minutes of the November 25, 2019 Town Council Meeting.**

Councilor Asherman moved the orders; Councilor Hemphill seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public comment period; there was no public comment.

Chair Trickett commented on the lengthiness of the minutes and the difference in length between the Council minutes and workshop minutes. He said that was not certain that the minutes were accurate in every respect but that they reflected the gist of the conversation as he recalled it.

The motion carried unanimously.

Item 4 Report from staff, Council committees, and Council liaisons regarding updates on assignments and projects.

Councilor Cahan said that REAC did initial outreach to businesses regarding plastic straw use and found that several businesses in town have already moved away from plastic straw use or are in the process of moving away from them. Many bids were received for the landfill solar array. She said that Metro Bus is looking for nominations for exceptional bus drivers to receive the Community Ambassador Award. Nominations can be submitted through the end of January.

Mr. Poore said that Very Merry Falmouth was a great success. The Town auditor submitted the first draft of the CAFR. He discussed the Public Works fund order on the last meeting agenda. He said that he began questioning some of the information the afternoon of the Council meeting but unfortunately the Public Works Director and Finance Director were on vacation. Mr. Poore said that he should have asked the Council to table that item until staff had better information. He gathered additional information the next day and found out that the purchase of a front-end loader had pushed the balance of that fund close to negative. He handled the issue internally by moving \$17,000 from contingency funds and deciding to delay the purchase of a vehicle to replace the Town Engineer's truck until the next budget year. The order that the Council passed will not be executed. He said that Route 100 construction activity will end for the winter by mid-January. The library construction is continuing on schedule and on budget.

Councilor Trickett asked if the Council needed to formally rescind the transfer order? Mr. Poore said he did not think there was any harm in rescinding the order. The Council could leave it in limbo until April when it reviewed the proposed FY2021 budget or an order to rescind the vote could be added to a future meeting. The Council decided to add an order to rescind the transfer order to a future agenda. Councilor Cahan asked if moving forward the relevant staff would be at the meeting. Mr. Poore said yes. He also felt that the system needs some adjustments regarding the capital improvement funds to better monitor this. Pete McHugh, Finance Director, is already working on improvements so that staff can have a real time update on balance changes.

Item 5 Public hearing and order relative to renewal of a permanent food service establishment license for Orchid Thai.

Councilor Johnson moved the order; Councilor Cahan seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public hearing; there was no public comment.

The order carried unanimously.

Item 6 Introduction of an Ordinance for Pesticide and Fertilizer Regulations.

Councilor Cahan said that the Conservation Commission has worked diligently on this for several years. They have done a lot of research and staff provided a lot of support. She felt that the proposed ordinance is a good first step that may lead to future steps.

Nancy Lightbody, Conservation Commission Chair, and Kimberly Darling, Energy and Sustainability Coordinator, delivered a presentation outlining the impetus for pesticide and fertilizer regulation as well as the education campaign and ordinance development process. Ms. Lightbody provided a brief history of the ordinance development process. She reviewed other jurisdictions in Maine that have ordinances in place. She also described different workshops that the Commission had held. She described the living lawns education program that will be included with the ordinance. She also described key elements of the proposed ordinance. Ms. Darling further described key elements of the proposed ordinance and discussed how it will be

implemented. She showed a map with the geographic areas that will be used for the reporting requirement. She reviewed the pesticide and fertilizer registration and reporting requirement exemptions. She also reviewed the penalties for non-compliance. She described a resolution that the Council will consider at a future meeting.

Councilor Cahan said that the Ordinance Committee chose to put forward the resolution and ordinance together because they are closely related. The resolution includes the Ordinance Committee's intent to further monitor this for further ordinance changes or additional oversight. She said that the Council will consider the resolution during the meeting at which it votes on the ordinance.

Councilor De Lima asked if there should be a regionally coordinated approach to the testing? Ms. Darling said that she did not know the answer to that question but would contact GPCOG. Ms. Lightbody said that the Conservation Commission has been invited to meetings with other Towns but there has not yet been a regional effort. Councilor De Lima asked how the ordinance would be communicated? Ms. Lightbody said that the Conservation Commission is working on an education campaign. She felt that the Forecaster Ad, the Falmouth Focus, and social media would also be useful. She said that there could also be tabling at events and elections. Chair Kuhn added that the Conservation Commission has done a lot of collaboration with other municipalities and that other communities have implemented healthy lawn care programs. Councilor Cahan said that this is not something that GPCOG is currently considering but that this data gathering could help Falmouth bring forward a request for regional coordination.

Councilor Trickett asked about how the Commission decided what activities or materials to exempt from the registration and reporting requirements? Ms. Lightbody said that utilities were exempt in the original draft of the ordinance because they go between different towns. She said that another question was if the registration and reporting should be done by company or by every employee who is performing application. Ms. Darling said that she would like to have a meeting with the utilities to understand how the Town can work with them to become compliant. She said that the utility applicators sometimes do not know when they have crossed town borders. Councilor Trickett asked about exempting commercial agriculture. Ms. Darling said that commercial agriculture is exempt from the proposed ordinance because commercial farmers do not have to report their use to the state. Councilor Trickett asked if it was necessary to put this burden on utility applicators given that we already know generally what they use. Ms. Darling said that the state only requires total uses, so the proposed ordinance is asking applicators to break that information down to how much is being applied in Falmouth. She did not think it would be a burden. Councilor Kuhn clarified that the state reporting requirement is just with respect to pesticides. Councilor Trickett asked about the question of requiring registration by individual applicators versus corporate entities? Ms. Darling said only the holder of the master applicator license is being asked to register and report. Typically, there is one master applicator per company. Councilor Cahan said that person should be able to require the data that they then report to the Town. Councilor Trickett asked if the winter fertilizer ban would be an issue for anyone? Ms. Lightbody said that she has not received any pushback from stakeholders. Councilor Cahan said that the Ordinance Committee originally considered banning fertilizer application in the middle of the summer but realized that a strong educational component would be necessary first. Councilor Trickett asked if the Town uses pesticides and fertilizers on Town property and, if so, will the ordinance impact that? Ms. Darling said the school department and parks department do use pesticides and fertilizers but are on board with the registration and reporting requirements.

Chair Kuhn said that she appreciated the registration and reporting approach as opposed to a ban. She felt that the Town needs to do a lot of education around why this matters and that it is necessary to define the problem before trying to develop regulation. She also appreciated the benefit of being able to evaluate the impact that the ordinance is having. She asked if any consideration was given to no registration fee for the first few years? Councilor Cahan said that the intention of the registration fee was to help cover the cost of

added staff time. Chair Kuhn asked which of the requirements under the ordinance applicators are already required to do under state law as opposed to creating a new responsibility? Ms. Darling said that applicators already must renew their licenses and report their use to the state. The new component is that the town is asking applicators to report fertilizer application including amount, date, and location of application. Chair Kuhn asked if any other towns had regulated fertilizer. Ms. Lightbody said South Portland is working on a fertilizer restriction.

Councilor Asherman said the Commission had run the ordinance by the commercial applicators. Ms. Lightbody said that is correct.

Chair Kuhn asked if the registration and reporting requirement applied to the golf courses? Ms. Lightbody said yes.

The Council decided to schedule a public hearing for January 13.

Councilor Trickett asked about the process moving forward. Councilor Asherman said that the Council could decide to modify the ordinance after the public hearing if there is public comment indicating that modifications were needed. He said that he still had questions regarding implementation. Chair Kuhn said Councilors should think about which experts it would be helpful to hear from at the public hearing. Councilor Asherman said the Ordinance Committee had discussed reaching out to the commercial applicators. He felt that it is easier for people to react to a detailed proposal. Councilor Trickett said that it would be important to understand how the fertilizer reporting requirement would impact people. Chair Kuhn said the other option would be to have a separate public forum although she felt it would be helpful for the community to have something specific to react to. Councilor Asherman asked Ms. Lightbody to describe the stakeholder engagement process. Ms. Lightbody described the Conservation Commission's stakeholder engagement efforts. Councilor Cahan said that the Conservation Commission is looking for a soil expert to attend the public hearing. Chair Kuhn said she would like to hear someone speak about impacts to Casco Bay and what they think registration and reporting could accomplish.

Item 7 Discussion regarding contracting with Vision Government Solutions to conduct a property assessment market analysis in advance of the town-wide property revaluation or proceed with the revaluation without an advance market analysis.

Mr. Poore said that the revaluation project was put out to bid. Staff interviewed three companies. The three companies that submitted proposals. Staff concluded that Vision Government Solutions should be awarded the contract. He said it was mentioned earlier in public forum that staff is recommending this market analysis. He said staff is neither recommending nor not recommending a market analysis. He is recommending is that the Town conduct a revaluation and that it is done as scheduled or deferred a year if the Council prefers to do so. He would not defer the revaluation farther than that, but he thought either of those approaches could work. The reason why staff brought forward the option to do the initial market analysis is because staff received information in the interviews that there could be some differences in the market compared to what has happened in the past based on the demand on housing, starter homes, and waterfront and what is happening in the commercial market. Having that advanced information could be helpful but there is the question of once you have it what you do with it. At the last meeting, the Council asked how much of the statistical market analysis cost could be blended into the revaluation? Only around \$5,000 of the \$30,000 market analysis cost could be used to reduce the cost of the revaluation. He said that the Council has three options for moving forward: 1) do the revaluation right now with the statistical market analysis, 2) delay the revaluation and do not do the market analysis, or 3) delay the revaluation and do the market analysis. He said that if the Council wants to move forward with the revaluation this year it needed to decide by the next Council meeting to stay on schedule.

Councilor Trickett said that the Council has received significant feedback related to the revaluation. He reviewed the reasons for why a revaluation is conducted: 1) state law aspect, 2) fairness, and 3) state aid. He said that the revaluation will not itself change how much the Town raises through property taxes, but some people will pay less taxes after the revaluation and some will pay more. He felt that the point of doing a market analysis in advance of doing a revaluation is having a good sense in advance of the impacts of the revaluation. One of the things that the market analysis may show is that the lower end of the market has appreciated more quickly than the higher end which may mean that the owners of the least valuable homes may see a substantial tax increase while people who own the more valuable homes will see a substantial tax decrease. He felt that the more information residents and the Council have about what is coming, the better. He was opposed to deferring the revaluation by a year. He was in support of conducting the market analysis but did not want the market analysis to delay the revaluation.

Chair Kuhn asked when the Town would receive the market analysis? Patrick Donovan from Vision said that if the Council was to move forward with the market analysis right after the first of the year it would take around eight weeks. He said that at least twelve months would be needed for the data collection for the revaluation. That data collection would need to start by March or April. The revaluation would start immediately after the completion of the statistical market analysis. Chair Kuhn asked about which year's tax bills would be impacted by the new assessments? Mr. Poore said the November 2021 tax bills.

Councilor Asherman asked how the results of the statistical market analysis would impact the Council's decision process if there was consensus around needing to conduct a revaluation within the next year or two. Mr. Donovan said that market analyses have been useful for municipalities that have not conducted revaluations in long periods of time to better communicate potential impacts of revaluations with residents. Chair Kuhn asked if in those cases it was done as a first step was in moving forward with a revaluation not a break on the revaluation. Mr. Donovan said that was correct. Councilor De Lima said that the study might allow the Town to allocate additional tax relief funds. She was unsure whether the Town would be able to buffer the impact in a way that is meaningful. Councilor Asherman agreed.

Councilor Cahan asked the Town's assessed ratio would be impacted if the Council deferred the revaluation by a year and the country entered a recession? Mr. Donovan said that as proposed the revaluation date of assessment would be April 2021. There are a lot of factors that could change the market between now and then, but no one can foresee that. Mr. Donovan said that if the Town did the market analysis now it would be looking at sales through the end of December 2019. If the revaluation was deferred it would be based on next year's sales data. Councilor Cahan said she was concerned about how things might change over the next year. She felt that it could hurt residents to move forward with the revaluation versus waiting one year. Chair Kuhn said that she recalled from the July Council presentation that the absolute value does not matter that much because what you are looking at is the distribution of the value across the different properties. The thing that would change is if the types of classes of housing changed over the course of a recession. Mr. Donovan said market conditions will be different on each class of property.

Councilor De Lima asked which class of real estate is most impacted when unemployment starts to climb. Mr. Donovan said that he did not know the answer but speculated that it would start with the lower end of the resident market but would probably carry forward with all property at some point. Councilor De Lima asked when the Town would absolutely have to start the revaluation. Mr. Poore said the Town does not have to start the revaluation in a year or two years. The state law regarding the 70% minimum assessment ratio does exist but he has never known it to be enforced. He felt that Falmouth was at the point where it is time to do a revaluation.

Councilor Trickett clarified that pushing off the revaluation for a year is on the table for discussion. He felt that the Council could always figure out a reason why the revaluation should be deferred. He wanted to do the market analysis so that the Town would have a good understanding what the revaluation is going to do.

Councilor De Lima asked about other towns that have done market analyses and how well they have gone. Mr. Donovan this would be the first one that Vision has done in Maine. He said that Vision does annual assessments for communities in Massachusetts. Councilor De Lima asked how towns that have done it have used that information? Mr. Donovan said Massachusetts' model of doing annual assessments allows the public to always be aware of their properties' assessed values. It has eliminated the need for full revaluations. It is a different scope from what Falmouth would be doing.

Chair Kuhn asked Mr. Poore to quantify the urgency of doing the revaluation. She said that the Council was told in the July presentation that it is time to conduct a revaluation. She said that she was not hearing a change in recommendation from Mr. Poore but that it could be bumpier and more impactful than initially expected. Mr. Poore said that was a fair characterization.

Councilor Asherman asked about the downsides of pushing the revaluation off another year. Mr. Thompson said that personal property is affected by the certified ratio so as the ratio decreases the Town will lose personal property tax revenue. He also said that residents' homestead and veterans' exemptions will decrease. He said the lower-priced housing will be the most impacted as they are the properties with the largest gaps between sales and assessed values.

Councilor Asherman asked if when the Town does a revaluation would it be looking at old sales data or current sales data? Mr. Donovan said that they would be looking at sales from the prior twelve months. He said if there was an extreme change in the market it might require a process called time adjusting sales.

Chair Kuhn said that it concerned her that it was anticipated that the lower value homes would be seeing the largest change. She said she recalled that property values remained stable during the 2008 recession. Mr. Poore said that they remained fairly static because the recession was immediately after the revaluation. She wondered if it would make any difference to put off the revaluation.

Councilor Trickett felt that the main reason for doing the revaluation is fairness. He said that the difference in assessed value and sale price had changed differently for different types of properties which is why different types of properties will be impacted by the revaluation differently. Mr. Thompson said that quality ratings have fallen but not to a drastic point. It is more that the certified ratios are affecting exemptions and personal property revenue. Councilor Trickett said that the overall fairness of the system will continue to decrease. It did not make sense to him to push the revaluation off.

Councilor Cahan felt that the Town may see some changes over the next year. She agreed with Councilor Trickett's desire for people to be informed about what could happen. She felt that it would be important to give people another year to prepare for tax increases.

Councilor De Lima asked about how many sales were needed to have statistically valid information. Mr. Donovan said statistically, one would not want to look at anything under 2%. It is necessary to look at a larger span of sales for different properties depending on how often they turnover.

Councilor Hemphill supported moving ahead with the revaluation. He also desired to investigate what information as an education tool the market analysis will provide.

Chair Kuhn said that she heard the conversation shift to taking that information and not necessarily using it as a basis to not move forward with the revaluation but as a means of effectively managing a revaluation. She was not hearing anyone say that they wanted to put a break on whole thing and defer for a year. She heard interest in moving ahead with the revaluation and/or moving ahead with the revaluation with the market analysis.

Councilor Cahan expressed concern with moving forward with a full revaluation right now. She would be supportive of doing the market analysis and then evaluating from that.

Chair Kuhn asked if a public hearing should be held at the next meeting on January 13 to get public feedback on the three options? Councilor Trickett asked Mr. Donovan if it would still be an option for the Town to pull the plug on or postpone the revaluation after doing the market analysis. Mr. Donovan said yes.

Chair Kuhn suggested getting an article in the Falmouth Focus helping to educate people about where the Council is with the process and encourage people to participate in the public comment opportunity at the January 13 meeting.

Mr. Poore asked how the Council desired to structure the January 13 agenda item. He said that a supplemental appropriation will be needed for the revaluation and market analysis. He asked if there were multiple options that will be weighed? Councilor De Lima said that there were two options: 1) move forward with the market analysis with the intent for a decision to be made about the revaluation after the market analysis is complete or 2) proceed with the revaluation in 2020-2021. Councilor Cahan said she was comfortable with those two options. Chair Kuhn added that if the Council was going to do a deferment it would not adopt either one of those. Councilor De Lima suggested holding a public comment opportunity before the January 13 meeting.

Mr. Poore asked Mr. Donovan if January 13 was the deadline to move forward with a revaluation or if it could be pushed eight more weeks. Mr. Donovan said deferring the decision would tighten the window. A decision after the market the analysis to move forward with the full revaluation would have to be made almost immediately if the Council wanted the revaluation to be completed by 2021. Mr. Poore said that the Council will have to make a quick decision. He asked Mr. Donovan if the Council waiting to make a decision would jeopardize getting the top Vision staff? Mr. Donovan said that the staff assigned to the project would remain the same.

Councilor Hemphill asked if the Council could have a public hearing and come back with a decision. Chair Kuhn said it would have to be the same meeting. Mr. Poore agreed. Chair Kuhn said the other option would be to schedule a separate public forum. Councilor Trickett felt that the Council wanted to stay on track to do the revaluation this year but to provide public comment opportunities and do some other communication and the market analysis is going to be one piece of the decision. An ultimate decision will be made in March about whether proceed with the revaluation. Councilor Asherman asked for confirmation that the Council had until March to decide whether to proceed with the revaluation this year. Mr. Donovan said yes. Mr. Poore suggested going ahead and negotiating the contract now with a built-in pull the cord provision. The vote on January 13 would be a supplemental appropriation to do the revaluation and do the market analysis. Chair Kuhn asked if there would be two proposed supplemental appropriations one for the market analysis and one for the revaluation? Mr. Poore said he was suggesting one supplemental appropriation order with both options. It would be a contract with both wrapped into it with an option for the Town to pull the plug on the revaluation in early March. Chair Kuhn asked if that seemed like a reasonable way to move forward for January 13? Mr. Poore said it would be helpful for the Council to think about how the other conversations would be structured. Chair Kuhn said almost in any situation with a twelve-year gap there are going to be some serious changes and some winners and losers, and the Town could benefit from the time to

prepare. Councilor Trickett felt that the conversation should be on the revaluation as a whole, letting the public know that this is going to be something that the Council will ultimately decide to do or not do by the end of March, to hear public comment, and to make sure that all the different factors are taken into account.

Chair Kuhn asked if there was anything additional comment before the Council moved ahead to the next agenda item. There was none.

Item 8 Resolution to commit to a process to develop a Vision and Values statement for the community that includes outreach and public input.

Councilor Asherman read Resolution 75-2020 into the record.

Councilor Trickett moved the resolution; Councilor De Lima seconded.

Chair Kuhn opened the public comment period.

Lee Hanchett expressed concern that the Council had not yet committed to rolling back the 2016 zoning changes in RB and RD. He felt that the Council would eventually have to address the rest of the 2016 zoning changes. He said that residents would not accept the Council using the comprehensive plan update to delay making a decision regarding RB and RD. He felt that it was important for the Council to stay focused on keeping an eye on RB and RD. He felt that the significant increase in duplexes that his is seeing will change the shape of RB and RD.

Valentine Sheldon of Route 88 agreed with Mr. Hanchett's comments. He asked about the timeline for the vision and values process. He said that RB and RD are big parts of town and they are being dramatically changed. Addressing those zones should be a priority.

Bill McKenney of Bucknam Road said that the vision and values of the 2013 comprehensive plan still hold true today. He listed the values. He said that the devil is in the details and that is where things fell apart with the rezoning and doubling of density within the RA zone, reduction of setbacks, and development within the RA and RB districts. He suggested a revision to a line in the draft RFQ regarding supporting diverse residential opportunity. He expressed concern that the Council is seeking a consultant to lead the vision and values process. He felt that the Town's Director of Long Range Planning could lead the update process. He urged the Council to promote inclusiveness and speak to Falmouth residents first. He encouraged the Council to host a public forum.

Chair Kuhn closed the public comment period.

Chair Kuhn said that the draft timeline is laid out in the November 18 Council workshop meeting minutes.

Councilor Trickett said that the previous Council resolved in its May 2019 resolution to be guided by a consultant for the comprehensive plan update. He said that the decision was in part a response to criticism of the process used for the 2013 comprehensive plan. He said that there have been serious questions raised about the extent to which the 2013 comprehensive plan vision and values statement still holds today. He felt that the Council could do a better job than it has ever done before in hearing from a broad cross section of the community. He felt that the consultant would be money well spent if the Council was successful in more broadly engaging the community.

Councilor Asherman agreed with Councilor Trickett's comments. He said that the Council was seeking a consultant to conduct a robust public process not to develop the vision and values statement. Council Cahan agreed on the role of the consultant. Chair Kuhn agreed with Councilor Asherman's comments.

The resolution carried unanimously.

Item 9 Ordinance to adopt the maximum levels of income and expenses for the General Assistance program, Chapter 6, Article 6, Section 6.68, Appendices A-F and H of the Falmouth Code of Ordinances.

Councilor Asherman moved the order; Councilor Trickett seconded.

The motion carried unanimously.

Adjourn

Councilor Asherman motioned to adjourn; Councilor seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Marguerite Fleming
Recording Secretary