

**WALDO COUNTY COMMISSIONERS COURT SESSION  
FEBRUARY 8, 2011**

**PRESENT:** Commissioners William D. Shorey – Chairman, Amy R. Fowler and Betty I. Johnson. Present to take minutes was County Clerk Barbara L. Arseneau.

**Call to Order:** Commissioner Shorey called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**FINANCIAL REPORT:**

Present with the Commissioners were Treasurer David A. Parkman and Deputy Treasurer Karen Trussell. D. Parkman reported the following regarding the County finances:

**CORRECTIONS:**

D. Parkman informed the Commissioners that he attended a recent Corrections Budget. He submitted copies of the Maine Department of Corrections Budget, to the County Commissioners.

**2011 COUNTY OF WALDO TAX ASSESSMENT / MIL RATE:**

D. Parkman recommended that the 2011 County of Waldo mil (tax) rate be set at .001419082. Rounded off, this would be just under \$1.42 per thousand, which is five cents lower than the 2010 tax assessment. The County-wide assessment was down \$296,901.24 from 2010. Prospect, Knox and Freedom are the only towns with assessments that increased from 2010, and that was due to the state valuation. The assessments for all the other towns decreased.

D. Parkman stated that the problem with the 2011 L.D. one CAP is that it is decreasing. He noted that the County budget is now so far below the CAP that in 2012 the County is “going to be in trouble.” The current County budget is \$499,623.35 under the CAP. W. Shorey said he didn’t see any way the 2012 County Budget would be any lower than 3 or 4%. Even if it was at 3% for 2012, if the previous three years were divided by 3, the County would still be operating with a budget at about a 1.5% average annual increase. D. Parkman feared that the Budget Committee will need to vote to increase the CAP for 2012, expressing that it would be best if it could be increased rather than exceeded. W. Shorey quipped, “It’s a strange world when we get punished for being efficient.” All agreed.

The Commissioners signed the 2011 Tax Assessment in the amount of \$6,804,569.65.

**APPROPRIATIONS:**

D. Parkman informed the Commissioners that the County Budget could be 12% expended and is currently at approximately 10% expended. The Commissioners checked the Sheriff’s fuel expenditure and expressed pleasant surprise that only 7% has been expended in view of the fact that the budget was too low to begin with and the Budget Committee had not wanted to increase it any more than they had.

**RESERVES:**

D. Parkman reported that \$90,000.00 has been moved from Undesignated Funds to the following reserve accounts: Severance (\$30,000.00), Technology (\$25,000.00), County Planning (\$5,000.00 earmarked for Deeds) and Employment Security (\$30,000.00).

D. Parkman read specific expenditures from the Reserve Accounts as the Commissioners followed along. These expenditures are included in the warrants below.

**WARRANTS:**

**\*\* A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize payment of the January 28, 2011 General Fund Accounts Payable warrant in the amount of \$224,568.07. Unanimous.**

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize payment of the January 20, 2011 General Fund Payroll warrant in the amount of \$90,895.32. Unanimous.**

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize payment of the January 28, 2011 Reentry Accounts Payable and January 20, 2011 Payroll warrant in the amount of \$67,933.00. Unanimous.**

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize payment of the February 8, 2011 Capital/Active/Restricted Reserve warrant in the amount of \$7,247.14. Unanimous.**

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to authorize payment of the February 8, 2011 General Fund Accounts Payable and February 3, 2011 Payroll warrant in the amount of \$190,507.42. Unanimous.**

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to authorize payment of the February 8, 2011 Reentry Accounts Payable and February 3, 2011 Payroll warrant in the amount of \$144,472.80. Unanimous.**

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize payment of the February 8, 2011 Active/Restricted Reserve warrant in the amount of \$25,285.91. Unanimous.**

**\*\*A. Fowler moved to accept the Treasurer's Report. Motion died for lack of second, with B. Johnson explaining that the proper terminology was "moved to file."**

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to file the Treasurer's Report. Unanimous.**

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to accept the Tax Anticipation Note paperwork with Bangor Savings Bank as presented by Bond Counsel Michael Trainor with Eaton Peabody. Unanimous.**

**(Break for Tax Abatement Hearing Lance Philbrook vs. Town of Montville Pet. #352. These minutes are separate from the regular court session.)**

**SHERIFF'S REPORT:**

Present with the Commissioners was Sheriff Scott Story and Chief Deputy Robert Keating with the following:

1. **INMATE PHONE SYSTEM CONTRACT RENEWAL:** S. Story explained that the Reentry facility needed to renew telephone services with the assistance of the Maine Jail Administrators Association, who will be negotiating a contract collectively for Jails as a group. There is better purchasing power as a bulk purchase. He submitted a copy of the newest agreement to let the Jail

Administrators negotiate a contract and recommended that the Commissioners continue doing business with them, as it has been for several years. S. Story noted that the agreement to participate in the service contract requires a Commissioners' Signature. He asked the Commissioners if they needed more time to review it and was told no.

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to sign the agreement for the Maine Regional Reentry Center to be part of the bulk purchase contract being negotiated by the Maine Jail Administrators for inmate telephone system services. Unanimous.** W. Shorey signed the contract as chairman.

2. The Town of Northport Village Corporation has asked the Sheriff to provide some patrol service for them. The Corporation has already budgeted money for this, and would like to have a different type of service beyond what they have been using. The Sheriff has had a series of meetings with Ned Lightner, who is in charge of the Corporation. S. Story stated that they have come up with a plan of action to provide service for the Corporation ten (10) weeks this coming summer. If this were treated like any other detail, it would be cost \$30.00 per hour, which is more than the Corporation budgeted. S. Story explained that the Corporation did budget \$150.00 per week for a vehicle and he reviewed previous Commissioners' minutes to look at the Sheriff's authority on the cost related to providing this service. Initially "Non-profits" could receive a detail rate of \$25.00 per hour, and the Sheriff has authority to waive the \$5.00 administrative fee. Later minutes showed that the detail rate increased to \$30.00 with the Sheriff's option to waive the \$5.00 fee. After some calculations, it has been determined that the Sheriff's Office can provide services with a part-time deputy for \$20.00 per hour and recoup the cost for the Deputy, including the Social Security wages, etc. The \$150.00 for the car will be given to the County regardless of how much it is used. The Corporation has requested bike patrol, foot patrol, etc. S. Shorey has told them that this will be a pilot project and that the County may not be able to offer this deal again in the future. He explained to the Commissioners that while the County may not really make any money on this, he believes it is good for the Sheriff's Office to provide such service to a community like this. He stated that he has drafted a memorandum of agreement, but added that he needs to speak with MCCA Risk Pool Manager Malcolm Ulmer regarding wording of the County's responsibility for liability insurance. There was brief discussion of local ordinances and Title 30-A § 3009 which makes a provision for the Sheriff's Office to enforce the ordinance. Also, regarding the liability, by way of example, five selectmen may come up with an ordinance, but it may not be found out until later to be an unconstitutional ordinance until it went to court. S. Story intended to speak with M. Ulmer about that wording, as well. He preferred that this arrangement be a Memorandum of Understanding.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize the Sheriff's Office to enter into an MOU with the Northport Village Corporation as presented. Unanimous.**

B. Johnson inquired about the foot and bike patrol coverage. S. Story explained that his vision is there would be times the deputy would be out with the cruiser for speeding problems. Some evenings would be spent on foot patrol in crowd situations. B. Johnson was specifically wondering if the County had a bike and was told that it does. R. Keating described this as more of a community service model.

3. S. Story requested to tap into Asset Forfeiture money for a CAD program, explaining that this would require checking to make sure is compatible with current systems. This program will perform crime-scene drawings and will be on one desktop in the office and on one laptop. The license for the two is a total of \$709.00 for CAD Zone, a public safety software out of Oregon. S. Story stated that the primary goal for Asset Forfeiture is for the drug canine program to remain

solvent without dipping into budget money. He would prefer this come out of the federal portion of the Asset Forfeiture.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to authorize purchase of the CAD Zone software as requested, to be paid from the federal portion of the Asset Forfeiture account. Unanimous.**

4. Updated Sheriff's Cruiser Bid Amount: S. Story informed the Commissioners that on the recent cruiser bids, there was a mistake made by the owner of the vehicles who was awarded the bid. Dodge has shut down the incentives and so the cost will now be \$23,728.00 with the extended warranty for each of the three (3) new cruisers, requiring a new vote by the Commissioners.

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to accept the corrected amount of \$23,728.00 to be expended on each of the three (3) new cruisers for the Sheriff's Office. Unanimous.**

#### **TABLED DISCUSSION OF HIRE/REHIRE PAY STEPS:**

Present for this discussion was Sheriff Story, Chief Deputy Keating, Communications Director Owen Smith, Register of Deeds Deloris Page and Register of Probate Sharon Peavey.

O. Smith said there is no policy on how the County rehires people who have previously worked for the County, other than the personnel policy, which doesn't stipulate much. By way of example, if someone worked for the Sheriff for two years and returned to work within the six months or even after, because of their certifications, O. Smith would hire them back at the two-year pay level but would not move the employee to the five-year step until he/she had worked five years.

S. Story asked for clarification and was told by O. Smith five years AFTER being rehired. O. Smith noted that at other times people are hired at a higher rate than starting, because of some previous experience. O. Smith explained that if it were done the other way, for example hiring a person at the two-year rate and then three years later moving them to the five-year level, now two dates have to be kept in mind – the hire date and the pay step dates. O. Smith informed the Commissioners that if this policy gets changed today, he has no money to fix the past.

S. Story stated that that he believed that the Sheriff's Office has been handling this correctly. He illustrated as follows: if the Sheriff's Office hires someone at the five-year step, it can be for many reasons; it may be credit for having already worked here five years have experience from somewhere else. He would use the five-year mark as the example. Three years from now, it would be the eight-year step and the employee would reach that step. Otherwise, the employee would have to work eight years before he/she would get to that point on the pay scale. He explained that from a fiscal standpoint, this has been a huge savings. A five-to-eight-year deputy step is .57 cents an hour difference, amounting to \$1,185.00 per year. The difference between giving a deputy a raise at the eight-year step three years later or eight years later is a difference of five years. That is \$5,925.00 more. S. Story noted that he would spend more that O. Smith would. S. Story explained that if he didn't do that, he would have to hire a new person and would not get someone with academy certification to come to the agency under those conditions. Once going through the academy, replacing them with another employee is \$12,369.00 and the six weeks of field training is \$4,000.00. It would be \$18,000.00 to get a new person. He estimated the net savings as being approximately \$12,000.00, explaining that from a financial point of view, it is a savings to hire a person with experience and believed that these are the tangible differences. He illustrated with another example, using himself and O. Smith as follows: Both start work five years ago. O. Smith stays, S. Story decides to go some work somewhere else for one year and then decides to come back to his former job. After being rehired with five years credit, he would be paid at the five-year level.

O. Smith, because he stayed, has six years of service. In two years, O. Smith will be paid at the eight-year level. In three years, S. Story would be paid at the eight-year level. He would have to wait one year longer because he left County service for one year. S. Story stated that this method has worked for years and is the fairest, as far as he can see. Those that he has hired with experience have worked out very well financially, etc. R. Keating added that those people who were hired a higher paid level because of skills and/or experience still had to earn vacation from “square one” as well as sick leave, noting that it is only the wages being discussed.

O. Smith stated that he does not have the same experience nor same situation as Sheriff’s Office because he cannot get experienced dispatchers. It happens down south, but not in Waldo County Maine. He stated that this has not been written clearly in the policy and he expressed concerned that it is going to be difficult to track and budget because now there will be two separate dates to keep track of. He did agree with S. Story about the experienced people who can be hired.

O. Smith requested more clarification in the policy and once it is clarified, that this be established moving forward rather than retroactively. He stated that the pay step is a longevity pay step and the employee gets it because he/she worked that many years. O. Smith added that he did not have “any heartburn” over which decision would be made – it just needed to be clearer in the policy, and be moving forward.

W. Shorey said he didn’t know why there would even need to be a disagreement. He said he could see both sides and wondered if law enforcement needed to be treated differently.

The Commissioners asked how S. Peavey and D. Page felt about this. S. Peavey agreed it was a great thing to attract someone with experience. She believed that the pay scale should be looked at not just as a longevity scale but also as an experience scale.

S. Story elaborated that the pay scales still need to be fixed, illustrating with the Chief Deputy’s position. S. Story said he needs to be able to bring someone in at a higher step and make sure they are not “punished” by having to wait for the next several years before receiving a pay step increase.

W. Shorey said he has had some time to think about things and he would like to have Commissioner Fowler and one department head from each department and the Human Resources Director meet together to get the pay scales right, even if it takes several months. It seemed to him that the Department Heads have to cope with making this system run and are the most knowledgeable about the pay situations they will run into. He felt if there was a good discussion with this group, there could be some solutions, including the hire/rehire situation just discussed. He agreed the current pay scales are “all over the place.”

O. Smith stated that the County had a pay scale structure that most of the employees worked under. What was strange to him was why it was felt that the scales needed to be redesigned when the County already had a model to work from, adding that it seemed that people were not rewarded at the end of the pay scale. He felt there also needed to be a step between years two and five.

B. Johnson felt that there needed to be a new pay scale with closer implements. She believed there needed to be one pay scale for all, with the steps a little closer together and that everyone should be on that type of scale. There would need to be starting points, such as a three-year starting or a five-year starting point, and then follow it with longevity steps after that.

S. Story said it would accomplish the same thing they are doing now. The one thing he thought was important, and expressed his opinion, was because the County has tried to do everything the same and he did not believe everyone was the same. He stated that police officer jobs are not the same as secretaries. "The problem has been that people have been trying to make people all shoe-horned into one business plan. This is part of the reason there are problems with unions forming. People are not looking in their own 'silo' which does not look like the barn over here or the milking parlor over there," he stated. S. Story suggested that the status quo remain within the department it is in now. He was concerned that there would be no steps in some scales if that were the case. He acknowledged that maybe a different application be used in a different "house."

B. Johnson felt that the scale should be uniform in step process – not necessarily the same starting rates. She did not believe one department should wait for three years between steps and another department wait for five years. S. Story said he agreed with part of that.

W. Shorey stated his belief that what happened was someone was trying to do away with COLAs and that it how this started, adding that "it cannot work and will not work." He understood B. Johnson's concept of adding more steps, and he stated that there will need to continue to be COLA's. When the scales started to be redesigned, it just wasn't working without a COLA.

O. Smith said he would like to see what comes out of this discussion on rehiring and hiring at other than starting rates. He acknowledged his philosophies are different from the Sheriff's and he thought it would help if there would be a process for how this would be done. If there needs to be two different dates to keep track of, the process just needs to be consistent.

S. Story said he would like to illustrate another way of why all county positions are not the same and cannot be treated the same. The County's SOP is a document of about an inch thick, the SOPs that they have to use are five or six times the size due to the nature of the work and mandated policies from the state. He stated that law enforcement is different and needs to have a different pay scale. He added that complaints on officers are handled differently than complaints on other employees by law.

W. Shorey said this discussion will take a long time to play out. The Commissioners asked if the Department Heads would be willing to meet to discuss the hiring and rehiring system as well as the pay scales. All present agreed.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to use the current practice within each department regarding hiring and rehiring until the Commissioners make any changes in the policy. Unanimous.**

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, W. Shorey seconded for Commissioner Fowler to meet with the Department Heads or representative from each department, along with the Human Resources/Payroll Director, to form a committee to start the discussion on pay scales and rehiring/hiring at a non-starting rate. Unanimous.**

**DISCUSSION OF IMPROVEMENT FOR SECURITY OF THE COUNTY NETWORK:**  
Present for this discussion was Communications Director Owen Smith, Sheriff Scott Story and Technology Consultant James Arseneau.

J. Arseneau explained that this group has asked to meet with the Commissioners was because last January the County was audited by the State for software related to obtaining license plate information. As part of the audit, the County needs to come into compliance on Advanced Authentication. Logins on the State network and the Metro network require a third authentication, which may be biometrics, a data card, a retina scan, etc. Any mobile devices that use the CJIS information (such as when deputies work remotely); because these “touch” Metro, that third piece of authentication is required. A lot of people use an RSA token that has information that changes every minute. In some cases, such as law enforcement’s use of Blackberry cellular phones, they have a “soft” token that has to be replaced every three years. Two pieces are required to do this connection: a device that reads the key fob, and a second device that will know that this person has to have a third piece of identification and can differentiate.

A key fob costs about \$2,600.00 and the identification is \$2,600.00 for a purchase. Each of the outside entities will need to purchase the \$200.00 portion for access. These agencies have already been notified about this. These will need to be repurchased every three years. There is also installation and labor costs to consider. The County is looking at \$15,000.00 to \$20,000.00 to put this into place. The County has a certain number of deputies, some supervisors, etc. who will need this type of authentication. J. Arseneau explained that the key fob cannot be interchanged; each person has to have their own. There will also be some licensing that needs to be renewed every time, at about \$25.00 per person each year. The outside agencies with fobs will have to maintain their own. Because the State is demanding this piece, the County could request that each of these agencies pay for its own. J. Arseneau was not sure when the County will be cut off if it is not in compliance.

O. Smith agreed that the County should not wait. He explained that the audit was for dispatch, the Sheriff’s Office and Belfast P.D. as a “courtesy” survey. The next time won’t be a “courtesy.” He didn’t think they would just shut off the County but this is a federal mandate that has filtered down to the State, etc.

B. Johnson asked if the County had been out of compliance for a number of years and J. Arseneau explained that this was a new requirement.

J. Arseneau briefly explained that he believed this should be funded from the Technology Reserve. He recommended purchasing just a few at a time, in order to go through the process and work out any bugs. Once this has been figured out on laptops and phones, etc., then the rest can be purchased.

A. Fowler reiterated that this will only be purchases for the County, not any other agency. J. Arseneau said he was not sure how many would be needed at this point but noted that eventually, in the future, each employee would likely need one of these.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to use \$15,025.00 from the Technology Reserve for the Security Compliance Project. Unanimous.**

2. J. Arseneau said that when the Corrections budget was originally put together, there were three lines for improvement for phones, video lines and P.C.’s. At the end of 2009, they had been put in as an expense item. The Commissioners had Treasurer David Parkman move the \$11,000.00 to a Capital Reserve in the Corrections line. Now, the second budget from June 30, 2009 and July 1, 2010 has not been transferred yet. This is still an expense item and needs to be moved in order to save up enough to upgrade every five years.

S. Story explained that this was budgeted every year in order to save it for that purpose. The State approved it and so did the BOC.

K. Trussell explained that there is already \$12,000.00 sitting in the account. The P.C.'s need to be upgraded every five years. She explained that the funds do not have to be moved today, but should be at some point. This process is for accrual to take care of the computers. K. Trussell said that it would need to be moved.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to move \$11,300.00 from the Reentry undesignated fund balance to the Jail Technology Reserve. Unanimous.**

W. Shorey asked J. Arseneau to stop the Barracuda Reports from coming to the Commissioners email addresses and the General Commissioners Mail box and to discuss implementing the reporting directly to the department heads rather than reporting to the County Commissioners. J. Arseneau said he would make this change immediately.

### **FACILITIES REPORT:**

Present for this report was Facilities Manager Keith Nealley.

1. FUEL OIL BID DISCUSSION: K. Nealley reported that he has consulted with a couple of fuel oil vendors and has been quoted an estimate of about \$3.10 to \$3.15 per gallon, roughly, if it were bid now. He explained that the City of Rockland just went out to bid and then rejected the proposals because they believed they were too high. K. Nealley stated that he would like direction from the Commissioners regarding how long to wait before going out to bid for fuel for the County buildings.

W. Shorey remarked that he has been troubled by situation. "There is tons of oil, but there is also tons of unrest," he observed. He stated that he believed it was best to go out to bid now, because the cost could likely go up to over \$4.00 per gallon.

A. Fowler said that she preferred to gamble. She didn't believe that the economy could continue to keep these prices up this high.

W. Shorey drew a little chart from 2009 to 2011 and noted that prices had gone from \$1.40 to \$2.59 per gallon, and has steadily gone up. He did not believe it made sense to gamble that it would go down. He would rather be off by .30 cents than by a lot more than that. It was noted that in 2008 the County paid \$3.89 per gallon.

K. Nealley said he would like to put it out to bid, and the Commissioners could always reject the bids if they believe they were too high. The Commissioners agreed.

After a brief discussion, K. Nealley stated that he will send bids out to be due back before 4:00 p.m. on February 17, 2011.

2. RECENT JOB DESCRIPTION CHANGES: K. Nealley reminded the Commissioners that the job descriptions for the Facilities Technician and Facilities Manager have changed including that both positions are now considered "essential," the County Clerk no longer supervises the Facilities

Manager, and the Courier Service was also added to both job descriptions. The Commissioners approved these updates.

### **CORRESPONDENCE:**

Present with the Commissioners was Human Resources/Payroll Director Michelle Wadsworth, County Clerk Barbara Arseneau and Deputy County Clerk Veronica Spear to assist with this portion of the minutes. B. Arseneau asked the Commissioners to allow M. Wadsworth to bring two things to their attention just before Correspondence and the Commissioners agreed.

1. AMENDMENT OF NOVEMBER 9, 2010 MINUTES: M. Wadsworth and B. Arseneau explained that the minutes from November 9, 2010 on page 7 need to be corrected to reflect the Sheriff's intention that wages for uncertified patrol deputies will still start at \$14.09. They will need to read as follows, with the changes in bold: "PART-TIME PATROL PAY SCALE: S. Story noted that during the last couple of months, he had asked to change the part-time scale for Corrections. After looking back at the minutes, he realized he had not addressed the part-time pay scale for Patrol Officers. He asked that both part-time salaries for both Corrections Officers and Patrol Officers be established at the starting rate of a **part-time** Corrections Officer or Patrol Officer until the part-time Officer has achieved FTO or any certifications that the Sheriff deems necessary, in which case he/she would move to the starting scale for **an uncertified** full-time officer (**removing the words "with those certifications"**).

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to amend page 7 of the November 9, 2010 Commissioners Court Session Minutes as requested. Unanimous.**

2. UPDATED PART-TIME NON-UNION PAY SCALE: Due to the discussion just held regarding corrections to the November 9, 2010 Court Session minutes, the part-time non-union pay scale also needed to be corrected and signed by the Chairman of the Commissioners. Commissioner Shorey signed the corrected pay scale.

3. Hall of Flags-April 28, 2011: B. Arseneau reminded the Commissioners that this date was fast approaching and asked if there needed to be any discussion on plans for Waldo County's display. The Commissioners briefly discussed this, including asking Deputy County Clerk Veronica Spear to assist. Ideas included some sort of power point presentation on the Reentry facility and information on the Waldo County Garden Project. More planning will need to be done.

4. B. Arseneau asked A. Fowler to contact MCCA regarding the response she sent back for the additional services survey. Robert Howe has notified the counties that some of the responses are still missing and a few arrived unmarked so he was not sure who sent them. A. Fowler said she would follow up on that.

5. W. Shorey asked B. Arseneau to assist him in drafting a grant application for AED units from a private company who may be willing to provide funds. He would provide the company contact information to her.

6. B. Arseneau reminded the Commissioners to register online for the Maine Partners in Emergency Preparedness Conference on April 28 and 29, 2011, as each one would need to select which sessions they wish sign up for. At this point, only Commissioner Johnson plans to attend.

7. B. Arseneau informed the Commissioners that the line for the MCCA Risk Liability insurance will be overdrawn by \$561.00 because the Commissioners budgeted the County's portion of that invoice lower than the estimate provided by Malcolm Ulmer back in the fall during budget preparation. Fortunately, the Corrections portion would not be overdrawn. The Commissioners were not concerned and were confident that the rest of the Commissioners Budget could absorb that small amount.

8. 2012 Budget Preparation Schedule: B. Arseneau asked the Commissioners to consider the following regarding the 2012 budget preparation schedule: that the pay scales be established so that the Commissioners could make a decision regarding wages and any COLA increases by either June or July of 2011. B. Arseneau explained that the schedule would need to be a little earlier this year than usual because the Commissioners Office will be short-staffed with the Human Resources/Payroll Director being out on leave from September through November and because B. Arseneau will be out of the office the last two weeks of September. B. Arseneau asked if the Commissioners would be willing to not hold any court sessions unless there were emergency circumstances while she was out those two weeks, in consideration of the Deputy County Clerk, who will be very busy during that time. The Commissioners agreed to try to work with an earlier schedule and would avoid holding court sessions if at all possible during the last two weeks of September. This will mean that 2011 budget templates will be sent out earlier and due back a few weeks earlier than usual. Since Commissioner Shorey will be away during the second week in August, the Commissioners agreed to hold the August Commissioners Court Session on August 2, 2011. B. Arseneau said she would develop a schedule of budget preparation for the Commissioners to aid in the planning.

9. District Attorney Geoffrey Rushlau send a letter dated January 20, 2011 in which he alerted the Commissioners that there will be some additional expenses related tot the Randal Hofland Trial including travel expenses related to extra driving for the District Attorney to the Waldo County Superior Courthouse and also travel expenses for the key witness for this case.

10. Caremark Rx Inc. has issued a rebate distribution check in the amount of \$2,147.28 to the County of Waldo related to the County's health care plan.

11. Part-time Corrections Officer Jennifer Stilkey resigned December 31, 2010.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, B. Johnson seconded to accept resignation of Part-time Corrections Officer Jennifer Stilkey effective December 31, 2010. Unanimous.**

12. B. Arseneau inquired of the Commissioners about what to do with the unfinished payment contract with an electrical contractor who had been paid in full by the County for work he started and never finished, and which he agreed to pay back. To date, only \$50.00 of the \$6,317.30 was paid back before the electrician disappeared and has not been heard of since. Commissioner Shorey offered to follow-up on this.

14. B. Arseneau asked the Commissioners to clarify a motion that had been made during the January 11, 2011 Commissioners Court session. The Commissioners had simply voted to approve the hire of a full-time Probate Clerk to fill the current vacancy, as presented previously, but had not had the name of the employee at the time.

**\*\*A. Fowler moved, W. Shorey seconded to hire Elaine Russell as full-time Probate Clerk effective January 13, 2011 at \$12.98 per hour. Unanimous.**

## **COMMISSIONERS MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

Commissioner Shorey requested an Executive Session for the purpose of discussion of labor contracts, proposals and negotiations between the County and the Support Staff and Deputies Association Units as permitted by M.R.S.A. Title 1 § 405, 6(D).

**\*\*W. Shorey moved, A. Fowler seconded to enter Executive Session to discuss labor contracts, proposals and negotiations between the County and both the Support Staff and Deputies Association Units as permitted by M.R.S.A. Title 1 § 405, 6(D) at 12:29 p.m. Unanimous.**

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to exit Executive Session at 12:37 p.m.** No action was taken.

2. Public Meetings: Consideration of using U-Stream: B. Johnson spoke to the Commissioners on the subject of possibly recording Commissioners Court Sessions for the public to view. Some counties use U-Stream for other committee meetings, and perhaps the County of Waldo could try using it to recording court sessions, etc. She noted that it is free, but she will also do more research on it. It was her understanding that it can be viewed “live,” explaining that if someone wants to log into it, they can. It would be recorded and then people can click on it and play later, also, if they wish. It would require good sound, etc. She will talk with the County’s technology consultant about the particulars if the other Commissioners were in agreement.

W. Shorey stated that the Commissioners will need to be cognizant of any remarks or comments that they would make. The Commissioners would also need to determine how long those records would be kept, whether or not the recorded meetings would be the rights of U-Stream, etc. A. Fowler said that as long it did not cost the County any money, she was all for it. B. Johnson offered to use her Camcorder for this purpose.

3. VillageSoup did not print the County’s press release from the January 11, 2011 Court Session. B. Johnson noted that she had seen the reporter sit with the County Clerk and receive a lot of information and then when VillageSoup didn’t release the press release and the Deputy County Clerk inquired about it, she was told that the reporter was going to use it for an article and he never did. W. Shorey said he did not object to VillageSoup coming in to get information from B. Arseneau, if they wished. The other Commissioners agreed, but B. Johnson said she only wanted to send the next press release to the Free Press and the Beacon.

4. B. Johnson stated that she would also like to continue to consider implementing “Constant Contact” on the County’s website, which is approximately \$20.00 per month. There is also another one she may look into that is not as costly. She suggested that Commissioners Court agendas could be put on these. A. Fowler reported that someone complained that there were no pictures on any of the County news releases, and the Sheriff’s Office Newsletter does have pictures. B. Johnson responded that she didn’t think the Commissioners had the same type and variety of activity that would warrant very many pictures.

## **MINUTES APPROVED:**

**\*\*W. Shorey moved, A. Fowler seconded to W. Shorey seconded to approve the minutes from the January 11, 2011 and January 18, 2011 Waldo County Commissioners Court Sessions. Unanimous.**

**\*\*W. Shorey moved, B. Johnson seconded to approve the minutes from the January 11, 2011 Tax Abatement Hearing Pet. #351 Lucco vs. Town of Palermo. Unanimous.**

**NEXT COURT SESSION:**

The next regularly scheduled Commissioners Court Session is March 8, 2011.

**\*\*B. Johnson moved, A. Fowler seconded to adjourn the Court Session at 12:58 p.m. Unanimous.**

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