STATE OF MAINE
COUNTY OF YORK                CITY OF SACO

I. CALL TO ORDER – On Monday, November 17, 2014 at 7:05 p.m. a Council Meeting was held in the City Hall Auditorium.

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS – Mayor Donald Pilon conducted a roll call of the members and determined that the Councilors present constituted a quorum. Councilors present: Leslie Smith Jr., Bette Brunswick, Kevin Roche, Arthur Tardif, Eric Cote and Nathan Johnston. City Administrator Rick Michaud was also present. Councilor Precourt was excused this evening.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. GENERAL: PROCLAMATION OF ARBOR WEEK

Whereas, In 1872 J. Sterling Morton proposed to the Nebraska Board of Agriculture that a special day be set aside for the planting of trees, and
Whereas, this holiday, called Arbor Day, was first observed with the planting of more than a million trees in Nebraska, and
Whereas, In 1978, the State of Maine first celebrated Arbor Week during the 3rd full week of May, and
Whereas, trees can reduce the erosion of our precious topsoil by wind and water, cut heating and cooling costs, moderate the temperature, clean the air, produce life-giving oxygen, and provide habitat for wildlife, and
Whereas, trees are a renewable resource giving us paper, wood for our homes, fuel for our fires, and beautify our community, and
Whereas, trees, wherever they are planted, are a source of joy and spiritual renewal.

Now, Therefore, I, Donald Pilon, Mayor of the City of Saco, do hereby proclaim

May 18th through May 24th as the celebration of

Arbor Week

in the City of Saco, and I urge all citizens to celebrate Arbor Week and to support efforts to protect our trees and woodlands, and

Further, I urge all citizens to plant trees to gladden the heart and promote the well-being of this and future generations.
V. AGENDA
A. TAX INCREMENT FINANCING 120 MAIN STREET – SACO ISLAND – (PUBLIC HEARING)

The Saco City Council is holding a Public Hearing this evening to receive public comments on the designation of the proposed City of Saco, Saco Island Building No. 4 Municipal Development and Tax Increment Financing District for 5.04 acres, including Building No. 4, on Saco Island and the adoption of a development program for the said District, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 206 of Title 30-A of the Maine Revised Statutes.

The proposed District will be located on Saco Island on a portion of the land designated as Tax Map 37, Lot 1 and Tax Map 37, Lot 8 with the overall address of 120 Main Street. A copy of the proposed development program for the district is on file with the Planning Department and may be reviewed during normal business hours.

Document History:
Workshop: 09/29/2014
10- day notice of PH Met
Public Hearing 10/20/14 continued to 10/28/14

10/28/14 – Public Hearing Minutes of the motion:

Councillor Roche moved, Councillor Precourt seconded to re-open the 10/20/2014 Public Hearing on Saco Island Mill 4 – 120 Main Street Tax Increment Financing proposal. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Councillor Smith moved, Councillor Precourt seconded to close the Public Hearing on Saco Island Mill Building 4, 120 Main Street, Tax Increment Financing. The motion passed with seven (7) yeas.

Councillor Roche moved, Councillor Brunswick seconded “Be it Ordered that the City Council adopt the TIF Resolution, as presented in Exhibit H, and to dispense with the reading thereof and to amend the TIF to 80% - 20% for 1-8 years and 60% - 40% for the remaining 9-30 years”. The motion passed with four (4) yeas and three (3) nays – Councillors Smith, Cote and Johnston.

The City Administrator will advertise for Public Hearing for Nov. 12th.

Councillor Johnston called a Point of Order. He wanted to bring attention to the flawed process of posting this public hearing. Notices were sent out on the 12th that meeting was cancelled and no notices were sent out to inform people of that and no notices were sent out to inform people of this public hearing. In addition, this is unacceptable and because of this I would like to table this public hearing so that it can be properly posted.

TABLED – Councillor Johnston moved, Councillor Smith seconded to table the Public Hearing for proper notification.

City Administrator Rick Michaud stated that Councillor Johnston was correct. No notices were sent out to abutting property owners on this meeting. This meeting was posted in the newspaper as required by Statute and this public hearing is in compliance with the law.

Councillor Johnston noted that this might be the case but he didn’t think this was a fair process. You post notices in the paper and half the people don’t read the paper. If this paper is what you sent out on the 12th, this is what should
have been sent out again. There was no cancellation notice sent out to people there was no subsequent notice saying that there was a public hearing tonight. This is unacceptable.

Councilor Roche asked the City Administrator what would happen if someone came on the 12th for the public hearing. Was there a posting to say that the meeting was postponed until the 17th? City Administrator Rick Michaud replied that there was a notice posted on the doors of the building. Councilor Roche asked by law, is that in compliance? City Administrator Rick Michaud replied that the Statute requires that this public hearing be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing, and that notice was placed in the paper and we are in compliance with the law.

Councilor Johnston noted that he had spoken to people who were going to come on the 12th but couldn’t make it tonight. You think this is fair to tell everybody to come this day and switch it and don’t tell people.

Councilor Tardif noted that the attorney for TIF’s was here and could we get a legal opinion from him.

The attorney stated that the answer is as the City Administrator had said. The Statute really requires that a particular 10 day notice for the public hearing. You have actually acted affirmatively already on this TIF. The only requirement that exists is an administrative one from DECD that they prefer and require an additional public hearing under the exact terms of the TIF as it was finally approved. Councilor Roche’s TIF as approved differed from the meeting notice from back in October therefore the requirement that there be another public hearing does not initiate change, nullify or anything else the legal effect of the Council’s approval of the TIF back in October. This is in essence an administrative requirement for the purposes of having DECD bless the TIF that you have approved.

Councilor Johnston stated that Councilor Roche’s motion that night did not contain any of the wording that is in our meeting commentary here and unless you have something to say otherwise I don’t think that we actually voted on this TIF. I have yet to see the minutes or yet to hear a recording.

Mayor Pilon inquired with the audience how many people were here for the Public Hearing this evening? Several people raised their hands.

City Administrator Rick Michaud noted that technically under Robert’s Rules of Order, a tabling motion is not subject for debate and I would encourage you to call for the vote.

Mayor Pilon called for a vote on the tabling motion. The motion passed with five (5) yeas and one (1) nay – Councilor Tardif.

City Administrator Rick Michaud asked Matt Asia, Representative for Chinburg Properties, what the effect of this motion has on your project.

For the record, Matt Asia from Chinburg Properties. The answer regarding whether or not we can extend our purchase and sale agreement would depend on when the next Public Hearing can be held.

City Administrator Rick Michaud stated that typically it takes a couple of days to get a notice to the newspaper and then it is a 10 day requirement, so we would be looking at 14 days into the future, best case.

Councilor Roche inquired whether they closed today. Mr. Asia replied “no” they did not. Councilor Roche stated that the TIF as amended was approved but the public hearing is required for the DECD to give the final stamp for the closing. Mr. Asia noted that the DECD stamp is their stamp on the TIF itself and not on the closing. Councilor Roche inquired whether a new closing date was set. Mr. Asia stated that a new closing date after the 17th was set for tomorrow because we knew this hearing would happen and that the TIF would be firm.
City Administrator Rick Michaud noted that the public hearing could go on the December 1st meeting and wanted to know if this would work for Mr. Asia. Mr. Asia responded that he would need to check but didn’t see why not, given the circumstances.

The Public Hearing will be scheduled for December 1, 2014.

**B. ZOA §707-4 – SIGNS IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES FOR COMMERCIAL USES – (PUBLIC HEARING)**

The Planning Office has been approached about allowing larger signs for commercial uses in residential zones on certain arterial streets. A recent example is the Acapello Salon seeking approval for a larger sign, as traffic on Main Street makes reading signs difficult, particularly for those seeking an unfamiliar destination. The current request is regarding a small business recently established at 7 Industrial Park Road, in the R-2 zone. The proposed language would allow larger signs in specific residential-zoned areas that public ways such as Elm Street, Main Street, and Industrial Park Road pass through.

The Planning Board considered this in workshop and held a public hearing on Oct. 1, 2014. The Board recommends that the amendments proposed be adopted.

Councillor Brunswick moved, Councillor Smith seconded to open the Public Hearing. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Beth Johnston, 62 Pleasant St. – Ms. Johnston is coming up to ask for a little clarification about this. Could someone give me a little more information about how this would work. Mayor Pilon inquired specifically what type of information. Ms. Johnston replied, it says “signs in residential zones” and we are talking about increasing the signs if I understand correctly, but I’m not sure I’m hearing anything about details about how much or does it depend on where it is located? I understand that there are a couple different locations but I’m just looking for more information. Mayor Pilon asked the City Planner Bob Hamblen to step forward and address Ms. Johnston’s questions.

City Administrator Rick Michaud called a Point of Order. – He stated that generally the public hearings are an opportunity for members of the public to come forward and express their opinions and reviews and not necessarily to engage in debate discussion on the matter.

Ms. Johnston noted that she is really just looking for clarification about how big the signs might be, if there are any stipulations about how close to residences they can be etc. I’m not looking for anyone’s opinion because I will probably subsequently give you mine.

City Planner Bob Hamblen noted that a couple of months ago the Planning Office was approached by a small business owner in Saco who relocated her business to the Industrial Park. The first few parcels on the easterly side in Industrial Park Road as one turns from North St. onto Industrial Park Road are in the Residential R2Zone. She found to her chagrin after buying the property that she would be limited to 2 sq. ft. per side for a 2 sided sign or she could go with a 1 sided sign and get a 4 sq. ft. sign. She found further to her chagrin that with the levels of traffic on the Industrial Park Road, even those she told ahead of time how to find her business. They had a hard time picking out such a relatively small sign. This kind of brings to mind Acapello Hair Salon out on Main Street that a handful of months ago sought a contract zone amendment to increase the size of her sign. The same thing, allot of traffic and very difficult to pick out a smaller sign. So based on the testimony, staff is suggesting that for very specific arterials in town which would include Route #1, Elm St., Main St. and Portland Rd. for residential zones and for Industrial park Road which involves 4 parcels. The R2 zone is very limited there. Then on North St, Route #112 from Park St. out to Rotary Dr. those streets alone where business signs in residential zones be allowed to be
increased in size from 4 sq. ft. to 12 sq. ft.. If this is going to be a free standing sign then it may be 2 sided and each side of that sign can be up to 12 sq. ft. I think a pretty decent reference point is the new Acapello sign that went up out on Main St. She actually got approval for up to 15 sq. ft. per side and driving by now I’m able to see the sign and it is not offensive. In a size sense, it is not overly large. So that is it. Currently up to 4 sq. ft. is allowed in residential zones in those particularly high traffic areas. This proposal would allow up to 12 sq. ft.

Beth Johnston, 62 Pleasant St. – Ms. Johnston said “thank you” for allowing the clarification from Mr. Hamblen. She noted that he used a word that we all use from time to time which is “chagrin”. I feel that allot when I’m driving through Saco. I feel it when I see that there are already huge traffic issues and speeding issues. I would like to suggest that at the very least that Elm Street is not a location where this increase in size for signs is appropriate. Elm Street is first of all a fairly short street already extremely congested, already over trafficked, already has too much speed and they don’t stop for pedestrians in the cross walk. I would like to suggest that there are already many signs, very large ones and we don’t need to add to that to what we already have on that streetscape. In actual fact, it would be nice if we could try to retain a little bit of the lovely New England Village that all of us may have been attracted to at some point in the past. I’m not sure it is appropriate in any location to increase the size of these signs but I’m very confident that it is not on Elm Street and I’m also very confident that if we could slow some of our traffic down, people would be able to see the signs a lot better.

Dick Petersen, 44 High Street – Mr. Petersen stated that he didn’t have Time Warner, so when I want to watch the City Council meetings you usually stream them on the 1st and 3rd of the month, and they are not being done. So I was just curious as to why this isn’t being done.

Councilor Smith moved, Councilor Brunswick seconded to close the Public Hearing. The motion passed with unanimous consent.

Councilor Brunswick moved, Councilor Johnston seconded “Be it Ordered that the City Council set the Second and Final Reading for the document titled, ‘Amendments to Table 707 – Signs in Business and Industrial Zones, Amended June 11, 2013’, for December 1, 2014’. Further move to approve the order. The motion passed with six (6) yeas.

"Amendments to Section 707-4. B – BUSINESS SIGNS IN RESIDENTIAL, CONSERVATION AND RESOURCE PROTECTION DISTRICTS, Amended OCTOBER 1, 2014”,

(Please note **underline** represents new language while strikethrough is language to be deleted).

**Amendments to Section 707-4. B – BUSINESS SIGNS IN RESIDENTIAL, CONSERVATION AND RESOURCE PROTECTION DISTRICTS**

Exterior signs shall not exceed four square feet if attached parallel to the wall of a building, two square feet (each side) if projecting from the wall of a building, or two square feet (each side) if the sign is freestanding. Signs shall not be illuminated. Only one category of sign (wall sign, projecting, or free-standing) shall be allowed per building. No illuminated or mobile (chassis-mounted) signs shall be permitted in a Residential or Conservation District. No signs are permitted on trucks or trailers parked continuously in a Residential, Conservation, or Resource Protection districts.

Exterior signs for properties approved for non-residential uses in residential districts with frontage on roads or streets listed below shall not exceed twelve square feet if attached parallel to the wall of a building, twelve square feet (each side) if projecting from the wall of a building, or twelve square feet (each side) if the sign is freestanding. Signs may be externally illuminated during hours of operation only, and only with a top of sign-mounted, fully shielded fixture which illuminates the sign only. The roads and streets affected include Route One (Elm Street, Main Street, Portland Road), Industrial Park Road, and North Street/Route 112 (Park Street to Rotary Drive). (Amended 11/21/94, 11/21/01, 11/21/14)
C. AUTHORIZE BOND QUESTION REGARDING FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS – (FIRST READING)

There are pressing capital improvement needs that cannot always be addressed within the annual operating budget to be replaced in the most timely, cost effective manner. Capital needs that will be addressed with the Facility and Infrastructure Bond include:

Foss Road Recreation and Transfer Station Improvements
• The existing transfer station was set up as a temporary solution when the landfill closed over 20 years ago. Since then, the transfer station has seen an increase in use, as well as tremendous traffic increases due to the abutting recreational uses of the former landfill site.

• The use of the Foss Rd recreation complex has grown tremendously over the past 7 years. With it, the need for adequate parking and separation from the existing transfer station has grown as well. Over 800 cars may frequent this complex on a busy Saturday.

City/School Fleet Services
• The Public Works maintenance garage, which services over 180 vehicles, is not adequately sized to perform routine maintenance efficiently, or provide space for larger vehicle repair projects. There are also no vehicle lifting capabilities for the majority of the City fleet.

• The existing Public Works facility does not have adequate wash facilities to efficiently wash trucks and equipment. Corrosion is one of the leading causes of Citywide fleet deterioration, contracted maintenance costs, and premature replacement of vehicles. The current wash area is located within the future garage maintenance bays.

• The City’s diesel and gasoline fueling facility is aging and in need of replacement. The existing tanks are nearing the end of their projected life span. The sizing of the tanks is also inadequate due to the move from gasoline to more efficient diesel vehicles over the past 20 years.

Lincoln Street Reconstruction
• Lincoln Street has been in need of paving for quite some time. The road is in need of new sewer and drain systems, as well as pedestrian improvements prior to paving as well. The work needed is too costly to absorb in the annual capital improvement budget.

School Facility Improvements
• The school Transportation Department is currently located at the Public Works Facility in a small mobile building with all busses stored outdoors in a gravel parking area. Parking for busses, as well as employee vehicles is limited and office space is very cramped.

• The aging schools that are not being considered for replacement in the near future are in need of energy efficiency upgrades to lessen the annual expenditures on utilities.

Public Works Facility Improvements
• The existing Public Works offices are located on the second floor with no handicapped access or conference space for the public. The facility also lacks adequate employee training and locker facility space.

• The majority of the Public Works fleet is stored outdoors year round. This slows emergency response during storm events and shortens the lifespan of the vehicles.

City Facility Energy Improvements
• The City heats, cools, and lights a number of public buildings and spaces throughout Saco. Many of these systems
that do so have been in place for decades. With utility costs rising, and an effort to lower maintenance time and expenses, the City needs to retrofit these sites with today’s energy efficient technology.

The timing of this bond is such that payments will not be incurred by the City until 2018. Between fiscal year 2015 and 2018 the City will retire $540,000 in annual principal debt payments. In 2018 the annual payment of this Infrastructure Bond will be approximately $245,000. This still provides for an annual decrease in debt service payments of $295,000. Interest payments for this bond are estimated to total $150,000 annually.

Projecting out future needs and debt payments over the next twenty year period the City’s debt payments continue to drop significantly. A replacement of Young School is anticipated to be the only major facility bond over the coming years. This project, likely to be approximately $12 Million, if completed in 2019, would still allow for the City’s annual debt payments to decrease steadily over a 20 year period. A reserve account could be established with the retiring debt payments moving forward to address future capital needs in a sustainable manner, contributing to a long term stable tax rate.

The Facility and Infrastructure Bond question will require a public hearing in March 2015 and be put on the ballot for the scheduled June 2015 election.

Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Johnston seconded “Be it Ordered that the City Council remove from the table, the First Reading of the ‘Order Authorizing City of Saco to Borrow an Amount not to Exceed $5,500,000 for Facility and Infrastructure Improvements’, and move to schedule a Public Hearing for March 2015.”

TABLED – Councilor Cote moved, Councilor Johnston seconded to table this item until a Workshop in February. The motion passed with unanimous consent.
D. INDUSTRIAL PARK RAIL EXTENSION PROJECT FINANCING AT CASCO BAY TRANSPORTATION

Saco’s Industrial Park is serviced by a City owned rail line that extends from Pan Am’s rail that crosses North Street to a point located adjacent to 98 Industrial Park Rd. The primary users of this rail line are Boise Cascade (for offloading lumber supplies) and Casco Bay Steel (for offloading steel product).

Casco Bay Transportation, located at 102 Industrial Park Rd would like to extend the existing City owned rail a total of 1,100 feet to facilitate expansion of their business capabilities for offloading, storing, and transporting products delivered by rail. Project Estimates are as follows:

**Total Project Value: $350,000**
- State (MDOT) Funding: $171,500
- Casco Bay Transportation: $128,500
- City of Saco: $50,000

*Final project cost could vary slightly with bid results

The City of Saco contribution to the project ($50,000) would be paid using Spring Hill TIF funds. The Casco Bay Transportation portion of the project ($128,500) would be completed with a low interest loan from the Spring Hill TIF. These funds would be loaned out of the TIF and administered through the Biddeford-Saco Area Economic Development Corporation (BSAEDC). This loan would be paid back into the TIF account over a 10 year period at 3% interest. The current balance available in the Spring Hill TIF is $478,900. These funds are eligible for use on street and site improvements within the limits of the Industrial Park.

By facilitating the construction of this rail expansion, the City would be able to better utilize an existing City owned parcel that is currently used by Casco Bay Transportation for offloading steel product, which must then be reloaded and transported to their facility further down Industrial Park Rd.

1st Motion - Brunswick moved, Smith seconded “Be it ordered that the City Council extend to Casco Bay Transportation $50,000 from the Development Fund toward the cost of extending the Rail Line in the Industrial Park to Casco Bay Transportation.” Further move to approve the order. The motion passed six (6) yeas.

2nd Motion –Councilor Brunswick moved, Councilor Smith seconded “Be it ordered that the City Council approve a loan for $128,000 from the City of Saco Spring Hill Tax Increment Financing Funds to Biddeford Saco Area Economic Development Corporation to loan to Casco Bay Transportation for the cost of extending the Rail Line in the Industrial Park to Casco Bay Transportation.” Further move to approve the order. The motion passed with six (6) yeas.

3rd Motion –Councilor Brunswick moved, Councilor Smith seconded “Be it ordered that the City Council approve the Loan Servicing Agreement with the Biddeford – Saco Area Economic Development Corporation a/k/a Economic Development Commission for the service of the loan from the City of Saco to Casco Bay Transportation for the extension of the Rail Line in the Industrial Park to Casco Bay Transportation.” Further move to approve the order. The motion passed with six (6) yeas.
Loan Servicing Agreement

Now Come the Parties, the Biddeford Saco Area Economic Development Commission ("BSAEDC"), a Maine not for profit, public development company with a principal office at 190 Main Street, Saco, Maine and the City of Saco, a Maine Municipal Corporation with a principal office at 300 Main Street, Saco, Maine who state as follows:

WHEREAS, the City desires to advance a total of $128,000.00 to BSAEDC for purposes of further public development of the City’s Industrial Park; and

WHEREAS, BSAEDC from time to time loans funds to businesses looking to expand in Saco’s Industrial Park; and

WHEREAS, a certain business has expressed an interest to both BSAEDC and the City in improving certain rail facilities and lines benefitting its site, and

WHEREAS, the expansion of such rail service will also benefit the Industrial Park itself, and the City;

NOW THEREFORE, the Parties agree as follows:

1. **Advance.** The City will advance $128,000.00 to the BSAEDC not later than November 21, 2014, subject to the additional terms below. An additional 30 day extension may be requested if the borrower is unable to complete BSAEDC loan documents/commitments by November 21, 2014.

2. **Future Loan.** BSAEDC, provided and upon application and proper completion of loan commitments and loan documents by borrower, agrees it will loan $128,000.00 to Casco Bay Transportation, LLC, not later than December 19, 2014 unless an additional 30 day extension has been requested per Section 1 above. The funds may not be loaned for any other purpose, or to any other firm.

3. **Loan Servicing.** BSAEDC will service the loan for all time until it is fully repaid by borrower. The fees and interest collected by BSAEDC for servicing the loan shall be split equally with the City, but all principal payments shall be forwarded by BSAEDC to the City. Payments to the City from BSAEDC shall be made not more than 10 days after payment is received from its borrower.

4. **Loan Terms.** The primary loan terms for BSAEDC to borrower shall be as follows:
   1. **Principal:** $128,000.00
   2. **Interest Rate:** 3%
   3. **Term:** 10 years
   4. **Payments:** Principal and Interest for 10 years

5. **Loan Due Diligence.** BSAEDC shall assure borrower signs, executes and delivers customary forms, representations, agreements, guarantees and commitments customarily asked of its borrowers, all to make best efforts to assure full and final repayment of the loan. As part of these conditions, BSAEDC will securitize the loan by means of a personal guarantee from the company’s principal, as well as a mortgage upon land where the business is located, and any other form of commitment also and customarily requested by BSAEDC of its borrowers.
6. Release and Hold Harmless. The City will not hold BSAEDC liable for the default of borrower to make any payment required herein, and the City expressly waives and releases BSAEDC from any such obligation for any unpaid principal or interest. Notwithstanding the preceding, in the event of borrowers default, BSAEDC will however use, employ and pursue all its customary legal remedies against borrower including enforcement of all its rights including the above referenced personal guarantee and foreclosure of its mortgage.

7. Assurances as to Workmanship. BSAEDC will provide in its loan documents certain covenants requiring that borrower and borrower’s general contractors perform all work and install all rail improvements, rail lines and all supporting facilities to the standards of quality and workmanship required by railroads operating in this region of the country.

8. Good Faith. For all times it is managing the loan to Casco Bay Transportation, LLC, BSAEDC will act in good faith as regards the City of Saco.

Dated at Saco, Maine this ___ day of November, 2014.

William Armitage
Executive Director
Biddeford Saco Area Economic Development Commission

Richard Michaud
City Administrator
City of Saco
VI. CONSENT AGENDA

Councilor Smith moved, Councilor Tardif seconded to approve consent agenda items # A, B, C, D, E, F and G as follows:

A. There were no minutes listed for approval;
B. Be it ordered that the City Council confirm the Mayor’s reappointments to the Conservation Commission as follows:
   ► Ed Gardner, Full Member, 3 year term; 11/17/2014 to 11/16/2017
   ► Elizabeth Shaw, Full Member, 3 year term; 11/17/2014 to 11/16/2017
   ► Suzanne Emmons, Full Member, 3 year term; extending her current term ending from 07/13/2016 to 7/13/2017;
   ► Paul Christian, Full Member, 3 year term; extending his current term ending from 01/22/2015 to 01/22/2016;
   ► Dan Dearborn, Full Member, 3 year term ending 01/06/2017; and
   ► Thomas Goulding, Associate Member, 2 year term from 11/17/2014 to 11/16/2016.
Further move to approve the order;
C. Be it Ordered that the City Council confirm the Mayor’s reappointment of Jim Henderson to Saco Coastal Waters Commission effective November 17, 2014, with a term ending November 16, 2017."
Further move to approve the Order;
D. Be it Ordered that the City Council confirm the Mayor’s appointment of Stephen Ryan to the Historic Preservation Commission as a member for a 3 year term ending November 16, 2017." Further move to approve the Order;
E. Be it Ordered that the City Council grant Ping Wellness Center a Massage Establishment License in accordance to the Codes of the City of Saco, Chapter 138."
   Further move to approve the Order;
F. Be it Ordered that the City Council grant Wei Ming Han a Massage Therapist License in accordance with the Codes of the City of Saco, Chapter 138." Further move to approve the Order;
G. Be it Ordered that the City Council hereby approve the results of the November 4, 2014 State General & Special Municipal Referendum Election as presented”. Further move to approve the Order.

The motion passed with six (6) yeas.

Note: The complete item commentaries are listed below.

B. CONFIRM THE MAYOR’S REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The Mayor is seeking to reappoint Ed Gardner of 18 Ginger Lane and Elizabeth Shaw of 5 Brenda Circle; Suzanne Emmons of 130 Surf Street; Paul Christian of 21 Hillview Avenue; and Dan Dearborn – all as Full Members of Conservation Commission; and, reappoint Thomas Goulding of 8 Lighthouse Lane as an Associate Member.

C. CONFIRM THE MAYOR’S REAPPOINTMENTS TO THE COASTAL WATERS COMMISSION

The Mayor is recommending the reappointment of Jim Henderson of 17 Elmwood Drive, to serve on the Coastal Waters Commission for a three year term. Jim’s current appointment ends on 11/1/2014.

D. CONFIRM THE MAYOR’S APPOINTMENT TO THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

The Mayor is seeking to have Stephen Ryan appointed for a 3 year term.
E. MASSAGE ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE – PING WELLNESS CENTER

Ping Wellness Center, 150 Main Street has applied for a Massage Establishment License. The owners will be employing Licensed Massage Therapists.

The applicant has paid all applicable permit fees and has provided a copy of the City of Saco Application for Business Registration.

F. MASSAGE THERAPIST LICENSE APPLICATION – WEI MING HAN

Wei Ming Han, located at the Ping Wellness Center, 150 Main Street has applied for a Massage Therapist License.

The applicant has paid all applicable permit fees and has provided a copy of their State of Maine Massage Therapist License in compliance with Chapter 138, Sub-section §138-9 Basic proficiency.

G. CERTIFICATION OF ELECTION RESULTS – STATE GENERAL & SPECIAL MUNICIPAL REFERENDUM ELECTION

On November 4, 2014 a State General & Special Municipal Referendum Election was held. The election results are being submitted to Council for Certification as required by Section 7.03 b. of the Charter of the City of Saco.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Councilor Smith moved, Councilor Roche seconded to adjourn the meeting at 7:48 p.m. The motion passed with six (6) yeas.

Attest: ________________________________
Michele L. Hughes, City Clerk