

Council Agenda Item #1: The Caribou City Council held a regular City Council Meeting on Monday, August 10, 2026, in the Council Chambers with the following members present: Mayor Boma, Deputy Mayor Smith, Councilors Bagley, Lovewell, Knight Phair, and Watson. Councilor Kelley was absent.

Department Managers Brian Lajoie (Fire Chief), Tim St. Peter (Code Enforcement), Eric Sanderson (Economic & Community Development Specialist), Gary Marquis (Superintendent of Parks and Recreation), and Peter Baldwin (Library Director) were present for the meeting.

Penny Thompson, City Manager, was present for the meeting.

The meeting was covered by Cameron Levasseur of “The County” and broadcast via Spectrum and YouTube.

Council Agenda Item #2: Invocation/Inspirational Thought

Deputy Mayor Smith read the invocation.

Council Agenda Item #3: Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Boma led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Council Agenda Item #4: Declaration of any Conflict of Interest

There were no declarations made.

Council Agenda Item #5: Public Forum

Councilor Watson read a letter from Larry Knight.

*“To: Mayor of Caribou, Caribou City Councilors, and City Manager Re:
Traffic and Safety Concerns on Glenn Street*

Dear Mayor, City Councilors, and City Manager,

My name is Larry Knight, and I live at 36 Glenn Street in Caribou. I am writing because I believe something needs to be done to address a serious and growing safety concern on Glenn Street.

Traffic is traveling down our street at speeds that are simply too fast for a residential neighborhood. Combined with the number of children, pedestrians, bicycles, e-bikes, and scooters using the street, I am very concerned that we have an accident waiting to happen.

My specific concerns include:

1. *Children riding bicycles and e-bikes are frequently traveling at high speeds, sometimes in the middle of the roadway. With some e-bikes capable of traveling at significant speeds, this creates a dangerous situation for both the children and motorists.*

2. *Children riding scooters, sometimes with two or three children on a single scooter, are also traveling at high speeds on the street. This creates another serious risk, particularly when they are sharing the roadway with moving vehicles.*
3. *Vehicles are traveling too fast on Glenn Street throughout the day and evening. This is not a problem limited to school arrival or dismissal times. It occurs morning, noon, evening, and at night.*

I am particularly concerned that if something is not done, eventually a child, pedestrian, cyclist, or motorist is going to be seriously injured. Even people simply walking along Glenn Street are at risk, particularly at night when vehicles are traveling at higher speeds and visibility is reduced.

I understand that increased police enforcement may seem like one possible solution, but I do not believe it is reasonable to expect the Caribou Police Department to continuously monitor one residential street. No police department can have eyes on this situation 24 hours a day, and this problem extends well beyond school hours.

I respectfully ask the City to give serious consideration to a more permanent traffic-calming solution for Glenn Street. Speed humps or other appropriate traffic-calming measures could help reduce vehicle speeds and encourage drivers to recognize that this is a residential neighborhood where children and pedestrians are frequently present.

I would much rather see the City take preventative action now than wait until a serious accident occurs and then ask what could have been done differently.

Please give this matter your serious consideration and consider having the appropriate City department review Glenn Street to determine what traffic-calming and safety measures may be appropriate.

Thank you for your time and for taking these concerns under consideration.

Sincerely,

Larry Knight”

Council Agenda Item #6: Minutes

- a. May 11, 2026, Regular City Council meeting
- b. June 15, 2026, Regular City Council meeting
- c. June 29, 2026, Regular City Council meeting
- d. July 20, 2026, Regular City Council meeting

Motion made by Councilor Knight Phair, seconded by Councilor Watson to accept the minutes with the following corrections:

Page 17: June 15, 2026, Page 5, change Easton to Watson

Page 18: June 15, 2026, Page 6, change July 120 to July 20

Page 32: July 20, 2026, Page 4, change the word vehicles to bids

Page 34: July 20, 2026, Page 6, add vote, to 8A

Page 34: July 20, 2026, Page 9, remove extra vote from agenda item 10G

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

Council Agenda Item #7: Bid Openings, Awards, and Appointments

a. Bid Opening for 103 Water Street (Starch Plant) demolition

Tim St. Peter, Code Enforcement officer explained that on July 14th, 2026, an RFP for the demolition of 103 Water St. was issued. We received three bids in response to the RFP. After reviewing the proposals in detail, staff recommend awarding the contract to Soderberg Construction Co. with a bid of \$68,350.

This project is funded through a grant from NBRC. The above bid totals slightly less than 70% of the budget for this project.

Motion made by Councilor Watson, seconded by Councilor Knight Phair to award Soderberg Construction Company the contract to demolish 103 Water Street.

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

b. Façade Improvement Grant, summer application period committee recommendations

Deputy Mayor Smith stated that he was able to attend and meet with the applicants and they are all doing great things at their businesses.

Eric Sanderson, Economic & Community Development Specialist explained The City of Caribou's Façade Improvement Grant Program is financed via Tax Increment Financing (TIF) program funding for the Downtown TIF and RC-2 District TIF. Each year, the City Council has allocated \$40,000 to be applied for biannually, with applications due each Spring and Fall. With the Spring round of funding this year having only one award for less than \$700, the City Council voted to open a Special Summer round of Façade Improvement Grant applications, which were due on July 24th.

Each of the projects eligible were in high visibility, most used local labor, and almost all would or did visually improve commercial properties. With \$35,675.80 requested this round and only \$19,381.87 available, the shortfall totals \$16,293.93. After some discussion, it was noted that that several applicants who had applied in 2023 and 2024 had not completed work for funded projects within the required 18-month timeframe of the program. With this in mind, the City Manager checked the account balance of the Façade Improvement Grant account, which is the knowledge that more due to incomplete projects, the Review Committee, recommends all projects be awarded funding for a total of \$35,675.80.

Applicant	Business	Address	Project	Amount Requested
Jen Anderson	Thrive Body Spa	73 Sweden Street	Paint porches, lattice work, fix white fence, handicap ramp, sign at back entrance	\$2,000
Adam St. Peter		539 Main Street	New doors (entry & overhead), new windows, new trim, new vinyl siding, new signage	\$7,500
Bill Flagg	Powers Theater	46 Sweden Street	Reface rear/Center Street side of building	\$7,250
Yuri Samayoa		545 Main Street	Windows, metal siding, new facade and overhang	\$7,500
Todd Russell	Russell-Clowes Insurance	562 Main Street	Two sign face changes on free-standing sign frame, one sign face change on building	\$2,250
Gerri Nadeau	County Ag & Timber Candle Bar	7 Dow Siding Road	Two metal signs, one for County Ag, and one for Timber Candle Bar on the building	\$1,675.80
Lisa Cotts	Former Maryjo's	465 Main Street	New siding, windows, gutters as part of building remodel	\$7,500

Motion made by Deputy Mayor Smith, seconded by Councilor Lovewell to allocate 2026 funds for the Façade Improvement Grant pursuant to the Review Committee's recommendation in the amount of \$35,675.80.

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

Council Agenda Item #8: Public Hearings and Possible Action Items

a. Ordinance 6, 2026 Series Animal Control Ordinance Public Hearing

Open Public Hearing: 6:16PM

Eric Sanderson, Economic & Community Development Specialist explained that over the Winter and Spring, staff has worked with the Police Department and volunteers from the Planning Board to update the City Charter Chapter 3 – Animals and Fowl, Article I Dog Ordinance. As proposed, the title of the ordinance would be updated to “Article 1 Animal Control Ordinance”. The Ordinance explicitly states the existing authority of the Police Department as the Animal Control Officer for encounters and calls for animals in distress, whereas the previous ordinance spoke to the “Dog Constable” or “Police Officer”. The update serves to have more consistent standards with respect to condition of animal facilities and the ability of the Caribou Police Department to effectively respond to calls for animal control.

The updated standards have been made after review of other communities with Animal Control Ordinances in Maine, including Presque Isle and Bangor. Included are definitions for an “owner”, “disturbance”, and “animal cruelty and abuse”. Many of the existing standards such as dogs running at large are maintained but are expanded upon to more closely match language observed elsewhere in an effort to be as comprehensive as possible. Keeping animals outside in unsafe hot or cold conditions, animal waste, bites, and the procedure for Rabies diagnoses are also covered.

The Planning Board held a public hearing at its May 14th Planning Board meeting, voting to advance the standards to the City Council for consideration. Upon its review for considering introducing this Ordinance (Ordinance 6, 2026 Series), the City Council requested language be added to provide exceptions on the limit on number of dogs, increasing that limit in the urban compact from three dogs to five, and speak to repeat offenses. Staff have updated Sec. 3-301 Number of Dogs Limited to reflect a limit of five dogs in the urban compact, excluding this limit for properties in the R-3, properties engaged in farming, commercial breeding, racing, or boarding of dogs, and those engaged in animal husbandry. Language related to repeated offenses is included in Sec. 3-106 Violation and states “repeated violation of this ordinance may be cause for having privileges to own and license a dog within the City of Caribou revoked, subject to review and recommendation by the parties named herein with Right to Enforcement”. Staff have provided a summary of Animal Control calls received by the Police Department for 2025 from January-December as Attachment 1 for the City Council’s reference.

Maura Bishop, Caribou Resident came to speak in opposition of the proposed ordinance.

I am speaking tonight because I strongly oppose the proposed changes to Caribou's dog ordinance, particularly the decision to place a blanket limit on the number of dogs a resident may own.

My biggest concern is that this ordinance appears to single out dog owners rather than address the actual problem: irresponsible animal ownership and nuisance behavior.

If the concern is excessive noise, animals running at large, unsanitary conditions, neglect, or disturbances to neighboring properties, then those behaviors should be addressed directly and consistently. They are not problems exclusive to dogs.

A responsible person owning six dogs should not automatically be treated as more of a problem than someone owning five dogs, ten cats, or multiple other animals. A dog does not suddenly become a nuisance simply because it is the sixth dog living on a property. Meanwhile, other domesticated animals can create noise, roam onto neighboring properties, damage property, create sanitation issues, and become legitimate nuisances as well.

That is why I question why dogs are being singled out.

If the City believes there is a legitimate animal nuisance problem in Caribou, then I would encourage the Council to create an ordinance based on behavior, conditions, and responsible ownership rather than an arbitrary number attached to one species of animal.

Enforce excessive barking. Enforce animals running at large. Enforce neglect and unsanitary living conditions. Enforce situations where someone's animals are genuinely interfering with their neighbors' ability to peacefully enjoy their property. Those are reasonable standards because they address an actual problem.

But simply owning more than five dogs does not prove that someone is irresponsible or that their animals are a nuisance.

I am also concerned about the precedent this creates. If the justification is that having more than a certain number of dogs might create a nuisance, then why wouldn't that same reasoning apply to cats or other domesticated animals? If six dogs are automatically considered too many, what makes six, eight, or ten cats acceptable? Where is the objective standard?

Ordinances should be based on demonstrable problems and applied fairly, not written in a way that disproportionately impacts one group of responsible animal owners because of the type of animal they choose to own.

There is an important difference between regulating irresponsible ownership and regulating responsible people simply because they own more animals than someone else believes they should.

I am asking the Council to reconsider this ordinance and instead focus on regulations that apply to actual nuisance behavior regardless of whether the animal involved is a dog, cat, or another domesticated animal.

Responsible dog owners should not be punished for the actions of irresponsible ones.

If there is a nuisance, address the nuisance.

If there is neglect, address the neglect.

If an animal is creating a legitimate public safety issue, address that issue.

But please do not assume that the number of dogs someone owns automatically determines whether they are a responsible member of this community.

I urge the Council to reject this ordinance as currently written and develop something that is fair, consistent, and focused on the actual behavior causing the problem rather than unfairly singling out dog owners.

Thank you.

Mary "Pat" Karpen, Caribou Resident came to share her concerns regarding the new dog ordinance.

*"I want to preface my remarks with a couple of statements. First of all, I am a dog lover, a dog person. I've lived with dogs for most of my life. Having stated that, I want to thank all the people who dedicated time to research, consideration, consultation and conversation to bring these ordinance corrections to us. I thank you for reminding us that citizenship is not just a matter of racking up rights but a matter of embracing responsibility and accepting compromise. ****

*In Sec. 3-104 Not to Create a Nuisance, I would ask that you also address the issue of animals who, while on their own property and who do not bite a person, but, in a chronic manner, are allowed to charge on tethers that sometimes and sometimes do not hold. I suggest also the inclusion of dogs on their own property who are not constrained but charge. If one is distracted by a charging dog and must remove their focus from an early spring -melt or an icy or slush covered winter sidewalk in order to discern the dog's state of containment, things can happen. People can be injured. People should be able to stroll with family, dogs and friends without chronic assessments of charging dogs. I don't include in this those dogs who alert passersby and then cease or are corrected by their people.****

*You note that "A leash shall not be more than eight feet long." Please require testing for all people with retractable leashes to prove that they are able to discern eight feet. *** In Sec. 3-501 Animal Waste and Other Disturbances, I hope your considerations will encourage those who don't to do. Good luck to all of us there. I ask, however, that you consider a compromise regarding birds. I know that cities not far from us are having serious rodent problems. The detritus of feeding is an important issue and an annoyance. However, for some, birding, feeding birds, caring for birds, watching birds, enjoying birds is an avocation, an important one. I would suggest that feeding be permitted late fall, all winter, and early spring with no repercussions. The understanding is that, immediately, as the snow is receding, the feeding areas must be scrupulously cleaned and remain so. Living in a city requires compromise. I can't deny people lawn ornaments I despise, flashing lights that I swear can cause seizures, the floating spores of weedy lawns and on. Please allow those birders their joy, perhaps sustenance. ****

*Finally, mercy. I ask that in the cases of harmful, annoying or deadly behavior that, if possible, consideration be given to a dog's rehabilitation after perhaps being placed with another family or an entity. Please give a dog whose essence has been crippled by our species a chance to live. Please. I would love to see all those signs that read "Beware of the dog or dogs" removed and forced to read instead "Beware of the people". *** Again...thank you for all this work and for reminding us that citizenship is not just rights but also responsibility and the ability to compromise when we are asked to realize that we are a "we" and not an "I". Thank you."*

Ken Powers, Caribou Resident

Mr. Powers came in appreciative that things are being taken more seriously. He explained that there are probably close to thirty dogs in the neighborhood that he lives in and that there is a lot of dog noise around his house. He explained that he can't even sit outside for ten minutes without hearing dogs' bark. He stated that crows are an issue as well but stressed that 15 minutes of barking is a long time.

Gloria Labreck, Caribou Resident

Ms. Labreck explained that pet owners need to take responsibility for their pets. She stated that there are bark collars available to help with the noise, but that pet owners should be involved with making new laws regarding pets.

Councilor Knight Phair read an email from Scott Fair:

"While I understand the proposal, I would point out the wording. Changing the wording from constable or officer to City Official creates a scenario where enforcement can be delegated or carried out by persons with no law enforcement background or training.

This could place the city in an untenable situation if a situation arises around 4th amendment issues of search and seizure, where a person without the appropriate training and knowledge violates a citizen's rights. The term City Official is far too broad and needs to be narrowed to prevent issues.

Councilor Lovewell read an email from Alexandra Weeks:

"Dear Ms. Brissette and Members of the City Council:

Thank you for your service and looking at ways to protect animals from abusive and neglectful situations. I appreciate the work that has gone into updating the City's animal control ordinance. I support the goal of keeping the public safe and ensuring that dogs are under appropriate control in public places.

I understand that the provision limiting leashes to no more than eight feet is not new language, but rather language from the existing ordinance that is being carried forward into the proposed ordinance. Since the ordinance is currently being reviewed and updated, however, I would ask the City to consider whether that particular restriction is still necessary.

Rather than setting an arbitrary maximum leash length, I believe the ordinance should focus on what actually matters: whether the owner or handler has immediate and effective control of the animal.

There are many situations where a responsible owner may appropriately use a longer lead while walking, training, or exercising a dog in an open public area. A dog on a 10- or 15-foot

lead may be under excellent control, while a dog on a six-foot leash may not be. The length of the leash itself does not necessarily determine whether the animal is being responsibly controlled.

I would suggest replacing the eight-foot restriction with language such as:

“The leash or lead shall be of a length and used in a manner that allows the handler to maintain immediate and effective control of the animal and prevent the animal from creating a hazard or interfering with other persons, animals, vehicles, or property.”

This would preserve the intent of the existing ordinance and still give law enforcement or animal control the ability to address situations where an animal is not being properly restrained, without unnecessarily restricting responsible owners who use longer leads appropriately.

Since this provision is already being revisited as part of the larger ordinance update, I hope the City will consider modernizing this section as well.

Thank you for your consideration.”

Councilor Watson expressed concerns regarding several parts of the proposed ordinance. He explained that the proposed ordinance has limitations of dogs, barking and howling for fifteen minutes is a long time, and can be handled by law enforcement. He also raised concern regarding the wording for if there was a rabies outbreak that animals would need to be quarantined inside their homes. He further explained that the term abrasion should be changed to broke skin.

Councilor Lovewell stated that she believes that being quarantined at their home means in their own yard, and not into the streets. She stated that she understands the concerns, but that it is important to give the law enforcement some teeth to keep us healthy and safe.

Wayne Ayers, Caribou Resident

Mr. Ayers expressed concern as he is a K-9 handler with border patrol and is concerned about repercussions when the dog is outside in the morning while he is getting ready for the day. He is also concerned about discrepancies regarding leash laws. He also explained that he is concerned because in the summertime, dogs spend more time outside.

Troy Haney, Caribou Resident

Mr. Haney explained that he uses a wireless leash system instead of a traditional tie out. He also explained that sometimes there are dogs in businesses because the owner of the business has them there.

Mayor Boma stated that she was happy to see some language changes since the original proposed ordinance.

Closed Public Hearing 6:50PM

Motion made by Councilor Watson, seconded by Councilor Knight Phair to reject Ordinance No. 6, 2026 Series, to amend Chapter 3, Article 1, Dog Ordinance and send it back to the planning board.

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

Council Agenda Item #9: Reports

a. City Manager’s Report

Manager Thompson reviewed the City Manager’s report dated August 10, 2026. She also reviewed the information regarding composition of the City Tax bills.

Council Agenda Item #10: Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business scheduled for discussion.

Council Agenda Item #11: New Business, Ordinances and Resolutions

a. Execution of a Quitclaim Deed for Taxes paid

Councilor Bagley asked if this was the same person that had a lawsuit with the City.

Manager Thompson confirmed that it was, and explained that we can’t penalize them for that, the quit claim is to discharge a lien from taxes paid which was dated back to 2014.

b. Brook Street Housing Proposal

Eric Sanderson, Economic Development Specialist, explained that staff, in conjunction with the Caribou Development Committee (CDC), is pleased to present a proposal for a development project for the City Council to consider. The proposal is for development of housing on a City owned 23-acre parcel on Brook Street. As proposed, the project scope is based on a direct goal from the City’s Housing Action Plan (see Attachment 1) to create more inventory on public land in locations with access to amenities and infrastructure. The draft sketch for development includes 33 lots (see Attachment 2), but the exact mix of units may need to be scaled down based on existing conditions, utilities, and public input to be conducted. The current proposal is to fund a survey to support a first phase of development with 6-8 lots along existing frontage of Brook Street. The CDC has begun drafting an MOU for any potential development agreement for after the property is surveyed and a more informed design can be created.

Motion made by Councilor Lovewell, seconded by Councilor Bagley to allocate up to \$20,000 from account G-5-473-00 for surveying existing conditions, analysis and pin setting for the city owned Brook Street property further identified as tax map 10 lot 001-C to support development of housing on the property.

Councilor Lovewell asked a clarifying question on if this would be to survey the entire property and if they would then get information for the highest and best use based on the housing study that was conducted.

Mr. Sanderson confirmed that the survey would be for the entire property and to set the pins. This will also help to find useable space on the lot to develop.

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – No, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

c. Consideration of local CDBG application process

Eric Sanderson, Economic & Community Development Specialist explained that the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, administered by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and by the Department of Economic & Community Development (DECD) in Maine, supports projects that benefit low and moderate income persons and jobs and addresses urgent community needs. Through the allocation with DECD, the City of Caribou is allowed one Community Development Block Grant Program award each year per CDBG program sub-area.

Since only one application per program area is allowed to be pursued per year, the City needs to make that decision on which business application it will move forward with through the formal CDBG application process. As the City has expanded its Economic Development Department and programming, more of Caribou local businesses have been interested in applying for these grants to support working capital, equipment purchases, and more. To ensure equity, fair notice, and review of applicants, the Economic & Community Development staff is proposing the attached application and process to be considered, for which the recommendation is to renew annually as each fiscal year's CDBG funds are made available at the Federal level.

Councilor Lovewell asked Mr. Sanderson if the entire piece of property was going to be surveyed.

Mr. Sanderson stated that it would be to survey the entire property.

Motion made by Councilor Lovewell, seconded by Councilor Watson to approve the City of Caribou Program Statement, Application Process, and Scoring Criteria for the State of Maine 2026 CDBG Economic Development Grant Program.

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

d. Referendum question on Fire Department Ladder Truck

Brian Lajoie, Fire Chief, brought the proposed referendum question and if approved by the City Council, will authorize placement of the question before the voters of the City of Caribou at the next available municipal election. The proposed referendum question has been reviewed and approved by the City's Municipal Attorney to ensure it complies with applicable legal requirements and is

appropriate for placement on the municipal ballot. The requested authorization would provide the City with the flexibility to pursue the most advantageous funding option available, including the use of municipal funds, reserves, grants, bonds, lease-purchase financing, or conventional bank financing, as determined by the City Council.

Motion made by Deputy Mayor Smith, seconded by Councilor Knight Phair to place the question, “Shall the City of Caribou be authorized to expend up to \$2,900,000 for the purchase of a replacement aerial ladder truck, together with all necessary equipment and accessories for the Caribou Fire & Ambulance Department to be funded from any combination of municipal funds, reserves, grants, the issuance of bonds, lease-purchase, or bank financing as determined by the City Council.”

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

Motion made by Councilor Watson, seconded by Councilor Knight Phair that the statement is included that the City Council recommends approval

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

Council Agenda Item #12: Reports and Discussion by Mayor and Council Members

Councilor Watson reminded everyone to show up at the Airport for the events over the coming weekend.

Deputy Mayor Smith would like to move towards a fiscal year.

Motion made by Deputy Mayor Smith to go to referendum to change the City to a fiscal year.

Motion failed due to lack of second.

Councilor Lovewell touched on safety concerns regarding the use of e-bikes and speeding traffic after receiving the information from Mr. Knight during public input. She explained that in town high rates of speed have been seen on streets such as Collins Street. She urged people to be mindful of their surroundings, for people walking on bikes and even scooters.

Motion made by Deputy Mayor Smith to put on the ballot the question “Should the City of Caribou move towards a fiscal year?”

Motion failed due to lack of second.

Council Agenda Item #13: Next Meetings: September 21, 2026

Council Agenda Item #14: Executive Session(s) (May be called to discuss matters identified under MRSA, Title 1, §405.6)

a. Executive Session for economic development pursuant to 1 MRSA, Title §405.6.C(Hospital District)

Motion made by Councilor Lovewell, seconded by Councilor Watson to move into executive session at 7:28PM for economic development pursuant to 1 MRSA §405.6.C for hospital district.

Roll Call Vote: D. Bagley – Yes, L. Knight Phair – Yes, T. Lovewell – Yes, J. Smith – Yes, P. Watson – Yes, C. Boma– Yes (So voted)

Attending the executive session, in addition to members of the City Council and the City Manager, were Cary CEO Kris Doody and Caribou Hospital District Board President Erica Raymond.

Council exited executive session at 8:16PM

Kris Doody and Erica Raymond left the meeting.

No action taken.

Council Dan Bagley excused himself from the meeting at 8:17 pm.

b. Executive Session for attorney consultation pursuant to 1 MRSA §405.6.E (80B Complaint)

Motion by Deputy Mayor Smith, seconded by Councilor Lovewell at 8:19 pm to go into Executive Session for attorney consultation pursuant to 1 MRSA §405.6.E (80-B Complaint).

Roll Call Vote: Lovewell – Yes, Smith – Yes, Knight-Phair – Yes, Watson – Yes, Boma – Yes (So voted)

Attending the executive session, in addition to members of the City Council and the City Manager, was Attorney Paige Eggleston from Bernstein-Shur.

Council exited executive session at 9:09PM

Paige Eggleston left the meeting.

No action taken.

Council Agenda Item #15: Adjournment

Motion made by Councilor Watson, seconded by Councilor Lovewell to adjourn the meeting at 9:09PM

Roll Call Vote: Lovewell – Yes, Smith – Yes, Knight-Phair – Yes, Watson – Yes, Boma – Yes (So voted)

Danielle Brissette, Secretary