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Resolution: We, the Raymond Board of Selectmen, recognize our individual and collective responsibilities as leaders and representatives of our community. To this end, we pledge to conduct ourselves in a manner befitting these roles and duties. We pledge and encourage others to “Be the Influence” and to recognize that decisions matter.

1) Call to order

2) Minutes of previous meetings
   a) September 8, 2020

3) New Business
   a) Set Date for RSU #14 Withdrawal Referendum Public Hearing – Rolf Olsen, Chairman
   b) Consideration of Letter to Bruce Sanford Regarding Cemetery Lot – Sue Look, Town Clerk
      ● Mr Sanford has expressed concerns that the adjacent lot has a headstone that is too close to his. A survey was conducted and found that this is not the case and stakes have been added to Mr Sanford’s lot to delineate.
   c) Consideration of Acceptance of a $5,000 Grant from the Center for Tech & Civic Life for Election Expenses – Sue Look, Town Clerk
      ● Will be used to buy 9 voting booths, finish paying for ballot drop-box, and pay for some of the extra cost of Election Clerks
   d) Consideration of General Assistance Annual Updates – Sue Look, Town Clerk
   e) Consideration of Acceptance of COVID-19 Grants – Don Willard, Town Manager
      ● Keep ME Healthy $80,656
         1) We rented portable restrooms, they were located at Veteran's park and Tassel top.
         2) Cathy Gosselin provided education for camps in the town.
         3) Tassel Top Staff visited local beaches to educate/observe on social distancing.
         4) Tassel Top Staff cleaned the portable restrooms.
         5) The Roadrunner was used to communicate virus information to the public, videos, and signs were produced.
      ● Cumberland County $400 passed on to Food Pantry
      ● GPCOG CDBG Grant $10,000 for Food Pantry
      ● Grant in kind from Windham Wedco $180,000 for 9 towns for PPE, signage, etc.
4) Public Comment

5) Selectman Comment

6) Town Manager’s Report and Communications
   a) Confirm Dates for Upcoming Regular Meetings
      - November 10, 2020
      - December 8, 2020
   b) Reminder of Upcoming Holiday Schedule
      - Monday, October 12th – Columbus Day
   c) Reminder of Upcoming Election Events
      - First week of October – absentee ballots should be available and begin to be mailed
      - October 19th – last day to register to vote by mail (in-person voter registration continues through Election Day)
      - October 29th – last day to request an absentee ballot be mailed
      - October 30th – last day to vote an absentee ballot in-person at the Town Office
      - November 3rd – Election Day
   d) Explanation of Election Day Procedures – Sue Look, Town Clerk

7) Executive Session
   a) To Update the Select Board on a Pending Legal Matter (pursuant to 1 MRSA §405 (E))

8) Adjournment
Resolution: We, the Raymond Board of Selectmen, recognize our individual and collective responsibilities as leaders and representatives of our community. To this end, we pledge to conduct ourselves in a manner befitting these roles and duties. We pledge and encourage others to “Be the Influence” and to recognize that decisions matter.

Select Board members in attendance: Rolf Olsen, Marshall Bullock, Teresa Sadak, Samuel Gifford, Lawrence Taylor

Select Board members absent: none

Town Staff in attendance:
- Don Willard – Town Manager
- Curt Lebel – Contract Assessor
- Nathan White – Public Works Director
- Alex Sirois – Code Enforcement Officer
- Cathy Ricker – Finance Director
- Sue Look – Town Clerk

1) Called to order by Chair Olsen at 6:30pm

2) Minutes of previous meetings
   a) August 18, 2020
      Motion to approve as presented by Selectman Sadak. Seconded by Selectman Bullock.
      Unanimously approved.

3) New Business
   a) Consideration of Liquor License Renewal for A La Mexicana – Jose Chavez Mendoza, owner
      Motion to approve contingent upon an acceptable Fire Inspection by Selectman Bullock. Seconded by Selectman Gifford.
      Unanimously approved

   b) Consideration of Special Amusement Application for A La Mexicana – Jose Chavez Mendoza, owner
      Some discussion of where the singer/guitarist will be and how that fits with COVID-19
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and Chair Olsen pointed out that the Town grants the license and the State has the COVID-19 requirements.

**Motion** to approve contingent upon an acceptable Fire Inspection by Selectman Sadak. Seconded by Selectman Bullock.

**Unanimously approved**

c) **Consideration of Budget Adjustments to Close FY 2019-2020** – Cathy Ricker, Finance Director

Finance Director Ricker – A number of appropriation items went over, but we did not go over in total.

Chair Olsen – By Town Warrant Article if we need to move money from one department to another, we need to approve it in a public meeting.

Selectman Bullock – By moving payroll from the individual accounts to the FEMA account, you are understating the original accounts. I also think you are creating a receivable on a cash accounted statement. Have you talked to the Audit Team about that?

Finance Director Ricker – The Auditors were here today and will be here tomorrow. It depends on how far along you are in the FEMA process. Right now we are not guaranteed a penny.

Selectman Bullock – Exactly, that is why it is a receivable.

Chair Olsen – We have spent money that was not previously allocated which has to be authorized to be moved from Surplus to be able to close the books.

Finance Director Ricker – I would suggest that we appropriate from accounts that have money leftover in them.

Chair Olsen – At the end of the day it is the same thing. We have had unanticipated costs that have been expended, which needs to come from Surplus. You have made a collection pool to make it easier to identify expenses for potential reimbursement. If we get reimbursed the money will go back into Surplus, but that could be a year or more away.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Insurance</td>
<td>$7,995.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$3,475.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>$25,788.18 – should be from Surplus, not here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>$90.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>$59,087.19 – move salaries back to original accts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>$81.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair Olsen – Recreation was authorized by the Select Board to be paid out of Surplus for FY19-20, so it does not need to be in this list.

Selectman Bullock – Emergency Management is where I have an issue because you are understating other categories and moving them to the FEMA account. They should be recorded correctly as budgeted items. It should be the way the Auditors want.

Chair Olsen – You can journal the items to make it easier for grant writing, but by
moving them to the FEMA account you are showing that we didn’t spend that money for Administration.

Finance Director Ricker – I will move the salaries back to the original accounts.


**Unanimously approved**

**Motion** to move $10,925.02 from surplus to Emergency Management to balance by Selectman Bullock. Seconded by Selectman Taylor.

**Unanimously approved**

d) **Consideration of Mill Rate Options for Property Tax Commitment** – Curt Lebel, Contract Assessor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX RATE</th>
<th>TAXABLE VALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,034,855,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COUNTY | $788,378.00 |
| SCHOOL | $10,418,235.09 |
| TIF AMOUNT | $241,322.41 |
| MUNICIPAL | $2,402,138.48 |
| OVERLAY | $8,831.24 |
| TOTAL PROPERTY TAX | $13,918,815.22 |

**PROPERTY TAX REVENUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST YEAR (FY 2019-20)</th>
<th>THIS YEAR (FY 2020-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX RATE</td>
<td>TAXABLE VALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$13.45</td>
<td>$1,038,890,960.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| COUNTY | $784,426.00 |
| SCHOOL | $10,703,753.23 |
| TIF AMOUNT | $244,455.89 |
| MUNICIPAL | $2,589,377.64 |
| OVERLAY | $39,727.04 |
| TOTAL PROPERTY TAX | $14,388,639.80 |

**NON PROPERTY TAX REVENUES USED TO REDUCE MUNICIPAL APPROPRIATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAST YEAR (FY 2019-20)</th>
<th>THIS YEAR (FY 2020-21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOMESTEAD REIMB</td>
<td>$165,603.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETE REIMB</td>
<td>$44,974.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE REV SHARING</td>
<td>$197,355.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>$1,569,728.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELECT BOARD USE OF FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL APPROPRIATION</td>
<td>$4,639,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NON TAX REV</td>
<td>$2,177,641.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MUNICIPAL TAX REV</td>
<td>$2,462,138.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contract Assessor Lebel – The State has approved a fully funded Homestead Exemption which is a $5,000,000 loss, but we are up about $9,000,000 in new growth. Our assessment ratio is a State calculation and is 88% of market value. We have up to a 10% allowance, and we were able to certify at 97%. This means that we need to adjust Homestead, Personal Property and any valuation declarations to 97% of value. It is the first year we have been less than 100% due to the increase in the market.

There was discussion to not use the full $300,000 allowed by Town Meeting because we still could have unanticipated expenses in relation with COVID-19 and there will be some costs related to the RSU Withdrawal if that is approved.

Finance Director Ricker – The Surplus account is estimated at $2,200,837.15. We are required to have 15%, leaving $113,000, $75,000 of which has been voted to the Selectmen’s Contingency. It is your policy and if you intentionally go below the 15% you need to have a plan to get back to 15%, or you could change your policy to 12.5%.
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The amount in Surplus is only critical if we are going to borrow money and we have no plans to do this in the next year.

Town Manager Willard – We have historically gone with a very skinny overlay and have been fine, but with the current uncertainty I think the $13.95/$1,000 option is good.

**Motion** to approve a mill rate of $13.95/$1,000 and use $200,000 of surplus to reduce the tax commitment by Selectman Bullock. Seconded by Taylor.

**Unanimously approved**

e) **Update on Main Street Sidewalk Project** – Owens McCullough, Sebago Technics & Nathan White, Public Works Director

Public Works Director White – Started out as an LPA project and we went to the State and changed it to an MPI (Municipal Partnership Initiative). It has been accepted (on August 8th), funded, and we are finalizing the design. We are looking at Spring of 2021 to begin and that will be our paving project for next Summer. We will subcontract the paving and the curbing. All other construction work will be done by my crew. We will post the plans when they are complete.

Mr McCullough – The design should be done by the beginning of December. The alignment is the same as previously presented in public meetings.

Town Manager Willard – The change allowed us to save costs by not needing to adhere to Federal standards, we will only need to adhere to State standards.

f) **Consideration of Changes to the Fee Schedule for Codes Fees** – Alex Sirois, Code Enforcement Officer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Permits</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction or additions</td>
<td>$0.30 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfinished Area</td>
<td>$0.25 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Industrial</td>
<td>$0.30 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Permit Fee</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations or Renovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to $500</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501 to $1,000</td>
<td>$25 $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,001 to $5,000</td>
<td>$40 $60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,001 to $10,000</td>
<td>$65 $75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 and up</td>
<td>$65 $75 plus $8 per thousand or fraction thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separate Permit Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimneys/Antennas</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving (within town)</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving (into town)</td>
<td>$25 $0.30 per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolitions</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs – Business or Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 square feet</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 6 square feet</td>
<td>$25 plus $.15 per square foot over 6 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ground</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Ground</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks – Permanent or Seasonal</td>
<td>$0.10 per square foot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Town Manager Willard – Sue did a survey of the towns surveyed in the salary survey.

Town Clerk Look – Looking at broad categories we did not see any glaring discrepancies.

Code Enforcement Sirois – There were minor changes to get us better aligned with the towns in our area and South.

Motion to approve as presented above by Selectman Gifford. Seconded by Selectman Bullock.

Unanimously approved

g) RSU #14 Withdrawal Committee Update – Rolf Olsen, Chairman

Chair Olsen – The Withdrawal Agreement has been approved by both sides and has been submitted to the DOE. There are a series of presentations by the Withdrawal Committee that have been scheduled:

- Sept 10 via Zoom at 7pm
- Sept 14 via Zoom at 6pm
- Sept 17 at East Raymond Fire Station at 12pm – no Zoom
- Sept 22 at JSMS Gym at 7pm – no Zoom
- Sept 28 via Zoom at 6pm

The change in venue and time are to try to give as many people as possible options to have access to the information and the ability to ask questions. We will be putting out information for the Roadrunner, Facebook, and the Town Website www.raymondmaine.org. The email address to ask questions is rsu.withdrawal@raymondmaine.org.

Sue Look will be the host for the Zoom meetings.

4) Public Comment – none

5) Selectman Comment – none

6) Town Manager’s Report and Communications

Thanks to Nathan for the great job in cosmetic changes to the Town Office and the service window for the front office.

a) Confirm Dates for Upcoming Regular Meetings

- October 13, 2020
b) Reminder of Upcoming Holiday Schedule
   - Monday, October 12, 2020 – Columbus Day

Auditors are here and I would like to say that we have come through the pandemic very well financially. Thanks to the employees, elected officials, and the citizens for this.

7) Treasurer’s Warrant – none

8) Adjournment
   Motion to adjourn at 7:24pm by Selectman Bullock. Seconded by Selectman Sadak.
   Unanimously approved

Respectfully submitted,

Susan L Look, Town Clerk
October 2, 2020

TO: Town of Raymond Select Board

FROM: Susan L Look, Town Clerk and Cemetery Superintendent
      Nathan White, Public Works Director

RE: Sanford Plots in Raymond Hill Cemetery

On August 18, 2012, Karen Sanford purchased the use of the 4 plots making up lot 84 in Raymond Hill Cemetery. These plots were purchased based on a hand-drawn map with the understanding that they had not been surveyed, nor had the land been improved. There was a plan to expand the Raymond Hill Cemetery as monies and time allowed, with Public Works doing most of the work, once the property was surveyed to define where the roads and plots would be.

On May 1, 2018, a survey of the new section was completed to lay out the new rows and roads. Between May of 2018 and the Fall of 2019 the work was completed to remove the stumps and rocks, install the roads, and plant grass.

Mr Sanford has expressed his concerns about his lot in 2016, 2018 and 2020 (emails are included in the epacket).

I contacted William Shippen, owner of Survey, Inc. (Mr Shippen had previously done the survey work to lay out the new roads and lots). On September 28, 2020, Nathan and I met Mr Shippen at Raymond Hill Cemetery where we reviewed the hand-drawn map (an excerpt showing Mr Sanford’s lot in the upper right corner is included in the epacket) and we asked Mr Shippen to survey Mr Sanford’s lot and place pins at the corners, which he did that morning. His Sketch Plan is also included in the epacket.

I respectfully request that the Select Board approve the enclosed letter to Mr Sanford requesting that he review the pins that were placed at lot 84 and notify the Town of Raymond in writing by October 16, 2020 if he is satisfied. If he is not satisfied or if we do not receive a reply, I would like to issue him a refund of the $1,200 purchase price.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.
CEMETERY LOT CONVEYANCE  
Town of Raymond, Maine

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, THAT, in consideration of the sum of $1,200.00 paid to the Town of Raymond by Karen Stephenson Sanford of Raymond, Maine, the Town of Raymond does hereby grant, bargain, sell, and convey to said Karen Stephenson Sanford, heirs and assigns, the perpetual use and occupancy for the purpose hereinafter mentioned, of the following described parcel of land in Raymond Hill Cemetery in the Town of Raymond, County of Cumberland and State of Maine, situated in, Annex, Lot 84 said lot contains four (4) plots.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the said use and occupancy of said premises and the privilege thereof unto the said Karen Stephenson Sanford, heirs, administrators, executors, and assigns forever, for the sole purpose of a place of burial for the dead, which use and occupancy by the said Grantee shall be at all times in strict conformity to the laws of the State of Maine and the ordinances, rules and regulations of said Grantor, now or hereafter existing, with reference to said cemetery, it being expressly understood, and this conveyance is executed and delivered with the express reservation by the Grantor, that if said premises shall at any time be used, or attempted to be used, by any person or persons, whosoever, for any other purpose than as herein set forth, the use, occupancy, rights, and privileges granted herein shall immediately terminate.

AND the Grantor does covenant and agree to grade said premises and to be firmly bound and obligated unto Karen Stephenson Sanford, heirs and assigns, in perpetuity to keep the sward or turf even and in good condition, the grass properly cut, and the trees and shrubbery trimmed on said premises.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, NANCY YATES, Director of Finance of the Town of Raymond, have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the seal of the Town of Raymond this 16th day of August A.D. 2012.

[Signature]
Nancy L. Yates, Director of Finance

State of Maine
Cumberland County ss.

Date: August 18, 2012

Personally appeared the above named Nancy L. Yates and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be of her free act and deed.

[Signature]
Notary Public

Date commission expires:

LOUISE H. LESTER
Notary Public, Maine
My Commission Expires November 26, 2014

Adopted 2/5/08

Price of Lot $1,200.00
NOTES

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS SKETCH IS TO DEPICT THE LOCATION OF THE SANFORD CEMETERY PLOT AND MONUMENT THE SAME.

2. REFERENCE IS MADE TO A SKETCH OF CEMETERY PLOTS AS PROVIDED BY THE TOWN OF RAYMOND.

SKETCH PLAN
SANFORD PLOT
NORTH RAYMOND CEMETERY
RAYMOND, MAINE

SURVEY, INC.
P.O. BOX 210
WINDHAM, ME 04062
(207) 892-2556
INFO@SURVEYINCORPORATED.COM

DWN: WCS
CHK: DRR
DATE: SEPTEMBER 30, 2020
JOB NO. 16122
Mr Bruce Sanford  
222 Mountain Rd  
Raymond ME 04071

Dear Mr Sanford,

On August 18, 2012, Karen Stephenson Sanford purchased the use of all 4 plots in lot 84 of Raymond Hill Cemetery for a total of $1,200.00. As of the date of conveyance the plots in that section of the cemetery had not been improved in any way, nor had it been surveyed. The intent was that the Town of Raymond’s Public Works crew would make the improvements once the roads were defined via survey, and as time and funds allowed around other projects.

On May 1, 2018, a survey of the new section of Raymond Hill Cemetery (which includes your lot) was completed to lay out the new rows and roads. Between May of 2018 and the Fall of 2019 the work was completed to remove the stumps and rocks, install the roads, and plant grass.

On September 28, 2020, we had your lot surveyed and temporary stakes installed at the corners.

Please go to the Raymond Hill Cemetery and view where these markers are. If you are satisfied, notify the Town of Raymond in writing by October 16, 2020. If you are not satisfied or if the Town of Raymond does not receive your acceptance by October 16th, you will be issued a refund check for the full amount of $1,200.00.

We hope that this will clear up the issues you have brought forth.

Town of Raymond Select Board:

Rolf Olsen, Chairman  
Samuel Gifford

Marshall Bullock, Vice-chairman  
Lawrence Taylor III

Teresa Sadak, Parliamentarian

October 5, 2020 Board of Selectmen Meeting
CONESTCO.

222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071

Opinions of Probable Cost ~ Construction Consulting ~ Value Engineering

Board of Selectmen
Town of Raymond
Webbs Mills Road
Raymond ME 04071

October 1, 2020

Dear Board of Selectmen:

I apologize for the multiplicity of emails cc’d to you over the past 10 days or so regarding 8 years of Town non-compliance in completion of our contract with them for a usable grave lot at the Raymond Hill Road cemetery. Without going into the details of dates certain and the specific history of interactions with the Town Manager and Roads Commissioner over these past 8 years and schedules advanced or verbal and emailed written promises made, suffice to say none of the schedules or promises were kept in a timely manner. My wife and I purchased the grave lot in 2012 and, after all these years of Town non-compliance with the terms of their own written contract with us for grave lot boundary staking and providing of a usable grave lot, I decided to include BOS folks in the discussion to try to force resolution.

I had no idea this issue was going to be included on your BOS agenda for October 5 until receipt of an email from the Town indicating inclusion of my concern onto the meeting for that date. Please accept my apologies for the email trail and non-conformance to date with provision of information in a formal packet for your review.

Happily, our concerns for (finally) receiving a usable grave lot as contracted for seem to be (more or less) satisfied. Our lot has been (more or less) brought to finish grade and the corners are now staked, although the staked corner measurements of 9’ 6” x 17’ 6” are incorrect and should be staked for a 10’ x 20’ lot size. I presume the Town can correct this incorrect staking sometime before my wife and I pass away.

The balance of the issue that I see is the future expansion of the portion of the cemetery lots within the boundaries of the 4 or 5 grave row grass island that our lot and the DeSalle and Jiang lots abutting ours all occupy. I have copied and pasted from my earlier emails the issues that I see that are now engendered by the Town grandfathering DeSalle and Jiang lots as 12’ deep lots and not the 10’ depth that I have been led to believe is standard lot depth. It is not my pay grade to determine future Town action concerning these clear anomalies in lot spacing as issues now stand on the ground. If there is anything that I have learned in 40 years of general contracting, clear descriptions of issues and relation of those problems to supporting informational graphics often go a long way toward defining an issue and reaching resolution.

There very may well be nothing here now for the BOS to continue considering. But the fact remains that the grandfathering of DeSalle and Jiang as 12’ lot depths creates strong possibility for future confusion as to correct lot spacing and walkway placement between lots throughout the remainder of the DeSalle-Jiang-Sanford grass lot in particular.

Two (2) documents are attached: an overall general diagrammatic not to scale rendering of the Raymond Hill Road cemetery grounds that show original, first expansion, and most recent expansion footprints and generic location of the DeSalle-Jiang-Sanford lots at issue; and a larger plan scaled at 1/8” = 1’ that exhibits the issues engendered by grandfathering of DeSalle and Jiang lots as 12’ deep lots and how that affects future walkway width between lots and how staking of future lots might be made more difficult by the 12’ lot depth grandfathering of DeSalle and Jiang.

A. General diagrammatic not to scale rendering of entire Raymond Hill cemetery footprint
   a. Sketch dated 9-30-20 is diagrammatic in nature and is not to scale ..
   b. North arrow is informational and not true or magnetic north . N-E-S-W on global cemetery plan only indicates general directions toward Auburn (N) – Portland (E) – Massachusetts (S) - NH mountains (W) ..
   c. Drawn cemetery islands and roads in both “original expansion area” and “recent expansion area” are also not true to actual on the ground road count or island widths and are drawn to give overall context ..
B. Larger view of DeSalle-Jiang-Sanford lots scaled 1/8" = 1'
   a. Measurement of DeSalle and Jiang lot widths along Road A was not measured in the field... somewhat irrelevant, as it is lot depth issues we are considering... I just sketched in DeSalle and Jiang lot widths as 20', they likely are different measured widths...
   b. Granite corner markers "J" drawn on the sketch are located between DeSalle and Jiang lots...
      outside "J" to outside "J" measured dimension along the ground is 12'... unclear to me whether DeSalle and Jiang were sold as 12' deep lots and "J" locations as corners of these lots is correct... or whether DeSalle and Jiang are supposed to be 10' deep lots and the "J" corner marker closest to new Sanford lot is actually set at the back of the 2' minimum walkway mandated to exist between adjoining lots...
   c. Back side of existing DeSalle monument is 12' distance to back of "J" corner marker near new Sanford lot... back of Jiang monument is 36' distance to back of "J" corner marker near new Sanford lot...
   d. If DeSalle and Jiang are supposed to be 10' deep lots, then "J" marker location would actually be back side of 2' minimum walkway between DeSalle and new Sanford lot... in such a case, DeSalle monument infringes into 2' minimum walkway by 12'... Jiang monument would be fine as is, since it is 36' from back of "J" corner marker abutting new Sanford lot and would therefore be 12' inside its back lot line if correct lot depth is 10'.
   e. My offer to Town was that, if DeSalle monument does infringe into 2' minimum walkway, rather than forced relocation of DeSalle monument I could accept recreating the 2' minimum walkway by "sliding" our new lot away from the Church and toward the newest gravel road that exists toward the bottom of my sketch page (that road not shown on sketch as it is 30' or more away and the total grass island width is probably 50' anyway - I did not measure this total grass width of this island, but it is certainly wide enough to accommodate at least 4 rows of gravel)...!
   f. It would appear that, if our new lot was relocated by "sliding" it, then all the lots the entire run of this new grass island in line with our lot (at that way on the sketch) would also have to be relocated toward that new gravel road that was constructed 30' or more to the bottom of the sketch...
   g. I noted possibly correct corner locations on my sketch with two diamond shaped corners and a note indicating possible 10' correct corner depth (?)... I did this so I could then also demonstrate on the sketch that the 4' walkway would look like relative to 10' lot depth on the plan. If 10' lot depth is correct and walkway was continued in straight line to right end of grass island (at that way on the sketch)...
   h. The Town staked out new corners of our lot on 9/28/2020... our new lot corner stakes are 24' from the back of the "J" corner marker discussed above... so the Town did recreate the 2' minimum walkway between existing DeSalle and new Sanford lot by accepting the (possibly mis-staked) "J" markers and the 12' (possibly incorrect but now grandfathered) DeSalle and Jiang lot depths as currently exist on the ground... if lots to be created to the right direction on my sketch that would then run the entire length of the new grass island are to have the 2' minimum walkway continue in a straight line left to right AND if the correct lot depth to the right is a 10' lot depth and not 12' lot depth; the Town ipso facto has now created a 4' walkway between lots from the right edge (on plan view) of Jiang lot all the way to the end of the grass island... I realize this is a tad obtuse, as the potential 4' walkway does not affect our new Sanford lot layout, but it does impact future spacing not only to the end of the grass island but also to the lots developed toward the road (not shown) at the bottom of my sketch page...
   i. Corners staked for our lot by the Town on 9/28/2020 were staked at measurements of 9' 6" x 17' 6" instead of the correct 10' x 20' lot dimension that we have contracted with the Town for... outlines of these two areas are noted on the sketch... these stakes need to be reset by the Town to the correct 10' x 20' lot dimension...
   j. I did not bother drawing in the gravel issue relative to loam and seed at the edge of our new Sanford lot next to Road B... suffice to say that Road B is not straight... it curves slightly back from a straight line toward our lot location because of vegetation growth along Road B on the pasture side to the left of my sketch that defines that side of the road edge... and the road has varying widths its entire length... other lots along road B appear to have up to several feet width of loam and seed beyond the edge of gravel and the cornered edge of gravel lots... as currently stands, a 3' wide monument placed on the 5' wide plot on new Sanford lot that includes the tree next to Road B would result in the edge of the monument being only 12' from the edge of the gravel, road... obviously, this exhibits a damage issue to the monument from vehicular traffic... hence my wish to work with Nathan White to infill the grade up along the edge of our lot bordering the gravel road and extend loam and seed 18" or so past our lot line abutting Road B and bring the loam toward the road a bit more for separation purposes...
Thoughts above and attachments provided are for usage by the Town and any interested employees as you see fit in consideration of issues described herein. Thank you for your consideration of my submittal.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Bruce M. Sanford
222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071
207 827 6049 H
207 827 4099 O

Attachments:  Small not to scale diagrammatic rendering of Raymond Hill Road cemetery grounds
1/8" = 1' scaled larger plan view of DeSaille-Jiang-Sanford lot area
2016 emails

Questions about cemetery lot cornerstones, monument locations, corrections for abutting monuments misplaced, and responsibilities involved – emails:

From: Nathan White <nathan.white@raymondmaine.org>
To: Bruce Sanford <conestco@fairpoint.net>, Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, Sue Look <sue.look@raymondmaine.org>
Date: Fri, 4 Nov 2016 10:46:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Fwd: Re: questions about cemetery lot cornerstones, monument locations, corrections for abutting monuments misplaced, and responsibilities involved

Hi Bruce

I am waiting on the survey comp to lay out the road, once that is done we will grade the site and put in the roads. Then the survey comp will lay out the lots, at that point I will have the info your looking for.

As for a time line on this, I don't have that at this time but as soon as i do I will let you know.

Nathan White
Public Works Director
401 Webbs Mills
Raymond, ME 04071
(207)653-3641
(207)655-4742 x134
www.raymondmaine.org

On 10/29/2016 6:13 AM, Bruce Sanford wrote:

Nathan –

Have not had an acknowledgement of my request back on August 30 to contact me when you get ready to install the road behind our cemetery lot ..

Again, I want to meet with you so we can look at making sure that the corners of our lot-plot are marked correctly so we can set corner markers correctly .. it appears the lot-plot in front of us has their corner markers set up where our front markers should go and their markers actually over reach their back corners and include the 2’ walkway between lot-plot areas..

When do you expect to get to work on this? .. please advise.

CONESTCO

BRUCE SANFORD
Principal
222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071
207.627.4099 phone
Thanks for getting back, Sue .. some of your answers have convinced me that no one is minding the store to some degree when lots are bought, cornerstones set, monuments set etc ..

ss mentioned, many of the lots pretty clearly are not marked correctly for corners and monument location and direction facing is all over the map to some degree..

Nathan, please contact me when you get ready to flag the corners for us after the road is in and our lot loamed and seeded .. I would like to be there with you and examine the lot directly in front of ours on the church side to make sure they are not encroaching onto our lot .. and maybe we can determine if their headstone is actually encroaching on the 2’ walkway between our lots, it certainly appears to be doing so .. Sue cites a 2’ walkway between lots here and this lot in front of ours has their corner markers spaced 12’ apart front to back, not 10’ .. so it appears they set their back marker actually at the front corner of our lot and at the back side of the 2’ walkway and their monument sticks into the 2’ walkway ..
Subject: Re: Fwd: Re: questions about cemetery lot cornerstones, monument locations, corrections for a butting monuments misplaced, and responsibilities involved

Please see my answers below in BLUE...

-------- Forwarded Message --------

Subject: Re: questions about cemetery lot cornerstones, monument locations, corrections for a butting monuments misplaced, and responsibilities involved

Date: Tue, 30 Aug 2016 10:50:30 -0400

From: Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>
To: Bruce Sanford <conestco@fairpoint.net>, ltaylor@ids.tc, 'Nathan White' <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>
CC: 'Karen Sanford' <karensanfordd2@gmail.com>

Hello Bruce,

I have copied your email along to Town Clerk Sue Look for direct response.

Let me know if I can provide any additional assistance.

Don Willard
Town Manager
401 Webbs Mills Road
Raymond, Maine 04071
(207) 655-4742 x 131
(207) 650-9001
www.raymondmaine.org

On 8/30/2016 8:43 AM, Bruce Sanford wrote:

Lonnie –

I am addressing this cemetery concern to you as a committee member and ask that you share it with the other cemetery committee members .. none of the other committee members have emails published on the Town website and I cannot cc them herein .. thanks..

Don and Nathan, I am also including you two in this communication, as you likely will be involved in interpreting or answering my questions..

I have several questions and comments and ask for written responses from any or all of you, as necessary for the record..

I am asking the following based on certain understandings that I have regarding general lot size, cornerstone placement, monument placement etc, as follows .. if these lettered assumptions are incorrect, please clarify in addition to answering the numbered questions .. inserting answers in red below would be the cleanest way of handling answers..

Assumptions..

A. My understanding is that a lot can contain up to 4 plots .. is this correct? ..
A lot can hold any number of plots, as few as 1 plot and there is 1 in Raymond Village Cemetery with 26 plots in 1 lot.

B. A lot with 4 plots would measure 10’ x 20’ to its corner marker locations at the corners of the lot boundaries, correct? ..

A 10’ X 20’ lot is 5 plots.

C. Abutting lots that are back to back and do not have a road between them are separated by a 3’ wide walkway, correct? ..

Some abutt each other with no walkway, some have a 2’ walkway, while others have a 3’ walkway. Mr Sanford’s lot has a 2’ walkway between his lot on Road 7 and the abutting to the rear (on Road 6), but on the side there is a 3’ walkway.

D. If C. is correct, then two abutting lots that measure 10’ x 20’ each would be separated by a 3’ walkway and total distance from outer corner of one lot to outer corner of the next lot would be 23’ (10’ lot depth + 3’ walkway + 10’ lot depth). .. is this correct? ..

a. The rear row along the current back edge of the Raymond Hill cemetery is pretty sloppy .. it appears that cornerstones are laid out almost willy nilly, monument lines are not close to parallel or clean in many instances .. due to cornerstone placement possibly being off, it appears that newly purchased lots have encroachments either into the walkway between lots or actual misplacement of boundary cornerstones that then predetermine that the new lot abutting will have its boundaries misplaced and monuments misplaced, thereby multiplying the misplacement and haphazard layouts ongoing ..

b. The monument in the lot that abuts our lot toward the church building side has its monument apparently set some distance into the 3’ wide prescribed walkway between lots, assuming my 3’ walkway assumption is correct .. cornerstones for lot J just to the left of this monument as you face the monument measure 12’ distance outside corner to outside corner instead of 10’ total depth and the back of the monument is about 16” from the back corner line of the rear J lot marker .. if lots are supposed to be 10’ deep, the back corner marker of lot J is set 2’ too far to the rear and the monument is set a distance of about 8” beyond the rear lot boundary and into the 3’ walkway boundary ..

c. I measured a number of cornerstone layouts for multiple lots in the Raymond Hill cemetery this morning on a number of rows .. some are set at 10’ x 20’, some are odd measurements of 18’ x 20’, 17’ x 18’, 12’ x 18’ .. a real mishmash that appears to corroborate cornerstone stones have been misplaced ongoing .. some of this appears to be a mistake of the person laying the cornerstones not abiding by the 3’ walkway between lots, but apparently trying to halve the distance of the walkway 36” and claim half of that walkway as part of the lot by placing the back cornerstone halfway into the walkway between lots ..

Now for the questions ..

1. Who is responsible for initially and correctly temporarily flagging the proper corners of a lot? ..

Now we use a surveyor for expansions, I do not know how the existing cemeteries’ lots were laid out. I only have hand drawn maps that Ernie Hartley did

2. Who is responsible for installing granite lot corner markers, if desired? .. who is responsible for double checking cornerstone placements for accuracy? ..

The owner may install corner markers. I would like to change the ordinance such that the markers are required, and to ensure that they are placed I would like to raise the cost of the plots to cover the cost of the Town having the markers installed.
3. I assume set granite corner markers must conform to the flagged lot corner locations, correct? ..

Yes, this should be true.

4. Who is responsible for relocating a lot monument that is misplaced and intrudes into the 3’ walkway between lots? ..

The owner of the lot.

5. The cemetery ordinance states that each lot may have 1 monument on it .. but the ordinance does not differentiate between plots and lots ..

a. Does this mean that our lot with 4 plots may only have 1 monument and each individual grave (total of 4) could have its own flat flush ground marker? ..

b. Does this mean that each of our 4 plots can have its own monument and our lot, with 4 plots, can actually have 4 monuments? ..

c. These questions was asked at a Planning Board meeting with a cemetery committee member 6 months or so ago and remains unanswered ..

The intent as I understand it is that each lot may have only 1 large monument (like the obelisks for example) and each plot may have a headstone.

The Cemetery Ordinance does need to be organized, updated, clarified, and in some instances changed. The direction I received from the Planning Board was that they did not want to make my suggested organization changes without the other needed clarifications and that I should resubmit a new Cemetery Ordinance for consideration at the 2017 Town Meeting. This will be done.

Thank you for you assistance.

CONESTCO

BRUCE SANFORD

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 phone

207.627.4099 fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

https://conestco.com/
Sanford cemetery plot Raymond Hill Rd cemetery emails:

From: Sue Look [mailto:sue.look@raymondmaine.org]
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 12:02 PM
To: Bruce Sanford <conestco@fairpoint.net>
Cc: Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; joe.bruno@raymondmaine.org; teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org; rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org; ltaylor@ids.tc; sgifford1@maine.rr.com; Nathan White <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>
Subject: Re: Sanford cemetery plot Raymond Hill Rd cemetery

Good morning Mr Sanford,

I am charged with selling the lots/plots in Raymond's cemeteries and would like to offer a bit of further information.

The conveyance document states "AND the Grantor does covenant and agree to grade said premises and to be firmly bound and obligated unto Karen Stephenson Sanford, heirs and assigns, in perpetuity to keep the sward or turf even and in good condition, the grass properly cut, and the trees and shrubbery trimmed on said premises."

The lot you purchased (Road 7, Lot 84) is in the last row, last lot on side toward Valley Road of the portion of the Raymond Hill Cemetery behind the church. This lot abuts a newly surveyed and partially cleared expansion to the cemetery. This lot also is in a portion containing ledge near the surface (lots 80 and 81 in the same row are unusable due to ledge) making the growing or maintaining of grass in the current drought conditions difficult.

All this being said, the Town of Raymond is aware that there is work to be done at the back of the Raymond Hill Cemetery. This work is progressing between other projects and as resources are available since there is no money in the current budget to complete the expansion (the decision was made during the budget process to postpone completing the expansion until the 2017-2018 budget year).

As Town Manager Willard stated below, we are willing to refund your $1,200 paid for the lot if you prefer.

Sue Look
Raymond Town Clerk
655-4742 x121

On 8/15/2016 9:41 AM, Don Willard wrote:

Hello Bruce,

I have spoken with Nathan this morning about your cemetery lot concerns. He indicated to me that during your meeting he committed to getting the work done before winter 2016. If this timeline is unacceptable I am willing to refund the money you paid for the lot.

Please let me know if you need any additional written information.

Don Willard
Town Manager
401 Webbs Mills Road
Raymond, Maine 04071
(207) 655-4742 x 131
(207) 650-9001
On 8/11/2016 10:55 AM, Bruce Sanford wrote:

Don –

We purchased our family cemetery lot (4 plots) at the Raymond Hill Road cemetery on August 18, 2012. At the time of purchase, Town personnel promised that tree clearing and placement of loam and seed to bring the lot to proper grade and finish condition would be accomplished forthwith. After a number of our repeated requests for action over a couple of ensuing years, Karen and I met with Nathan White at the site during the summer of 2014 and walked through the area to discuss necessary contractual improvements.

After an additional 1 ½ years and more inquiries from us, the Town grudgingly got around to clearing trees and brush at the rear areas abutting our lot just prior to Winter 2015. Loam and seed and bringing the site to a proper grade and finish still has never been accomplished as I write this. Today is exactly 1 week before the 4th anniversary of the purchase and the Town remains negligent in providing us with a usable lot that we paid the Town full price for.

Part of the contract between us, implicit in the sale, is that the lot should be in an acceptable condition for usage, either for burial or for placement of a lot headstone. Please advise when the Town is going to loam and seed the area and bring it to an acceptable finish grade. I would appreciate your response in writing for our records.

Thank you.

CONESTCO

BRUCE SANFORD

Principal

222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 phone

207.627.4099 fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

https://conestco.com/
From: "Bruce Sanford" <conestco@fairpoint.net>
To: "Sue Look" <sue.look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: "Don Willard" <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, "Nathan White" <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>, <att2d@fairpoint.net>
Date: Sat, 21 Jul 2018 08:15:54 -0400
Subject: RE: Sanford cemetery plot Raymond Hill Rd cemetery

Don & Sue & Nathan –

Again with the cemetery stuff .. sorry to annoy ..

Sue said in an earlier email that a 10’ x 20’ lot had 5 plots .. I believe our lot has 4 plots .. does this mean we have a 10’ x 20’ lot with 4 plots or a 10’ x 16’ lot with 4 plots? .. I would like to know the sf area we actually have on the ground .. I was under the impression that a lot by definition was 10’ x 20’ and could contain varying numbers of plots, but now I am not at all sure of this ..

We met with Nathan at the lot site in 2014 and he explained at that time the issues in funding & etc in getting the rear area cleared, graded, etc .. the Town finally got around to clearing before winter 2015 and Nathan did promise to finish the work adding loam, grading, seeding, and planting corner stakes for us before the winter of 2016 .. however, Sue has also explained that work has been further pushed back to the budget year of 2017-2018 ..

Well .. it has now been 6 years since we bought the lot from the Town and we still do not have anything usable .. we really are not interested in a refund, we just would like the Town to uphold their end of the contract implicit in selling us suitable ground at the proper grade for our lot, with maintenance & etc as agreed .. until the lot has been filled, loamed, seeded, and corner staked, we do not have a usable lot ..

Although neither of us are planning on dying soon, I would hate for the inevitable to happen and then have nowhere to be buried .. given the snail pace of advancement to date by the Town, this is a matter of some concern and perhaps a bit of bemusement to us .. help? ..

CONESTCO

BRUCE SANFORD

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 phone

207.627.4099 fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

https://conestco.com/
2020 eMails

Sanford packet submission re Raymond Hill Road cemetery for BOS meeting 10-5-2020 email:

From: <conestco@fairpoint.net>
To: "'Don Willard'" <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, "'Sue Look'" <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Date: Thu, 1 Oct 2020 10:26:24 -0400
Subject: Sanford packet submission re Raymond Hill Road cemetery for BOS meeting 10-5-2020

Don and Sue –

Teresa urged to submit an information packet under a single cover for BOS consideration for the 10-5-2020 meeting .. she is correct and I apologize for not doing so to date .. I did not know my concern was "on the docket" until Tuesday this week anyway .. Don, this takes the heat off you from having to parse my email trail and decide on my behalf what is pertinent for submittal to the BOS .. attached are my letter for BOS consideration and 2 attachments of the Raymond Hill Road cemetery grounds for their consideration .. issues on the ground that I raise now may well be beyond the scope of BOS consideration and more a matter of coordination by cemetery and Town civil engineering officials moving forward .. but I submit anyway in case the BOS wishes or feels constrained to be involved .. thank you.

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net
Raymond Hill cemetery emails:

From: conestco@fairpoint.net
Date: October 1, 2020 at 9:13:42 AM EDT
To: Teresa <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>
Subject: RE: Raymond Hill cemetery

Teresa –

Will go ahead and do this .. I had no idea my issue was on the BOS agenda for Oct 5 until the email sent to me by Sue Look yesterday or the day before with the agenda included .. so most of the emails sent that cc’d the BOS folks predated my being put on the agenda .. I included BOS folks in all my earlier emails of the past 10 days or so as a way of holding the town manager and road commissioner somewhat to account for the frustration of going thru 8 years of schedules given that never came to fruition and verbal promises made as to what actions could be expected and the schedules projected therefore and with said actions never materializing .. this last spate of emails from me that cc’d the BOS apparently finally has spurred the situation more or less to eventual completion .. I do not operate my A&E consulting business this way and find dealing with town officials pretty exasperating, as la de da is pretty much the order of the day in the way they promise taxpayers something that they can then blow off until the issue comes around again at some point in the future .. that is my rant for the day .. I’ll prepare a statement and include outstanding pertinent papers and submit to the town for the BOS meeting Oct 5 ..

Bruce M. Sanford
CONESTCO.
Principal

222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071
207.627.4099 tel/fax
conestco@fairpoint.net

From: Teresa <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>
To: conestco@fairpoint.net
Cc: Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, Rolf Olsen <Rolf.Olsen@raymondmaine.org>, Sue Look <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 2020 15:55:43 -0400
Subject: Re: Raymond Hill cemetery

Bruce,

Again, I must ask that you summarize what your complaint is, give a brief description (because you have sent numerous emails with detailed descriptions) and what you are looking to have done. That should be coming from you and not the town. I have counted like 7-8 emails from you.

Sorry for any previous confusion. Thank you.

Teresa

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 30, 2020, at 11:06 AM, conestco@fairpoint.net wrote:
Teresa –

Don has already indicated in his email below (already cc’d to you previously by Don) that he is coalescing my submittals for inclusion into the BOS packet..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

From: Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 3:44 PM
To: conestco@fairpoint.net; 'Nathan White' <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>; 'Sue Look' <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org; rbullock1@maine.rr.com; teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org; ltaylor@ids.tc; sgifford1@maine.rr.com; 'Karen S. Sanford' <karensanfordd2@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: FW: Raymond Hill cemetery

Hello Bruce,

I will be sure that all of your most recent communications and related staff responses regarding your cemetery lot concerns are included in the BOS epacket. This will all be posted to the website on Friday for the Monday October 5th BOS meeting to be held via Zoom at 6:30pm. Materials can be received until the end of business on Thursday. You are encouraged to attend to present your concerns to the BOS at the meeting.

Sue will email you the epacket and Zoom link when it goes out to the BOS.

Thank you.

Don

--

Don Willard
Town Manager
401 Webbs Mills Road
Raymond, Maine 04071
(207) 655-4742 x 131
(207) 650-9001

www.raymondmaine.org
From: Teresa <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>
To: conestco@fairpoint.net
Cc: Rolf Olsen <Rolf.Olsen@raymondmaine.org>, bullock <rbullock1@maine.rr.com>, Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, Nathan White <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>, Sue Look <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>, rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org, ltaylor@ids.tc, sgifford1@maine.rr.com, "Karen S. Sanford" <karenssanfordd2@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 2020 09:45:55 -0400
Subject: Re: Raymond Hill cemetery + EXPLODED VIEW OF AREA IN QUESTION (sketch 9-29-20) & DIAGRAMMATIC CIVIL PLAN F.Y.I. (sketch 9-30-20)

Mr Sanford, I do not believe it is appropriate for Mr. Willard and Mrs. Look to put together the information on your behalf. This is your situation and feel you need to put together what you feel the board will need on your behalf and then submit it to the Town for the epacket.

Teresa Sadak

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 30, 2020, at 9:16 AM, conestco@fairpoint.net wrote:

Good point, Teresa .. Don Willard and Sue Look are already cc'd on my email trail to date and can put together synthesis that fits the Board’s needs .. I am on the Planning Boaord myself, so I understand your concern .. I do not expect to have any more communications, it only just occurred to me this morning that an overall civil plan of the cemetery landscape might be useful for informational purposes in addition to what has already been sent .. my apologies ..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME  04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

From: Teresa <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 9:08 AM
To: conestco@fairpoint.net; Rolf Olsen <Rolf.Olsen@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: bullock <rbullock1@maine.rr.com>; Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; Nathan White <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>; Sue Look <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>; rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org; ltaylor@ids.tc; sgifford1@maine.rr.com; Karen S. Sanford <karenssanfordd2@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Raymond Hill cemetery + EXPLODED VIEW OF AREA IN QUESTION (sketch 9-29-20) & DIAGRAMMATIC CIVIL PLAN F.Y.I. (sketch 9-30-20)
With all due respect to Mr. Sanford, I would ask that he put together a summary of the issue and submit it to either Sue Look or Don Willard so that it can be submitted in the epacket. We keep getting these emails with different numbers and measurements and theories. I would like to look at the whole issue from his side and the town’s, not all these emails that have all kinds of varying info.

Thank you.

Teresa

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 30, 2020, at 7:34 AM, conestco@fairpoint.net wrote:

Team –

Informational followup from my email last night that includes reattached look at DeSalle-Jiang-Sanford specific area in question as already sent yesterday .. thought it would be useful to the Team to have a global sketch of the entire Raymond Hill cemetery development for diagrammatic informational purposes .. might help any who are not aware of the expansion history and precise location of DeSalle-Jiang-Sanford area in question in the greater context of the entire cemetery layout ..

Attached global look at entire cemetery layout sketch dated 9-30-20 is diagrammatic in nature .. it is not to scale .. north arrow is informational and not true or magnetic north .. N-E-S-W on global cemetery plan only indicates general directions toward Auburn (N) – Portland (E) – Massachusetts (S) - NH mountains (W) .. drawn cemetery islands and roads in both “original expansion area” and “recent expansion area” are also not true to actual on the ground road count or island widths etc, these are drawn just to give overall context ..

Should otherwise be self-explanatory ..

Bruce M. Sanford
CONESTCO.
Principal
222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071
207.627.4099 tel/fax
conestco@fairpoint.net

From: <conestco@fairpoint.net>
To: "bullock" <bullock1@maine.rr.com>, "Don Willard" <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, "Nathan White" <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>, "Sue Look" <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: <rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org>, <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>, <ltaylor@ids.tc>, <sgifford1@maine.rr.com>, "Karen S. Sanford" <karensanford2@gmail.com>
Team –

See my sketch attached, pertinent notes for this sketch below .. 1/8” = 1’ scale to sketch ..

Measurement of DeSalle and Jiang lot widths along Road A was not measured in the field .. somewhat irrelevant, as it is lot depth issues we are considering .. I just sketched in DeSalle and Jiang lot widths as 20’, they likely are different measured widths ..

1. Granite corner markers “J” drawn on the sketch are located between DeSalle and Jiang lots .. outside “J” to outside “J” measured dimension along the ground is 12’ .. unclear to me whether DeSalle and Jiang were sold as 12’ deep lots and “J” locations as corners of these lots is correct .. or whether DeSalle and Jiang are supposed to be 10’ deep lots and the “J” corner marker closest to new Sanford lot is actually set at the back of the 2’ minimum walkway mandated to exist between adjoining lots ..
2. Back side of existing DeSalle monument is 12” distance to back of “J” corner marker near new Sanford lot .. back of Jiang monument is 36” distance to back of “J” corner marker near new Sanford lot ..
3. If DeSalle and Jiang are supposed to be 10’ deep lots, then “J” marker location would actually be back side of 2’ minimum walkway between DeSalle and new Sanford lot .. in such a case, DeSalle monument infringes into 2’ minimum walkway by 12” .. Jiang monument would be fine as is, since it is 36” from back of “J” corner marker abutting new Sanford lot and would therefore be 12” inside its back lot line if correct lot depth is 10’ ..
4. My offer to Town was that, if DeSalle monument does infringe into 2’ minimum walkway, rather than forced relocation of DeSalle monument I could accept recreating the 2’ minimum walkway by “sliding” our new lot away from the Church and toward the newest gravel road that exists toward the bottom of my sketch page (that road not shown on sketch as it is 30’ or more away and the total grass island width is probably 50’ anyway – I did not measure this total grass width of this island, but it is certainly wide enough to accommodate at least 4 rows of graves) ..
5. It would appear that, if our new lot was relocated by “sliding” it, then all the lots the entire run of this new grass island in line with our lot (àthat way on the sketch) would also have to be relocated toward that new gravel road that was constructed 30’ or more to the bottom of the sketch ..
6. I noted possibly correct corner locations on my sketch with two diamond shaped corners and a note indicating possible 10’ correct lot depth (?) .. I did this so I could then also demonstrate on the sketch what the 4’ walkway would look like relative to 10’ lot depth on the plan, if 10’ lot depth is correct and walkway was continued in straight line to right end of grass island (àthat way on the sketch) ..
7. The Town staked out new corners of our lot on 9/28/2020 .. our new lot corner stakes are 24” from the back of the “J” corner marker discussed above .. so the Town did recreate the 2’ minimum walkway between existing DeSalle and new Sanford lot by accepting the (possibly mis-staked) “J” markers and the 12’ (possibly incorrect but now grandfathered) DeSalle and Jiang lot depths as currently exist on the ground .. if lots to be created to the right direction on my sketch that would then run the entire length of the new grass island (àthat way on the sketch) would also have the 2’ minimum walkway continue in a straight line left to right AND if the correct lot depth to the right (àthat way on the sketch) is a 10’ lot depth and not 12’ lot depth, the Town ipso facto has now created a 4’ walkway between lots from the right edge (on plan view) of Jiang lot all the way to the end of the grass island (àthat way on the sketch) .. I realize this is a tad obtuse, as the potential 4’ walkway does not affect our new Sanford lot layout, but it does impact future spacing not only to the end of the grass island (àthat way on the sketch) but also to the lots developed toward the road (not shown) at the bottom of my sketch page ..
8. Corners staked for our lot by the Town on 9/28/2020 were staked at measurements of 9’ 6” x 17’ 6” instead of the correct 10’ x 20’ lot dimension that we have contracted with the Town for .. outlines of these two areas are noted on the sketch .. these stakes need to be reset by the Town to the correct 10’ x 20’ lot dimension ..
9. I did not bother drawing in the gravel issue relative to loam and seed at the edge of our new Sanford lot next to Road B .. suffice to say that Road B is not straight and has varying widths its entire length .. Road B naturally curves somewhat back toward our new Sanford lot because of vegetation growth along Road B on the pasture side to the left of my sketch that defines that side of the road edge .. gravel runs right up to the staked edge of our lot, whereas on other lots along road B there appear to be up to several feet of loam and seed between the edge of gravel and the cornered edge of grave lots .. as currently stands, a 3’ wide monument placed on the 5’ wide plot on new Sanford lot that includes the tree next to Road B would result in the edge of the monument being only 12” from the edge of the gravel, road .. obviously, this exhibits a damage issue to the monument from vehicular traffic .. hence my wish to work with Nathan White to infill the grade up around the tree properly and extend loam and seed 18” or so past our lot line abutting Road B and bring the loam toward the road a bit more for separation purposes ..

Sorry for the length of this reply .. but hope these notes and the attached sketch will illustrate everything to Mr. Bullock (and other’s) satisfaction ..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME  04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

From: bullock <rbullock1@maine.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2020 6:04 PM
To: 'Don Willard' <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; conestco@fairpoint.net; 'Nathan White' <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>; 'Sue Look' <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org; teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org; ltaylor@ids.tc; sgifford1@maine.rr.com; 'Karen S. Sanford' <karenssanford2@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: FW: Raymond Hill cemetery

Hello:

There appears to be a lot to this issue.

It would help me understand the details if I could see some drawings of the encroachments, etc.

No pictures please, drawings or survey maps with comments. Visualize this issue please.

M S Bullock
Hello Bruce,

I will be sure that all of your most recent communications and related staff responses regarding your cemetery lot concerns are included in the BOS epacket. This will all be posted to the website on Friday for the Monday October 5th BOS meeting to be held via Zoom at 6:30pm. Materials can be received until the end of business on Thursday. You are encouraged to attend to present your concerns to the BOS at the meeting.

Sue will email you the epacket and Zoom link when it goes out to the BOS.

Thank you.

Don

--
Don Willard
Town Manager
401 Webbs Mills Road
Raymond, Maine 04071
(207) 655-4742 x 131
(207) 650-9001
www.raymondmaine.org

On 9/29/2020 2:45 PM, conestco@fairpoint.net wrote:

Nathan and Sue –

Mine herein needs to be communicated to the Board of Selectmen for their meeting scheduled 10/5/2020 .. I have just returned from the Raymond Hill cemetery and have the following comments ..

First, I need to note that our purchase from the Town was for 4 each 5’ x 10’ plots to equal 1 each 10’ x 20’ total dimensioned lot .. the corner pins and stakes as recently set by the Town on 9/28/2020 are set to provide a lot dimension of 9’ 6” x 17’ 6” .. so the recently set corner stakes are incorrectly placed and need to be corrected ..

1. Clearly, the Town decided to utilize the solution I provided by grandfathering the 12’ DeSalle and Jiang lot depths as currently denoted by granite corner stones marked “ J” between the DeSalle and Jiang lots .. these corner stones measure 12’ distance out to out of each other ..
2. I do not know whether this 12’ lot depth is “legal” or not .. my understanding is that lots are to be a maximum 10’ depth, but perhaps DeSalle and Jiang were originally sold as 12’ lot depths .. but by grandfathering the cornered DeSalle and Jiang existing lots as 12’, my problem is solved .. our lot stakes are set 2’ back from the back corner of the “J” granite marker closest to our lot, thereby recreating a 2’ minimum walkway between DeSalle and Sanford ..
3. It is not my pay grade to determine how the Town is going to parse this 12’ DeSalle and Jiang lot depths relative to our recreated 2’ minimum walkway between DeSalle and Sanford and the walkway depth between lots the entire length of the grass island .. by grandfathering DeSalle and Jiang as 12’ deep lots, if the Town wants to maintain a the 2’ minimum walkway in a straight line down the island, there will be a 4’ walkway between lots on my side and any lots on DeSalle and Jiang side that are correctly cornered to a 10’ depth .. the Town shall have to wrestle with that one ..

4. The gravel roadway abutting our lot does wander a bit off course and is not strictly a straight line, due to the vegetation line on the pasture side of the gravel road .. the total width of the gravel road also varies .. the road happens to be about 18” wider of gravel along the edge of our lot than it presents generally elsewhere as a result of the dumping and spreading of the gravel road during its placement .. our corners are staked about 18” closer to this wider portion of the gravel edge of the road than other corners with a wider loam separation noted existing along the gravel road line .. this can be “solved” by removing about 18” width of gravel next to our gravel to loam line and extending the loam line out 18” .. the net gravel road width would remain at least as wide as it presents generally for the balance of the road travel down the cemetery edge line .. the land on our lot edge abutting the gravel road still falls down toward the road here anyway for about an 18” width next to the road and has not been entirely cleanly filled to the correct finished grade along our lot side abutting the road .. I am happy to work with Nathan White on this issue or simply bring some loan out myself and do the bit of infilling needed to bring our lot to correct finish grade and also reclaim as loam instead of gravel out to 18” beyond the edge of our staked lot .. my chief concern here is that, if we place a 3’ wide monument centered on our 5’ wide plot abutting the road and this 18” gravel width under question is not reclaimed to loam, the edge of our monument would literally be 12’ from the gravel edge of the existing road edge, something that certainly invites vehicular mischief .. reloaming this 18” width would provide a better separation between edge of gravel and edge of our monument ..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.
Principal
222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME 04071
207.627.4099 tel/fax
conestco@fairpoint.net

From: conestco@fairpoint.net <conestco@fairpoint.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 27, 2020 8:08 AM
To: 'Nathan White' <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>; 'Sue Look' <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: 'Don Willard' <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; 'rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org';
     <rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org>; 'rbullock1@maine.rr.com' <rbullock1@maine.rr.com>
     'teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org' <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>; 'ltaylor@ids.tc' <ltaylor@ids.tc>
     'sgifford1@maine.rr.com' <sgifford1@maine.rr.com>; "Karen S. Sanford" <karenssanfordd2@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: FW: Raymond Hill cemetery

Nathan –
Sorry to annoy, had a 1 am wakeup moment last night .. believe that I have the notes below on the 15” and 9” setbacks of the DeSalle monument reversed .. back of DeSalle monument is 15” from back side of the interior J corner marker (furthest from the gravel road) incorrectly set at 12‘ lot depth between DeSalle and Jiang lots .. so once the J corner marker is reset to correct 10‘ lot depth excluding 2‘ minimum walkway, you should find that back of DeSalle monument infringes 9” into the 2’ walkway space, not 15” .. does not change anything if you decide to relocate the monument, but does save net 6” of territory the full length of the grass island if the “sliding lot method” of grandfathering the issue is used ..

Brain cell synapses sleep a little more these days than they used to .. my apologies and thanks again.

Bruce M. Sanford  
CONESTCO.  
Principal  
222 Mountain Road  
Raymond ME  04071  
207.627.4099 tel/fax  
conestco@fairpoint.net

From: conestco@fairpoint.net <conestco@fairpoint.net>  
Sent: Saturday, September 26, 2020 1:16 PM  
To: 'Nathan White' <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>; 'Sue Look' <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>  
Cc: 'Don Willard' <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; 'rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org' <rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org>;  
'bbullock1@maine_rr.com' <rbullock1@maine_rr.com>;  
'teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org' <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>; 'ltaylor@ids.tc' <ltaylor@ids.tc>;  
'sgifford1@maine_rr.com' <sgifford1@maine_rr.com>; 'Karen S. Sanford' <karensanfordd2@gmail.com>  
Subject: RE: FW: Raymond Hill cemetery

Nathan –

I took a little time to explore out at the Raymond Hill cemetery this morning .. here is what I found ..

DeSalle is the lot with the monument question directly abutting our lot on the Church side .. Jiang is the lot next to DeSalle, also on the Church side and caddy corner to our lot .. there are two small square granite lot corner markers between the DeSalle and Jiang lots .. these corners have the letter “J” on them .. I presume that “J” must indicate the lot letter .. the lot depth distance out to out of the J lot corner markets is 12’ .. I believe it should be 10’, as the lot corners are not supposed to include the 2’ minimum walkway between lots within the designated shoebox of the overall lot property corners..

The back side of the lot-plot monuments on Jiang are properly set back 24” +/- from the back of the incorrectly placed rear J corner marker.. so Jiang’s monuments are faithful to the 2’ wide minimum walkway and the back of Jiang monuments would therefore be even with the back line of the correct Jiang 10’ lot property line .. the back of the DeSalle lot monument is 15” into the 2’ wide walkway and 9” from the outside back edge of the J corner marker line .. I do not know who set the corner markers at the incorrect 12’ depth instead of 10’ .. if “J” on the corner markers does indicate the lot letter, then whoever owns lot J must have made this mistake, whether intentional or unintentional ..
It appears that the DeSalle monument would have to be relocated 15” toward the Church if it is not possible to recreate the minimum 2’ walkway between DeSalle lot and our lot .. or it could be grandfathered if space allows the sliding of all the undeveloped lots in the row on my side, so to speak, 15” toward the road recently created on the newly expanded side of the cemetery and thereby creating a 2’ walkway between DeSalle and Sanford and 39” walkway the rest of the length of the lot runs .. of course, this means that several additional rows of lot grave sites that will eventually occur on the grass area between roads would also have to slide toward the gravel road .. there appears to be room for 4 or 5 rows of graves between the roads at this area of the cemetery, although I did not bother to run any calculations based on the unmeasured distance between the gravel roads..

Now you know what I know .. I’ll let the surveyor and you take it from here .. thank you.

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME  04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

From: conestco@fairpoint.net <conestco@fairpoint.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 12:51 PM
To: 'Nathan White' <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>; 'Sue Look' <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: 'Don Willard' <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; 'rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org' <rolf.olsen@raymondmaine.org>; 'bullock1@maine.rr.com' <bullock1@maine.rr.com>; 'teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org' <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>; 'ltaylor@ids.tc' <ltaylor@ids.tc>; 'sgifford1@maine.rr.com' <sgifford1@maine.rr.com>
Subject: RE: FW: Raymond Hill cemetery

Nathan –

Thank you .. please have them double check the posted corner locations of the lot adjoining ours on the side toward the Church .. as noted previously, the main monument on that lot is set completely back or beyond what may be the rear edge of their lot line that is supposed to run parallel to the 2’ walkway between adjacent lots .. my memory may be incorrect, but I believe the posted corners of this lot are spotted for a 12’ depth +/- to the lot and not to the “legal” 10’ depth .. so the main monument may actually be set back not only to the rear line of their proscribed 10’ lot depth, but actually to the back side of the 2’ walkway lane between lots, essentially placing that main monument on the rear line of our lot .. it has been several years since I walked the lots and did some rough measurement pacing, but something seems amiss here ..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal
At this time we are waiting for the surveying company to finish the boundaries, and your lot. They are scheduled for Monday Sept 28th.

Sue –

I have not had the courtesy of a response from you on my email below, dated 8/28/20 .. nor have I had any indication that my request has been formally submitted to the Cemetery Committee as requested .. your response? ..

Members of the Board of Selectmen –

My wife and I have been trying for 8 years to get the corners of our cemetery plot staked at the Raymond Hill Cemetery without success .. in addition, the monument on the lot next to ours on the Church side may be encroaching either into the prescribed 2’ walkway between lots or actually into our lot, as the depth of that lot may be cornered incorrectly and to depth greater than the 10’ depth indicated on Town cemetery lot maps .. our repeated requests to the Town Manager, Roads Commissioner, and Town Secretary have routinely been shunted aside or ignored and after 8 years, we still have no resolution .. the Town employees appear to be masters at telling citizens what they wish to hear in the moment in order to forestall any actions leading to actually solving the problems and then promptly ignoring the situation until the next entreaty from the citizen involved ..

Cemetery ordinances clearly indicate that the Town Sexton is responsible for staking correct corners to cemetery lots at Town cemeteries .. I assume this must mean the Sexton is also responsible for ascertaining that existing lot(s) adjacent to ours have their actual corners correctly located and that said lots are not
cornered to a depth exceeding the proscribed 10’ lot depths and that monuments on adjacent lots are not incorrectly located and encroaching either into walkways between lots or into adjacent lots.

The Town entered into a purchase agreement with us in 2012 and my wife, Karen Sanford, paid the indicated lot $$ fee. .. after 8 years of waving our hands in the air, we are entitled to completion of our contract with the Town and ask that you intervene and instruct the Town employees involved to put the doughnut down and do their jobs accordingly. .. some small portion of our tax $$ that we pay in full and on time every 6 months should be apportioned to issues such as these and I resent having to beg and scrape to get our legitimate concern taken care of.

Thank you for your kind and prompt consideration of this matter.

   Bruce M. Sanford
   CONESTCO.
   Principal
   222 Mountain Road
   Raymond ME  04071
   207.627.4099 tel/fax
   conestco@fairpoint.net

From: conestco@fairpoint.net <conestco@fairpoint.net>
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 3:56 PM
To: ‘Sue Look’ <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Subject: Raymond Hill cemetery

Sue –

Would you please forward this email body below to members of the cemetery committee for me? .. thank you .. I would also appreciate being cc’d on the email sent to committee members or, if you have to write up a communication for insertion into their folder for their next meeting, cc’ing me on that document created. ..

Dear Cemetery Committee Members –

Attached is a copy of our Raymond Hill Road cemetery lot assignations and purchase paperwork. .. Lot 84, Plot A purchased on 8/15/2012. .. I have the following comments and questions that I am asking the Committee to address for me. .. either a joint written committee response or your *answers in red below are acceptable.* ..

We have been trying without success to get the corners of our purchase marked since the purchase in 2012. .. according to the most current cemetery ordinances, the Sexton is responsible for ascertaining correct lot/plot corner locations and providing stakes to set the boundaries. .. please see that this is done.

   1. The monument on the lot/plot directly next to ours on the Church side appears to either be infringing into the 2’ walkway that I believe is supposed to exist between separately owned lots/plots or actually into the area that would be designated as our lot/plot once the correct
corner stakes are installed. It is unclear who from the Town is responsible for making this assertion, but I suspect it would be the Sexton. Please see that this is done.

2. If the monument adjacent is incorrectly placed and needs to be relocated, please see that this is done.

I believe that waiting 8 years to have these matters addressed exhibits a great deal of patience on our part and I would honestly appreciate the Town taking its contractual responsibilities regarding our purchase seriously, as to date the Town has ignored their responsibility to complete the contract according to the language of Town purchase documents and cemetery ordinances.

Thank you very much.

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net
Raymond Hill Cemetery emails:

From: "Sue Look" <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
To: pickerdude51@fairpoint.net, "Don Willard" <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, "Nathan White" <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: rbullock1@maine.rr.com, ltaylor@ids.tc, olsen@raymondmaine.org, Leegifford3@gmail.com, teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org, "Karen Sanford" <karenssanfordd2@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 26 Jun 2020 16:53:47 -0400
Subject: Re: FW: Raymond Hill Cemetery

Dear Mr Sanford,

I have spoken with Town Manager Willard and we understand and appreciate your concerns. After the upcoming Election the issue will be addressed.

Sincerely,

Sue Look
Town Clerk of Raymond Maine
207-655-4742

From: <pickerdude51@fairpoint.net>
To: "Don Willard" <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, "Nathan White"
                        <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>, "Sue Look" <sue.look@raymondmaine.org>
Cc: <rbullock1@maine.rr.com>, <ltaylor@ids.tc>, <olsen@raymondmaine.org>, <Leegifford3@gmail.com>,
                        <teresa.sadak@raymondmaine.org>, "Karen Sanford" <karenssanfordd2@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, 26 Jun 2020 15:59:26 -0400
Subject: FW: Raymond Hill Cemetery

Don & Nathan –

Attached is a copy of the 2012 statement drawn up by Karen Sanford regarding dedication of the various plots in our 10’ x 20’ cemetery lot purchase on Raymond Hill Road church graveyard. I am working somewhat from memory about all this regarding the following sequences of events, but these are my recollections ..

During the purchase process in 2012, Karen was told that, after land clearing, land fill and loam and seed to bring the lot to level would be placed, as the prevailing grades across the back of the entire rear of the cemetery were a fill condition and, at the time of purchase, not yet suitable for usage as a burial lot ..

1. During the purchase process in 2012, Karen was also told that the Town would survey the correct lot corners and stake them for us so we could place our own permanent corner markers and make arrangements for placement of the lot major headstone ..
2. Karen and I met with Nathan White at the site to discuss Town surveying of the corners, fill placement, and grading, loaming and seeding .. I do not believe the rear had been cut back of tree and scrub growth when we met Nathan on the site .. I believe we met Nathan at the site in 2015 .. at that meeting, Nathan promised that all that work would be done by the end of the next Town budget year so, if my recollection of the date year is correct, the completion by the town to make our lot suitable would have been accomplish by the end of 2016 ..
3. At our meeting on site with Nathan White in 2015 or 2016, we also discussed existing placement of the lot major headstone on the lot directly abutting our lot, with that lot being toward the Church side .. that existing lot monument is so far back that it may well be encroaching into or actually fully into the rear of what I understand is a 2’ walkway that is supposed to exist running in between abutting
lots .. so a 10’ x 20’ lot that abuts our 10’ x 20’ lot would have a 2’ clear walkway between the
adjacent lots .. the answer to this question is still not resolved ..
4. It took about 1 or 2 years after our meeting with Nathan White onsite for the Town to do the clearing
around the back area of the cemetery where our (then ) rear corner lot is located .. we had asked
that the young maple tree at the corner of our lot be preserved (it has) ..
5. I believe the loam was stockpiled on the site late in 2017 .. the loam was not spread and roads
installed until at least a full year after the fill had been stockpiled on site .. it might have been 18
months or so ..
6. As of 2020 when I visited the cemetery during the earlier spring, the fill had finally been placed and
the roads installed .. this work might have been done in 2019, I am not certain ..
7. The corners of our lot are still not staked as of the date of my most recent inquiry to the Town 10 days
or so ago .. I have not visited the site in the interim to see if stakes are actually in place or not ..
8. I wrote the Cemetery Committee about all these questions about 5 years or so ago .. I believe I also
contacted the Board of Selectmen, given the lack of suitable or useful response from anyone else
involved .. I have no records in my hands of a written response from either body, although I could be
in error on that and said written response might have been misplaced at my end ..
9. I did receive an offer from Don Willard around 2015 or so to refund our $$, since the Town appeared
to be either unwilling to or incapable of completion of their side of the contract engaged in by
accepting our $1,200 for purchase of the lot .. it was not clear from Don’s letter offering a refund
whether it was actually a refund or whether it was liquidated damages for non-performance of a
contract .. I wrote Don again asking about that, but have no record of a response ..

Gentlemen, it has now been almost 8 full years since we purchased this cemetery lot .. as a taxpayer
whose semiannual $$ remittances help pay the salaries of folks employed by the Town, I admit to finding it a
tad gallling that I have to write again about all this .. I realize, in the general overall scope of Town business,
that our concerns are minute in your minds and eyes, but to us it is both our $1,200 spent for our forever
resting place and a lot of promises made by Town personnel that either have not been kept or have taken
years and years longer than was personally promised to us for various resolutions ..

Must I employ my own surveyor to stake the corners of our lot? .. must I employ a headstone company to
relocate the adjacent lot monument myself if it is misplaced? .. if so, all those costs would be directly
deducted from my semi-annual $$ land tax remittances that are submitted faithfully and on time to the Town
so you can pay the bills to take care of such similar issues ..

Is it asking too much for someone to scrape their feet together, shuffle around a bit, and admit to some small
measure of embarrassment for such a lackadaisical piece of Town response to a legitimate taxpayer
concern and polite ongoing requests? ..

What, gentlemen, is your pleasure? .. the 8 year old still outstanding issues are staking of the corners of our
lot and an answer as to whether the lot monument on the lot abutting ours on the Church side needs to be
relocated or not .. help? ..

Sue –

I have cc’d the Board of Selectmen in the addy trail above .. would you kindly see that this email is
distributed to the members of the Cemetery Committee? .. thank you very much ..

EL BRUCO INDUSTRIES
Bruce Sanford

222 Mountain Road
Raymond ME  04071
207.627.6049
ATTACHMENT:

*Cemetery Arrangements for Karen Stephenson Sanford*

Raymond Hill Cemetery located on Raymond Hill Road, Raymond Maine 04071 in Lot 84, Plot A.

Lot 84 (four plots) in the Raymond Hill Cemetery was purchased on 08/15/2012 for $1,200.00 by Karen Stephenson Sanford with conveyance of the land within Lot 84 to Karen Stephenson Sanford in perpetuity by the Town of Raymond.

Lot 84 in the Raymond Hill Cemetery measures approximately 10’ x 20’ and is located, at this writing on 08/15/2012, in the back northwest corner of the cemetery.

The four plots within Lot 84 are oriented along the approximately 20’ aspect of the lot side-by-side from south to north with letter designations in order: D, C, B, A. Plot A is the outside plot; Plot D is the innermost plot into the cemetery. The depth of the lot, and therefore each plot, is approximately 10’. This should allow the width of each plot to be approximately 5’, with the overall dimensions of each plot to be approximately 5’ x 10’.

As of this writing on 8/15/2012, Bruce Mullenix Sanford and Karen Stephenson Sanford shall be cremated and placed side-by-side in Plot A, with Karen placed to the south and Bruce placed to the north within Plot A.

My wish is that Craig Berndt Sanford will be given Plot B.
My wish is that Cole Arthur Sanford will be given Plot C.
My wish is that Clark Louis Sanford will be given Plot D.

My decision to give each son his plot, in this order, is based upon their birth order, oldest to youngest.

Being of sound mind and body on this day, Wednesday, August 15, in the year 2012, I do declare the above to be my wishes regarding the disposition of Lot 84 in the Raymond Hill Cemetery.

Karen Stephenson Sanford
Oaths emails:

From: <conestco@fairpoint.net>
To: "Sue Look" <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Date: Fri, 28 Aug 2020 15:28:28 -0400
Subject: RE: Oaths

Sue –

As soon as I get some resolution from the Town on the corners of our cemetery plot and whether the headstone on the lot next to ours encroaches into either the 2’ walkway space between lots or actually onto our lot and whether it needs to be moved and is moved, I’ll be happy to stop in and be sworn at for the Planning Board oath taking thingie ..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME  04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

---

From: Sue Look <Sue.Look@raymondmaine.org>
Sent: Friday, August 28, 2020 12:36 PM
To: PATRICIA BEATON <patricia.beaton@macular-retinal.org>; timbergf@aol.com; Cathy Gosselin <Cathy.Gosselin@raymondmaine.org>; Chris Hanson <christophershanson1956@gmail.com>; Jessica Jackson <ACOJJACKSON@GMAIL.COM>; theoneills@maine.rr.com; conestco@fairpoint.net; Joanne Stinson <jmstinson9@gmail.com>; Brenda Tubbs <btubbs@graymaine.org>; Bruce Tupper <bruce.tupper@raymondmaine.org>
Subject: Oaths

Please come to the Town Office at your earliest convenience to be sworn to office for the next year (or 3 for Planning Board or ZBA).

Thank you!

Sue Look

Town Clerk of Raymond Maine

207-655-4742
Stuff emails:

From: <conestco@fairpoint.net>
To: "Nathan White" <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>, "Don Willard"
<don.willard@raymondmaine.org>, "Sue Look" <sue.look@raymondmaine.org>
Date: Wed, 24 Jun 2020 12:47:22 -0400
Subject: RE: stuff

Nathan –

We are several weeks after you were going to look into it according to your email below .. so, when will the corners of our lot be staked or placed by you folks and when will you determine if the monument on the lot next to ours is improperly located and needs to be relocated? .. these same issues have been dragging on for over 5 years and that is about 4 years and 11 months longer than should be necessary .. I appreciate you are stretched thin and have many fires to put out, but can we please come to some finality on these issues? ..

Bruce M. Sanford

CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME  04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net

From: Nathan White <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2020 3:34 PM
To: Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>; conestco@fairpoint.net; Sue Look <sue.look@raymondmaine.org>
Subject: Re: stuff

Good afternoon Bruce

I will look into that next week with Sue, Have a good weekend

Nate

From: Don Willard <don.willard@raymondmaine.org>
To: conestco@fairpoint.net, Sue Look <sue.look@raymondmaine.org>, Nathan White <Nathan.White@raymondmaine.org>
Date: Wed, 3 Jun 2020 10:40:26 -0400
Subject: Re: stuff

Good morning Bruce,

I am not sure who you interacted with first yesterday morning, so I am copying Town Clerk Sue Look to distribute your email as appropriate. Apparently there was some level of misunderstanding between the staff and our private sector technology provider about the telephone routing settings, causing some calls not to go to the designated number. My understanding is that this issue was rectified before you were admitted to the building. In a perfect world, such issues would not occur. Unfortunately and as I told you yesterday, these are not the best of times for any of us and we are learning to some degree as we go along, making improvements and adjustments as necessary. I will have Sue Look investigate the DMV take a number system although I am not sure how that would work without the associated electronic systems that underlie it. Most towns that I am aware of are using the same type of telephone based system as us.

As for your Cemetery inquires, those are Town Clerk and Public Works questions, so I have copied Nathan White in on this email as well. I hope you have a good day.

Don

--
Don Willard
Town Manager
401 Webbs Mills Road
Raymond, Maine 04071
(207) 655-4742 x 131
(207) 650-9001
www.raymondmaine.org

On 6/3/2020 7:14 AM, conestco@fairpoint.net wrote:

Don –

Kindly relay my apologies to the lady I had discourse with yesterday morning at the front door .. I do not know her name .. I am sure everyone there is doing the best they can with what they have .. I admit to not having the most patience in the world sometimes, especially with governmental entities that post their own rules of operation and special contact methods that are then not lived up to .. but it is not a perfect world .. it might be worthwhile reconsidering the phone call thingie for gaining entrance, as that method does lock out anyone who arrives without a phone in hand .. DMV does not use a phone appointment method for ,good reasons and utilizes the number system because it works ..

On another tack, I no longer have records of emails about our cemetery plot on Raymond Hill Road cemetery .. I was out there several weeks ago and, while the roads and lawns are finally in, corners to the lots are not flagged off .. so I do not know precisely where our corners are .. the other issue is the same one remaining from my last contact about this some years ago .. the major headstone on the lot directly abutting ours is set back so far toward the back of that lot that I believe it actually is installed in the separation area (2’ or similar) that is supposed to exist between lots and may not even be technically on the lot itself .. how do we ascertain whether the stone is improperly located and get it moved to a proper location if it is? .. please advise ..

Bruce M. Sanford
CONESTCO.

Principal

222 Mountain Road

Raymond ME 04071

207.627.4099 tel/fax

conestco@fairpoint.net
September 23, 2020

Raymond Town, Maine
Town Manager
401 Webbs Mills
Raymond, ME 04071

Dear Don Willard,

I am pleased to inform you that based on and in reliance upon the information and materials provided by Raymond Town, the Center for Tech and Civic Life ("CTCL"), a nonprofit organization tax-exempt under Internal Revenue Code ("IRC") section 501(c)(3), has decided to award a grant to support the work of Raymond Town ("Grantee").

The following is a description of the grant:

**AMOUNT OF GRANT:** $5,000.00 USD

**PURPOSE:** The grant funds must be used exclusively for the public purpose of planning and operationalizing safe and secure election administration in Raymond Town in 2020 ("Purpose").

Before CTCL transmits these funds to Grantee, CTCL requires that Grantee review and sign this agreement ("Grant Agreement") and agree to use the grant funds in compliance with the Grant Agreement and with United States tax laws and the laws and regulations of your state and jurisdiction ("Applicable Laws"). Specifically, by signing this letter Grantee certifies and agrees to the following:
1. Grantee is a local government unit or political subdivision within the meaning of IRC section 170(c)(1).

2. This grant shall be used only for the Purpose described above, and for no other purposes.

3. Grantee has indicated that the amount of the grant shall be expended on the following specific election administration needs: Ballot drop boxes, Poll worker recruitment funds, hazard pay, and/or training expenses, Temporary staffing, and Election administration equipment. Grantee may allocate grant funds among those needs, or to other public purposes listed in the grant application, without further notice to or permission of CTCL.

4. Grantee shall not use any part of this grant to make a grant to another organization, except in the case where the organization is a local government unit or political subdivision within the meaning of IRC section 170(c)(1) or a nonprofit organization tax-exempt under IRC section 501(c)(3), and the subgrant is intended to accomplish the Purpose of this grant. Grantee shall take reasonable steps to ensure that any such subgrant is used in a manner consistent with the terms and conditions of this Grant Agreement, including requiring that subgrantee agrees in writing to comply with the terms and conditions of this Grant Agreement.

5. The grant project period of June 15, 2020 through December 31, 2020 represents the dates between which covered costs may be applied to the grant. The Grantee shall expend the amount of this grant for the Purpose by December 31, 2020.

6. Grantee is authorized to receive this grant from CTCL and certifies that (a) the receipt of these grant funds does not violate any Applicable Laws, and (b) Grantee has taken all required, reasonable and necessary steps to receive, accept and expend the grant in accordance with the Purpose and Applicable Law.

7. The Grantee shall produce a brief report explaining and documenting how grant funds have been expended in support of the activities described in paragraph 3. This report shall be sent to CTCL no later than January 31, 2021 in a format approved by CTCL and shall include with the report a signed certification by Grantee that it has complied with all terms and conditions of this Grant Agreement.

8. This grant may not supplant previously appropriated funds. The Grantee shall not reduce the budget of the Municipal Clerk ("the Election Department") or fail to
appropriate or provide previously budgeted funds to the Election Department for the
term of this grant. Any amount supplanted, reduced or not provided in contravention
of this paragraph shall be repaid to CTCL up to the total amount of this grant.

9. CTCL may discontinue, modify, withhold part of, or ask for the return all or part of the
grant funds if it determines, in its sole judgment, that (a) any of the above terms and
conditions of this grant have not been met, or (b) CTCL is required to do so to comply
with applicable laws or regulations.

10. The grant project period of June 15, 2020 through December 31, 2020 represents the
dates between which covered costs for the Purpose may be applied to the grant.

Your acceptance of and agreement to these terms and conditions and this Grant Agreement is
indicated by your signature below on behalf of Grantee. Please have an authorized
representative of Grantee sign below, and return a scanned copy of this letter to us by email
at grants@techandciviclife.org.

On behalf of CTCL, I extend my best wishes in your work.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tiana Epps Johnson
Executive Director
Center for Tech and Civic Life
GRANTEE

By: [Signature]

Title: Town Manager

Date: 9-24-20
To: Welfare Officials and Contracted Agents  
From: Sara Russell, Program Manager, General Assistance  
Date: September 3, 2020  
Subject: New GA Maximums  

Enclosed please find the following items:


- “GA Maximums Adoption Form” which was developed so that municipalities may easily send DHHS proof of GA maximums adoption. Once the selectpersons or council adopts the new maximums, the enclosed form should be signed and submitted to DHHS. (see “Filing of GA Ordinance and/or Appendices” below for further information).

### Appendix A – H

The enclosed Appendices A – H have been revised for your municipality’s General Assistance Ordinance. These new Appendices, once adopted, should replace the existing Appendices A – H. Even if you have already adopted MMA's model General Assistance Ordinance, the municipal officers must approve/adopt the new Appendices yearly.

### The Adoption Process

The municipal officers (i.e., selectpersons/council) adopt the local General Assistance Ordinance and yearly Appendices, even in town meeting communities. The law requires that the municipal officers adopt the ordinance and/or Appendices after notice and hearing. Seven days posted notice is recommended, unless local law (or practice) provides otherwise.

At the hearing, the municipal officers should:

1) Allow all interested members of the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed ordinance;

2) End public discussion, close the hearing; and

3) Move and vote to adopt the ordinance either in its posted form or as amended in light of public discussion.
Municipalities May Establish Their Own Maximums

Municipalities may establish their own maximum levels of assistance provided that the proposed levels of assistance are reasonable and meet adequate standards sufficient to maintain the health and safety of applicants in the municipality. The municipality must submit to the Department documentation to justify these levels of assistance and verify that the figures developed are appropriate to maintain health and decency.

A municipality’s maximum assistance level for Food may not be below the Department provided figures which are issued by the USDA and published annually following a study of cost of food for various family sizes. A market basket survey may be used to establish food maximums if the maximums provided by the USDA are insufficient to maintain health in the municipality.

Filing of GA Ordinance and/or Appendices

Please remember that General Assistance law requires each municipality to send DHHS a copy of its ordinance once adopted. (For a copy of the GA model ordinance, please call MMA’s Publication Department, or visit their web site www.memun.org). In addition, any changes or amendments, such as new Appendices, must also be submitted to DHHS. DHHS will accept the enclosed “adoption sheet” as proof that a municipality has adopted the current GA maximums.
GENERAL ASSISTANCE ORDINANCE
APPENDICES A-H
2020-2021

The Municipality of __________________________ adopts the MMA Model Ordinance GA Appendices (A-H) for the period of Oct. 1, 2020—September 30, 2021. These appendices are filed with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in compliance with Title 22 M.R.S.A. §4305(4).

Signed the _____ (day) of __________________ (month)______ (year) by the municipal officers:

__________________________________________  __________________________
(Print Name)      (Signature)

__________________________________________  __________________________
(Print Name)      (Signature)

__________________________________________  __________________________
(Print Name)      (Signature)

__________________________________________  __________________________
(Print Name)      (Signature)

__________________________________________  __________________________
(Print Name)      (Signature)

__________________________________________  __________________________
(Print Name)      (Signature)
# 2020 General Assistance Maximums Reference Sheet-Portland HMFA

**October 5, 2020 Board of Selectmen Meeting**

## OVERALL MAXIMUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in Household</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,179</td>
<td>$1,284</td>
<td>$1,686</td>
<td>$2,180</td>
<td>$2,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household of 6</td>
<td>$2,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Add $75 for each additional person

## FOOD MAXIMUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$47.44</td>
<td>$204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$86.98</td>
<td>$374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$124.42</td>
<td>$535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$158.14</td>
<td>$680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$187.67</td>
<td>$807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$225.35</td>
<td>$969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$249.07</td>
<td>$1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$284.65</td>
<td>$1,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add $146 per month for each + person

## PERSONAL CARE & HOUSEHOLD SUPPLIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly Amount</th>
<th>Monthly Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>$11.60</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For each additional person add $1.25 per week or $5.00 per month.

## SUPPLEMENT FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Weekly Amount</th>
<th>Monthly Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$17.40</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23.30</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$27.90</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Burial Maximum: $1,475

### Cremation Maximum: $1,025

### New - Appendix H Revisions

## HEATING FUEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: When the dwelling unit is heated electrically, the maximum amount allowed for heating purposes will be calculated by multiplying the number of gallons of fuel allowed for that month by the current price per gallon. When fuels such as wood, coal, and/or natural gas are used for heating purposes, they will be budgeted at actual rates, if they are reasonable. No eligible applicant shall be considered to need more than 7 tons of coal per year, 8 cords of wood per year, 126,000 cubic feet of natural gas per year, or 1000 gallons of propane.

## ELECTRIC

**NOTE:** For an electrically heated dwelling also see “Heating Fuel” maximums below. But remember, an applicant is not automatically entitled to the “maximums” established—applicants must demonstrate need.

### 1) Electricity Maximums for Households Without Electric Hot Water

- The maximum amounts allowed for utilities, for lights, cooking and other electric uses excluding electric hot water and heat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25.75</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$27.70</td>
<td>$119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$32.25</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$38.75</td>
<td>$167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$176.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: For each additional person add $3.00 per month.*

### 2) Electricity Maximums for Households With Electrically Heated Hot Water

- The maximum amounts allowed for utilities, hot water, for lights, cooking and other electric uses excluding heat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20.65</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23.75</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$27.70</td>
<td>$119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$32.25</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$38.75</td>
<td>$167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$176.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: For each additional person add $3.00 per month.*

---

**1-800-442-6003**

Revised 7/22/20
# 2020-2021 GA Overall Maximums

## Metropolitan Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>Persons in Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangor HMFA:</strong> Bangor, Brewer, Eddington, Glenburn, Hampden, Hermon, Holden, Kenduskeag, Milford, Old Town, Orono, Orrington, Penobscot Indian Island Reservation, Veazie</td>
<td>775 879 1,116 1,397 1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumberland County HMFA:</strong> Baldwin, Bridgton, Brunswick, Harpswell, Harrison, Naples, New Gloucester, Pownal, Sebago</td>
<td>883 926 1,197 1,649 1,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lewiston/Auburn MSA:</strong> Auburn, Durham, Greene, Leeds, Lewiston, Lisbon, Livermore, Livermore Falls, Mechanic Falls, Minot, Poland, Sabattus, Turner, Wales</td>
<td>741 798 1,025 1,287 1,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penobscot County HMFA:</strong> Alton, Argyle UT, Bradford, Bradley, Burlington, Carmel, Carroll plantation, Charleston, Chester, Clifton, Corinna, Corinth, Dexter, Dixmont, Drew plantation, East Central Penobscot UT, East Millinocket, Edinburg, Enfield, Etna, Exeter, Garland, Greenbush, Howland, Hudson, Kingman UT, Lagrange, Lakeville, Lee, Levant, Lincoln, Lowell town, Mattawamkeag, Maxfield, Medway, Millinocket, Mount Chase, Newburgh Newport, North Penobscot UT, Passadumkeag, Patten, Plymouth, Prentiss UT, Seboeis plantation, Springfield, Stacyville, Stetson, Twombly UT, Webster plantation, Whitney UT, Winn, Woodville</td>
<td>741 742 981 1,229 1,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portland HMFA:</strong> Cape Elizabeth, Casco, Chebeague Island, Cumberland, Falmouth, Freeport, Frye Island, Gorham, Gray, Long Island, North Yarmouth, Portland, Raymond, Scarborough, South Portland, Standish, Westbrook, Windham, Yarmouth; Buxton, Hollis, Limington, Old Orchard Beach</td>
<td>1,179 1,284 1,668 2,180 2,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sagadahoc HMFA:</strong> Arrowsic, Bath, Bowdoin, Bowdoinham, Georgetown, Perkins UT, Phippsburg, Richmond, Topsham, West Bath, Woolwich</td>
<td>821 933 1,095 1,449 1,691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A  
Effective: 10/01/20-09/30/21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **York County HMFA:**  
Acton, Alfred, Arundel, Biddeford, Cornish, Dayton, Kennebunk, Kennebunkport, Lebanon, Limerick, Lyman, Newfield, North Berwick, Ogunquit, Parsonsfield, Saco, Sanford, Shapleigh, Waterboro, Wells | 918 | 980 | 1,212 | 1,539 | 1,720 |
| **York/Kittery/S.Berwick HMFA:**  
Berwick, Eliot, Kittery, South Berwick, York | 1,136 | 1,165 | 1,539 | 1,926 | 2,699 |

*Note: Add $75 for each additional person.

Non-Metropolitan Areas  
Persons in Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aroostook County</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>1,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock County</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec County</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox County</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford County</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis County</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldo County</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please Note: Add $75 for each additional person.
Appendix B  
Effective: 10/01/20 to 09/30/21

2020-2021 Food Maximums

Please Note: The maximum amounts allowed for food are established in accordance with the U.S.D.A. Thrifty Food Plan. As of October 1, 2020, those amounts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly Maximum</th>
<th>Monthly Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 47.44</td>
<td>$ 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.98</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>124.42</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>158.14</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>187.67</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>225.35</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>249.07</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>284.65</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For each additional person add $153 per month.
2020-2021 GA Housing Maximums  
(Heated & Unheated Rents)

NOTE: NOT ALL MUNICIPALITIES SHOULD ADOPT THESE SUGGESTED HOUSING MAXIMUMS! Municipalities should ONLY consider adopting the following numbers, if these figures are consistent with local rent values. If not, a market survey should be conducted and the figures should be altered accordingly. The results of any such survey must be presented to DHHS prior to adoption. Or, no housing maximums should be adopted and eligibility should be analyzed in terms of the Overall Maximum—Appendix A. (See Instruction Memo for further guidance.)

Non-Metropolitan FMR Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aroostook County</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Franklin County</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hancock County</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kennebec County</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-Metropolitan FMR Areas

### Knox County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lincoln County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oxford County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Piscataquis County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Somerset County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C
Effective: 10/01/20-09/30/21

#### Non-Metropolitan FMR Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waldo County</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Metropolitan FMR Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bangor HMFA</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumberland Cty. HMFA</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lewiston/Auburn MSA</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-3 Prepared by MMA – 6/2020
# Metropolitan FMR Areas

## Penobscot Cty. HMFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Unheated Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Heated Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Portland HMFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Unheated Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Heated Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>2,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sagadahoc Cty. HMFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Unheated Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Heated Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## York Cty. HMFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Unheated Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Heated Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1,617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## York/Kittery/S. Berwick HMFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated Weekly</th>
<th>Unheated Monthly</th>
<th>Heated Weekly</th>
<th>Heated Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>1,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>2,596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020-2021 GA MAXIMUMS SUMMARY SHEET

Note: The overall maximums found in Appendices A, B, C, D, E, and F are effective from October 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021.

APPENDIX A - OVERALL MAXIMUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

NOTE: For each additional person add $75 per month.

(The applicable figures from Appendix A, once adopted, should be inserted here.)

APPENDIX B - FOOD MAXIMUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly Maximum</th>
<th>Monthly Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$47.44</td>
<td>$204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.98</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>124.42</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>158.14</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>187.67</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>225.35</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>249.07</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>284.65</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For each additional person add $153 per month.

APPENDIX C - HOUSING MAXIMUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unheated</th>
<th>Heated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The applicable figures from Appendix C, once adopted, should be inserted here.)

FOR MUNICIPAL USE ONLY
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APPENDIX D - UTILITIES

ELECTRIC

NOTE: For an electrically heated dwelling also see “Heating Fuel” maximums below. But remember, an applicant is not automatically entitled to the “maximums” established—applicants must demonstrate need.

1) Electricity Maximums for Households Without Electric Hot Water: The maximum amounts allowed for utilities, for lights, cooking and other electric uses excluding electric hot water and heat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15.70</td>
<td>$67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$17.45</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$19.90</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$23.10</td>
<td>$99.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$107.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For each additional person add $7.50 per month.

2) Electricity Maximums for Households With Electrically Heated Hot Water: The maximum amounts allowed for utilities, hot water, for lights, cooking and other electric uses excluding heat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20.65</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23.75</td>
<td>$102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$27.70</td>
<td>$119.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$32.25</td>
<td>$139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$38.75</td>
<td>$167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$176.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: For each additional person add $10.00 per month.

NOTE: For electrically heated households, the maximum amount allowed for electrical utilities per month shall be the sum of the appropriate maximum amount under this subsection and the appropriate maximum for heating fuel as provided below.

APPENDIX E - HEATING FUEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR MUNICIPAL USE ONLY
purposes will be calculated by multiplying the number of gallons of fuel allowed for that month by the current price per gallon. When fuels such as wood, coal and/or natural gas are used for heating purposes, they will be budgeted at actual rates, if they are reasonable. No eligible applicant shall be considered to need more than 7 tons of coal per year, 8 cords of wood per year, 126,000 cubic feet of natural gas per year, or 1000 gallons of propane.

**APPENDIX F - PERSONAL CARE & HOUSEHOLD SUPPLIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Household</th>
<th>Weekly Amount</th>
<th>Monthly Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>$11.60</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For each additional person add $1.25 per week or $5.00 per month.

**SUPPLEMENT FOR HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN UNDER 5**

When an applicant can verify expenditures for the following items, a special supplement will be budgeted as necessary for households with children under 5 years of age for items such as cloth or disposable diapers, laundry powder, oil, shampoo, and ointment up to the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Weekly Amount</th>
<th>Monthly Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12.80</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$17.40</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23.30</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$27.90</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
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2020-2021 Mileage Rate

This municipality adopts the State of Maine travel expense reimbursement rate as set by the Office of the State Controller. The current rate for approved employment and necessary medical travel etc. is 45 cents (45¢) per mile.

Please refer to the Office of State Controller for changes to this rate:
Telephone: 626-8420 or visit: http://www.state.me.us/osc/
Funeral Maximums

Burial Maximums

The maximum amount of general assistance granted for the purpose of burial is $1,475. The municipality’s obligation to provide funds for burial purposes is limited to a reasonable calculation of the funeral director’s direct costs, not to exceed the maximum amounts of assistance described in this section. Allowable burial expenses are limited to:

- removal of the body from a local residence or institution
- a secured death certificate or obituary
- embalming
- a minimum casket
- a reasonable cost for necessary transportation
- other reasonable and necessary specified direct costs, as itemized by the funeral director and approved by the municipal administrator.

Additional costs may be allowed by the GA administrator, where there is an actual cost, for:

- the wholesale cost of a cement liner if the cemetery by-laws require one;
- the opening and closing of the grave site; and
- a lot in the least expensive section of the cemetery. If the municipality is able to provide a cemetery lot in a municipally owned cemetery or in a cemetery under municipal control, the cost of the cemetery lot in any other cemetery will not be paid by the municipality.

Cremation Maximums

The maximum amount of assistance granted for a cremation shall be $1,025. The municipality’s obligation to provide funds for cremation purposes is limited to a reasonable calculation of the funeral director’s direct costs, not to exceed the maximum amounts of assistance described in this section. Allowable cremation expenses are limited to:

- removal and transportation of the body from a local residence or institution
- professional fees
- crematorium fees
- a secured death certificate or obituary
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- other reasonable and necessary specified direct costs, as itemized by the funeral director and approved by the municipal administrator.

Additional costs may be allowed by the GA administrator where there is an actual cost, for:

- a cremation lot in the least expensive section of the cemetery
- a reasonable cost for a burial urn not to exceed $55
- transportation costs borne by the funeral director at a reasonable rate per mile for transporting the remains to and from the cremation facility.