



# Maine Human Rights Commission

# 51 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333-0051

*Physical location: 19 Union Street, Augusta, ME 04330*

Phone (207) 624-6290 ■ Fax (207) 624-8729 ■ TTY: Maine Relay 711

[www.maine.gov/mhrc](http://www.maine.gov/mhrc)

**Amy M. Sneirson**  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**Barbara Archer Hirsch**  
COMMISSION COUNSEL

## COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

*19 Union Street ~ Augusta, Maine*

October 26, 2015

Commission Chair Arnold Clark called the October 26, 2015 Commission meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Present were Commissioners Arnold Clark, Sallie Chandler, John Norman, A. Mavourneen Thompson and Deborah Whitworth.

### AGENDA

Commissioner Clark called for adoption of the Agenda and Consent Agenda.

Executive Director Amy Sneirson reviewed the following changes/requests for change to the agendas:

- Executive Director Amy Sneirson advised that the Complainant in E13-0677 (Dorr v. Bath Iron Works) requested to withdraw his complaint, which would change the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Chandler moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to allow the complainant to withdraw his complaint in E13-0677. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.
- Two cases have been tabled to the November 23, 2015 Commission Meeting:
  - E13-0681: Rodney Kates (Lewiston) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)
  - E13-0686: Richard Roberts (Lisbon Falls) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Commissioner Chandler moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to adopt the Agenda as amended and to accept the Investigator's recommendations in each of the cases on the Consent Agenda. 5 in favor | 0 opposed (see detailed listing on page 6).

### MINUTES

Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to adopt the September 21, 2015 Commission Meeting Minutes. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

### QUARTERLY PROGRAM REVIEW

- Inventory Status Report & Resolutions: There were 694 open cases at the end of September, and the average # of days a case was with the Commission at that time was 332 days. The Commission closed 173 cases during the preceding quarter with 30 settlements resulting in over \$698,125 to complainants.
- Training/Education: Commissioners reviewed the quarterly report indicating that staff presented at 9 training sessions and attended 7 training sessions.
- Litigation - Commissioners agreed to move this item to another part of the agenda when the Commission could go into Executive Session.

- Financial: Commissioners reviewed the quarterly financial report, including supplemental quarterly financial reporting required of quasi-independent agencies pursuant to 5 M.R.S. § 12023, and it was placed in the file.

## **ADMINISTRATION**

Executive Director Amy Sneirson reported that the Commission hired an investigator to fill the new Field Investigator position authorized in the Biennial Budget for 2016-2017. The Commission had submitted position justification forms, as mandated by the Governor's Office, requesting permission to fill the new Investigator Position and made a conditional offer to Audrey Gillespie on September 24, 2015 (contingent on the Commission receiving the Governor's signature on the position justification form). On October 2, 2015 the Commission received the Governor's signed authorization form and made a firm offer to Audrey Gillespie who accepted the position and began working the following Monday.

## **COMPLIANCE:**

Commissioners reviewed the compliance report showing no successful conciliations, three (3) unsuccessful conciliations, and eight (8) conciliations in progress. It was placed on file.

## **INVESTIGATION:**

New Charges: Commission staff opened 39 new cases in September.

Administrative Dismissals: The Executive Director administratively dismissed 24 cases in September.

Pre-determination Settlements: Since September 21, 2015, 30 cases pending at the Commission were resolved resulting in settlements with total monetary relief in excess of \$200,000 for complainants.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

The Commission's annual report will be issued soon; there is a draft provided for Commissioners' review in case there are any questions.

The Governor's Review Panel formed as result from the Governor's Executive Order began meeting last week.

Several bills related to service animals will be studied as part of a cohesive task force set up by LD 872; Barbara Archer Hirsch is part of the workgroup formed to look at service animal laws and abuses of the law.

With respect to the revisions to rules discussed at the last meeting, there are no changes to the Commission's Procedural Rules to discuss. The Education Rule discussion still needs further discussion when there is time in today's agenda.

**At 8:39 A.M. Chair Clark called for a 5 minute recess.**

## **CASES VOTED ON 8:45 A.M.:**

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young gave Complainants' introductory statement outlining the issues and facts, from their perspective, in these cases filed against Bath Iron Works. Attorney John Fitzgerald gave Respondent's introductory statement outlining the issues and facts, from its perspective, in these cases filed against it.

## Group 1:

E13-0670: James St. Amand (Durham) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0672: Guy Blanchette (Litchfield) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0673: Douglas Brunelle (Gardiner) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0676 Steven Dill (Portland) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of

employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0678 Claude Hamann (Lewiston) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0680 Patrick Hynes (Durham) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0682: Andre Laverdiere (Lewiston) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against

Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0684: Normand Nadeau (Auburn) v. Bath Iron Works (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0687: Kenneth Salls (Mechanic Falls) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0675: Jeanine Daley (Bowdoin) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young and Attorney Samuel Rioux restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant by denying a reasonable accommodation for her disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of her employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

Att 10:29 A.M.: Chair called for a 5 minute break.

## Group 2:

E13-0441: Raymond Labbe (Litchfield) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the cases. Commissioner Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainants by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0679: Donald Hersom (Lewiston) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the cases. Commissioner Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainants by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0683 Peter Moskus (Rumford) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the cases. Commissioner Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainants by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0688: David Smith (Thomaston) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)

Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Christopher Crabtree restated the position of the Respondent. Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the cases. Commissioner Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant in the terms, conditions, and privileges of employment on the basis of age

and/or disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 Opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainants by denying a reasonable accommodation for his disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that the Respondent Bath Iron Works Corporation discriminated against Complainant on the basis of age by implementing a practice that had an adverse impact based on age and resulted in an adverse impact on the terms and conditions of his employment (disparate impact). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

At 10:48 Chair Clark called for a 10 minute recess.

PA14-0587: Mariah J. Ireland (Harrison) v. Town of Bridgton / Police Dept. and Jacqueline Frye (Bridgton). Mariah Ireland restated her position as the Complainant. Attorney Gina McCormick restated the position of Respondents. Investigator Alice Neal restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Town of Bridgton / Police Department and Jacqueline Frye discriminated against Mariah Ireland on the basis of her disability or perceived disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

11:20 A.M.: End of AM Cases.

#### **New Business Continued:**

Barbara Archer Hirsch reviewed the revised Education rule changes. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to put the proposed revisions to the Commission's Procedural, Education Procedural and Education Rules out to public comment once the Commission receives approval from the Dept. of Education and receives the Governor's permission to publish the Education Rule. 3 in favor | 2 opposed (Clark and Thompson opposed).

At 11:53 Chair Clark called for a 7 minute recess.

#### **CASES VOTED ON 12:00 P.M. :**

E13-0613: Kary Haley (Presque Isle) v. Aroostook Medical Center (Presque Isle). Attorney Sarah Churchill restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Katy Rand restated the position of the Respondent. Investigator Robert Beauchesne restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Chandler moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth to find no reasonable grounds to that Aroostook Medical Center subjected Complainant Kary Haley to a hostile work environment based on sex. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E13-0659: Alix Lacrete (Alfred, ME) v. Annabelle Lee, Inc. (Bronx, NY). Complainant was not present. Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Complainant Alix Lacrete was subjected to unlawful race/color discrimination by Respondent Annabelle Lee, Inc, and no reasonable grounds to believe that Complainant Alix Lacrete was retaliated against for engaging in protected conduct under the Whistleblowers' Protection Act. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

E14-0309: Lise Theriault (Winslow) v. Alford Center for Health (Augusta). Attorney Jeffrey Neil Young restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Katy Rand restated the position of the Respondent. Investigator Alice Neal restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Alford Center for Health denied Lise M. Theriault a reasonable accommodation for her disability in violation of the MHRA, or discriminated against Lise M. Theriault due to her disability when it terminated her

employment, or retaliated against Lise M. Theriault for engaging in protected activity in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

H15-0243: Amanda Townsend (Auburn) v. Heritage Court, Inc. (Lewiston, ME), Weston Associates (Boston, MA), Mike Miles (Lewiston, ME), and Heritage Court II, LP (Boston, MA). Beverly Townsend restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney Aubrey Russell restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Whitworth moved, seconded by Commissioner Chandler, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondents discriminated against Complainant Amanda Townsend due to her receipt of public assistance or by denying her a reasonable accommodation for her disability. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

H15-0250: Kevin Roach (Sanford) v. Avesta Housing (Portland). Attorney Philip Bartlett restated the position of the Complainant. Attorney David Chamberlain restated the position of the Respondent. Chief Investigator Victoria Ternig restated the facts of the case. Commissioner Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Avesta Housing denied or delayed Complainant Kevin Roach a reasonable accommodation in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed. Commissioner John Norman moved, seconded by Commissioner Whitworth, to find no reasonable grounds to believe that Respondent Avesta Housing made an illegal inquiry regarding Complainant Kevin Roach's disability in violation of the MHRA. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

At 1:34 PM Commissioner Chandler moved, seconded by Commissioner Norman, to move into executive session to discuss pending or contemplated litigation, and the Commission's legal rights and duties, with Commission Counsel pursuant 1 M.R.S. §405(6)(E). 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

At approximately 1:56 PM Commissioner Chandler moved, seconded by Commissioner Norman, to come out of executive session. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

At approximately 1:57 P.M, Commissioner Chandler moved, seconded by Commissioner Norman, to adjourn. 5 in favor | 0 opposed.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Chair Clark adjourned the meeting the meeting at 1:58 PM.

**CONSENT AGENDA PAGE 6**



## CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda is a listing of cases scheduled on the Commission's meeting agenda in which there was no written disagreement to the Investigator's recommendation. Commissioners considered these cases without oral argument by the parties.

E13-0685	Joseph Page (South China) v. Bath Iron Works Corporation (Bath)	NRG
E14-0065:	Walter F. Buchala (Brunswick v. Coastal Metal Fabrication (Topsham)	NRG
PA14-0139:	Frank Woodard (Lincoln) v. Penobscot Valley Hospital (Lincoln)	RG
PA14-0362:	Craig A. Widdecombe (Rockland) v. Jan Mee Restaurant (Portland)	RG
E14-0547:	Heidi D. Pendleton (Islesboro) v. Norumbega Inn (Camden)	NRG
E14-0666:	Natasha Kinney (Lebanon) v. Town of Shapleigh (Shapleigh	
E14-0667:	Natasha Kinney (Lebanon) v. Shane Enger (Shapleigh)	NRG
H15-0219:	Rebecca Huckins, individually and on behalf of Minor Child (Gray) v. Beehive Properties, LLC(Scarborough), Christina Cange (Scarborough), and Suzanne Cange (Scarborough)	NRG