

TOWN OF WEATHERSFIELD SELECT BOARD

Phone: 802-674-2626

Fax: 802-230-6262

MEETING AGENDA

Tuesday, January 12, 2021 | 06:30PM 5259 US Route 5, Ascutney, VT 05030

REMOTE PARTICIPATION (CONFERENCE CALL/ DIAL IN)

Phone Number: (646) 749-3122 | Access Code: 837-211-861

Pursuant to Governor Phil Scotts March 30, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, See H.681, and the Governor's March 21, 2020 order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Weathersfield Select Board will be conducted via remote participation to the greatest extent possible.

Specific information and the general guidelines for remote participation by members of the public and/or parties with a right and/or requirement to attend this meeting can be found on the Weathersfield website, at

http://cms2.revize.com/revize/weathersfieldvt/covid-19 resident information/guidance for remote meetings.php

For this meeting, members of the public who wish to watch the meeting may do so in the following manner:

Comcast Channel "1087" and VTEL Channel "161" on Wednesday at 6:30PM GoToMeeting: "Live/ Real-time" – January 12, 2021 | 6:30PM SAPATV.org – Wednesday Afternoon

In-person attendance is permitted, but every effort will be made to ensure that the public can adequately access the proceedings in real-time, via technological means. In the event that we are unable to do so, despite our best efforts, we will post on the Weathersfield website an audio or video recording, transcript or other comprehensive record of proceedings as soon as possible after the meeting.

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Comments from Select Board/ Town Manager and Citizen on Topics not on the Agenda
- 3. Review minutes from previous meetings: January 4, 2021
- 4. 2021 Town Meeting Discussion
- 5. Fund Balance Policy / 19 V.S.A. § 312
- 6. Revised Budget Narrative & Compensation Reports
 - a. FY22 Budget Proposals
 - i. FY22 Highway Department Budget Third Pass
 - ii. FY22 Listers Budget Second Pass
 - iii. FY22 Town Clerk Budget Second Pass
 - iv. FY22 Land Use Budget Second Pass
 - v. FY22 Police Department Budget First Pass
- 7. Appointments
 - a. Budget Committee
 - b. Connecticut River Joint Commission
 - c. CRJC MT Ascutney Subcommittee
 - d. Fence Viewer
 - e. Selectmen Representative to School Board
 - f. Southern Windsor County Transportation Advisory Committee
 - g. Sourther Windsor/ Windham Counties Solid Waste Management District
 - h. Tree Warden
- 8. Any other Business
- 9. Adjourn

Select Board Martin Memorial Hall 5259 Route 5, Ascutney VT Monday, January 4, 2021 6:30 PM REGULAR MEETING

MINUTES

Select Board Members Present: N. John Arrison

David Fuller Joseph Jarvis Paul Tillman Michael Todd

Select Board Members Absent:

Brandon Gulnick, Town Manager (joined the meeting online)

Others Present (online):

Ray Stapleton		
AnnMarie Redmond		
Susanne Terrill		

The Public was permitted to attend this meeting in person. Remote public participation was facilitated via the GoTo Meeting video-conferencing platform and conference calling. The number for people to join or call in to the meeting was published on the meeting agenda and on the Town's website. Mr. Gulnick monitored the calls and the video-platform while Mr. Fuller ran the meeting. The meeting was recorded by both the GoTo Meeting platform and SAPA TV.

1. Call to Order

Mr. Fuller called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM.

2. Comments from Select Board and Town Manager and Citizens on Topics not on the Agenda

Mr. Todd reminded the Board that this is the time of year when the Board considers awarding the Citizen Service Award. He asked the Board to consider recognizing all Town Employees for the award, given the circumstances over the last year.

Mr. Tillman said the Planning Commission voted at their last meeting to adopt the Future Land Use Map. A public hearing with the Select Board will be required before the Map can be officially adopted as part of the Zoning Bylaws.

Mr. Fuller said he had attended some of the Planning Commission meetings to observe and was very impressed with the quality and thoroughness of their work.

Mr. Arrison once again stated that there are open elected positions and that no petitions are needed. However, all candidates must file a consent form with the Town Clerk by the deadline.

There were no comments from the public or the Town Manager.

3. Review minutes from previous meetings – December 21, 2020 Additions/corrections/deletions:

a. None

Motion: To approve the minutes of the December 21, 2020 meeting

Made by: Mr. Arrison Second: Mr. Todd

Mr. Fuller remarked that it was not his intention to be unclear in the discussion under

the "Chain of Command" agenda item.

Vote: All in favor

Mr. Fuller asked to move item #12 on the agenda to this point in the meeting. There were no objections.

Motion: To move the January 18th meeting to January 19th at 6:30 PM

Made by: Mr. Tillman Second: Mr. Jarvis

Vote: All in favor

Mr. Fuller asked to move item #5 on the agenda to this point in the meeting. There were no objections.

Due to the pandemic, the Legislature has given towns some flexibility in scheduling Town Meetings and holding elections. (Terms that expire in March will remain until the next vote is scheduled.) Key points of discussion:

- The voters have chosen to have the meetings on Saturday with voting on the following Tuesday.
- Mr. Fuller favors renting a tent and holding the meeting outside in May.
- The meeting could be held on May 8th with voting on May 11th.
- School Board Chair, AnneMarie Redmond, said that the Town of Windsor is planning to hold their Town Meeting on March 2nd. She was concerned about how a May 11th election would affect the school budget, in that Weathersfield is part of the same SU as Windsor.
- Mr. Todd said some decisions are made by the State that we don't have answers to in March.
- Mr. Arrison said that the school formula will be available for March meetings.

- Mr. Fuller asked Ms. Redmond to put this topic on the next School Board agenda (January 12th). Ms. Redmond agreed.
- Publication of the annual report will be postponed if the meeting is postponed.
- Mr. Fuller would like the school budget and the Town budget to be voted on the same schedule (not separate votes).
- Pushing back the meeting will not affect teacher contracts.
- The Secretary of State has said that an online meeting platform cannot be used as the primary medium for Town Meeting. It can be used as a secondary means of participation, but not the primary, so as to facilitate participation by those who cannot do so virtually.
- It was agreed to not make a decision on this at this meeting.
- Straw poll: Mr. Arrison, Mr. Fuller and Mr. Jarvis favor May 8th; Mr. Todd supports either date.
- Mr. Fuller said the SU budget is voted on by a board that represents the towns in the district it is not voted on by the public. Each town school budget is voted on by each town as a separate vote. There's no conflict with these budgets. All budget years end on June 30th.
- The only worry is if any of the budgets are voted down on May 8th is there enough time to amend the budget and get it back before the voters before the end of the fiscal year.

4. Town Manager Report

<u>Citizen's Complaint</u> – A complaint was received on November 3rd. All parties involved have been interviewed. Video footage has been viewed and information evaluated.

Mr. Gulnick said if there is an employee, a contractor or an elected official that "has an issue", that person should immediately contact the Town Manager or the front office and let them know "what's going on". He said confrontation is not appropriate. There is a procedure in place for resolving complaints properly.

Mr. Gulnick said the complaint to which he referred could have been resolved differently. He will be sending letters to all parties involved.

<u>Tenney Tree</u> – Earlier this year, the State of Vermont approached Mr. Gulnick about removing the Tenney tree. Since that time, the Principal Clerk and he have been holding meetings with members of the Conservation Commission, the Historical Society and four Tenney relatives. Information gathered has been conveyed to the State. The relatives have decided what they would like to see as a memorial to Romaine Tenney. He will be meeting with the State later this week to discuss hiring an architect, (artist?), and a construction company. He plans to hold workshops at Martin Memorial Hall this spring

with the Tenney relatives and the State of Vermont to develop the content for the display boards. Anyone wishing to attend these workshops is urged to contact the Town Office. The cost of the project will be negotiated with the State. Mr. Gulnick said the State seemed confident that they can meet the requests of the Tenney family (concrete slab with an overhang and display boards beneath).

Everyone has agreed that the tree should come down.

Mr. Gulnick will speak with the State this week and let them know what the Tenneys are requesting.

The State has offered to preserve parts of the tree for anyone that would like a part of it. Mr. Jarvis said he is interested in having a part of the tree. He said he knows some people who would be interested in this project in the event that help is needed in getting materials off the ground. Mr. Gulnick said he would contact Mr. Jarvis tomorrow (Tuesday, 1/5/2021).

LGERG – (The grant that is to cover COVID-19-related expenses between March 1st and December 31st) The grant was deposited in the Town's account on December 23rd. We have been fully reimbursed for our COVID expenses. As of January 1, 2021, there are no further funds available at this time. We have made wise purchases and should be alright for a bit, but we will need to be careful.

<u>Fire Department Contracts and Budget</u> – Town administration has met several times with AVFD since the last Selectboard meeting. In these meetings each section of the contract is reviewed with discussions back and forth as to how to make each one work. There are some areas that the department would like to see modified. Mr. Gulnick will compile a list of the requested modifications and get it to the board at either the next meeting or the meeting after that.

AVFD has provided to the Town their accounting records. Work has begun on combining them with the Town's records. They have reviewed the reimbursement clause of the contract to learn how it will be carried out. All expenses will now be invoiced to the Town for payment. They will flow through the Town's internal controls the same way as all budget departments operate.

Mr. Gulnick said he is taking AVFD's accounting records and merging them into one fire department budget for Ascutney. West Weathersfield is being separated out, so there will be two different budgets. Those budgets will include all of the department's operation expenses.

Mr. Gulnick has met with WWVFD and will meet with them again Thursday (1/7/2021).

5. Town Meeting Discussion

(See discussion above.)

6. Revised FY22 Budget Calendar

On the proposed budget calendar, the fire departments are the two last budgets to be presented.

Mr. Todd said the Board needs to wrap up the budgets by January 25th (assuming a March Town Meeting). The Board agreed that an extra meeting may be needed to finish up by that deadline. Mr. Gulnick will facilitate it.

7. Appropriations

The Board received a list of appropriations and a copy of the Social Services Policy.

Points of discussion:

- Requests for less than \$500
- Requests for more than \$500
- First-time requests
- Repeat requests
- Whether a presentation is needed to the Selectboard or the Town Meeting Susanne Terrill joined the discussion online. Only one request, which wasn't on the list (Cover Home Repair), isn't a 2nd year request. They submitted for the first time last year. Everyone else on the list applied for the second time last year. They all came in and presented or called in to the Board on January 7th.

According to the policy, once approved, the funding is provided for two years. Since Cover Home Repair was approved last year, they are automatically approved for this year.

Windsor County Mentors is requesting \$480. Cover Home Repair is requesting \$400.

Requests of \$500 and over are sent to the voters. Approved requests under \$500 are included in the general fund budget. The Board approves (or not) requests under \$500. There didn't seem to be guidance in the policy on how to approach requests under \$500 that have been previously denied by the Board.

Ms. Terrill confirmed that all the required information had been provided by the agencies making requests for this year.

Motion: To approve the request by Big Heavy World for \$250 under the appropriations budget (within the general fund).

Made by: Mr. Todd Second: Mr. Arrison

The Board asked what Big Heavy World does. Mr. Arrison said he remembered it being something to do with music, that they were located in Chittendon County and that the Board did not feel it had enough to do with Weathersfield to warrant the Town's support. Ms. Terrill stated, "It is a volunteer-run, independent, state-wide music office and archive of Vermont-made music, working to inclusively promote and (?) all kinds of music made across Vermont."

Vote: 1 in favor, 3 opposed (The Chair did not vote)

Motion: To approve all the other outstanding requests for funds \$22,953 (includes \$400

for Cover Home Repair and \$480 for Windsor County Youth Services)

Made by: Mr. Tillman Second: Mr. Todd

Vote: All in favor

8. FY22 Highway Department Budget

The proposed budget presentation packet has a title page, table of contents, a list of attachments, a review schedule, and an executive summary for each department's budget.

Mr. Gulnick read the executive summary for the Highway Department budget: Due to the State of Emergency, the Highway Department is proposing the same tax revenue as FY22. As you will see on Page 4 of this proposal the Highway Department anticipates a \$1,487 increase in State Aid to Highway and a \$23 increase in Permit Revenue. Revenue from other departments decreased by \$1,700 because the Highway Department will no longer contract its employees to conduct Water Operator duties and responsibilities to the Ascutney Water District. The cumulative Fund Balance as of June 30, 2020 for this Department is \$211,257.

There are some fluctuations in expenses which allowed us to absorb our debt service from purchasing the Motor Grader and Dump Truck. Personnel expenses decreased by \$24,303; Office expenses decreased \$185; Utilities decreased by \$158; Highway Garage & Truck Expenses decreased by \$10,00; and Road Materials & Repairs decreased by \$2,500. Our debt service increased by \$38,049, which includes a \$17,575 payment for the 2021 Dump Truck and a \$16,429 payment for the 2021 Motor Grader. The interest has also been accounted for in this budget. There were no variances in Fees & Permits nor in reserves. This budget includes no decreases/additions in the number of workers.

Mr. Gulnick said our books are showing a \$211,000 cumulative highway surplus. However, the auditors are accounting the entire loan payment that we took from ourselves. We are charging the highway budget annually to pay back that loan. The auditors are showing a \$21,000 surplus. Their numbers account for the total loan being paid back in FY20 when we took it out.

Mr. Fuller said it was assumed that the loan would be paid back in five years, not one. He said the money was still there. The loan was for paving the Center Road. Mr. Gulnick said it was - \$199,000. That was to be divided by five and charged to the highway department each year.

Mr. Fuller said the motion was to borrow the money from the reserves, not the highway department annual operating budget.

Mr. Gulnick said the \$38,000 payment was voted for last year. It was something we carried forward from last year. It was proposed for FY21 and he has similarly proposed it for FY22. He said if this not correct, then the FY21 budget must be changed as well.

Mr. Fuller said, "I don't recall making motions to fund money out of an annual operating budget. It was to borrow off our reserve accounts which were \$1M."

Mr. Gulnick agreed and said the \$38,000 is being paid back to the reserves. Mr. Stapleton said the Town borrowed money from the general reserves. It should show the \$190,000 going from the general reserves and the highway fund paying back \$38,000 every year for the next five years. But the auditors took the full \$190,000 out of the highway department in one year. The motion was to take the \$190,000 from the general reserves.

Mr. Fuller said this is why the Town should restrict its borrowing from a bank. When we borrow from ourselves, "the books become very muddy". He said it is not worth the small savings in interest payments, especially when the interest rate is as low as it is right now. "Let the bank be the bank, not the Town be the bank."

Mr. Fuller said the surplus in the highway fund has been \$100,000 for two years in a row.

Mr. Todd asked for clarification of where the money was to be borrowed from. Mr. Fuller said the Town has about \$1M in reserves. Mr. Todd asked if the money had been taken from these accounts or only from the highway budget. Mr. Stapleton said, "The paper trail – according to the auditors – shows we took \$190,000 from the highway department to pay for paving. We're now paying it back with interest." He said there appears to be no paper trail showing the funds were taken from the general fund surplus. Mr. Fuller said it was not from a surplus, but from a reserve account. Mr. Stapleton said it shows all of the money coming from the highway department in one year. Mr. Fuller said that was bizarre. He said that's the risk when we borrow from our reserve accounts. He said it appears that the \$200,000 surplus in the highway budget was used as a loan to pay for the paving. It was not taken from the reserve account. Mr. Stapleton said that was what the auditors did – he doesn't know what the Town did.

Mr. Tillman said the auditors don't do our books. He recommended going back in the record to find the original motion and then speak to accounting to find out what actually happened. Mr. Fuller asked that the appropriate minutes be made available to the Board at the next meeting.

Mr. Arrison had questions on the revenue side: \$211,257 audited fund balance – is that 100% of the audited fund balance from last year? Mr. Gulnick said it is the cumulative surplus in the highway budget as of June 30, 2020 (FY20). Mr. Fuller said that's an 18% surplus. He asked if \$190,000 of that is being taken out for the loan. Mr. Gulnick said it is important to figure out why there is a surplus – where did it come from? More revenue? Less expenses? Savings? He said the variances between FY18 and FY20 show how it happened. Analysis of those records will help prevent future accumulations as large as these.

Mr. Fuller said there are some assumptions involved in stating that the department is asking for the same amount of taxes for the FY22 budget. It assumes the Grand List is the same; the difference in taxes between FY18 and FY21 is close to \$100,000 more in taxes from people and nearly half of the cumulative surplus. The dump truck payment is \$17,000; the grader payment is \$16,000; the 2% pay raise is (approx.) \$7,000; if we have the same budget we had a year ago that generated \$100,000 surplus, we still have \$60,000 that we're looking for – other wise we're going to generate another surplus.

Mr. Stapleton said last year there were low fuel prices; it was a light winter with no overtime; not a high salt budget; and the Board put a spending freeze on the department, so he didn't buy extra tires, blades, and extra chains that he usually buys at the end of the year for the next year.

Mr. Fuller said he was not proposing "big cuts", but rather he was trying to learn what is needed and to give the department what is needed. But generating that big of surplus every year is not acceptable.

Mr. Arrison said that by using the \$211,257 surplus in the revenue line, it guarantees a \$0.04 tax increase next year, because that money won't be there next year. Mr. Fuller disagreed. Mr. Gulnick pointed to "Audited Fund Balance Carry Forward – Rev" (\$211,257) and then to "Audited Fund Balance carry forward – expense" (\$210,164) it shows the total amount expensed out to the reserves.

Mr. Fuller remembered in previous years the administration asking to put highway surplus funds into the two highway reserve accounts.

This budget includes \$33,000 for reserves (as a separate article) and \$50,000 for paving.

Mr. Stapleton said he had \$50,000 for paving in this year's budget that won't be spent and that needs to be moved to a reserve for next year. \$50,000 in next year's budget will still leave him about \$30,000 short. Mr. Arrison said he understood the plan, but the funds should show as being accumulated and not as an expense.

Mr. Fuller said that State law requires surplus highway funds be spent for their intended purpose the following year. He strongly objects to accumulating any surplus funds.

The Highway Equipment Acquisition reserve has \$135,000 in it. The Highway Capital Maintenance and Improvements reserve has \$75,716. Mr. Stapleton said \$40,000 from the sale of the truck and an additional \$35,000 were used to buy the new dump truck (all coming from the wheel fund). Mr. Gulnick said \$30,500 can be taken from the surplus or the reserve toward purchase of the grader – that's up to the Board. Approximately \$40,000 was to be taken from the fund balance to go toward the grader.

Mr. Stapleton said he is not proposing to buy any new equipment this year.

The State Aid figure in the proposed budget is an average over the past five years. We won't have the actual number until after Town Meeting. Mr. Stapleton said it might be wise to keep the surplus intact until we know what the State Aid actual amount will be.

Mr. Arrison agreed.

Mr. Todd said he had a problem with the fund balance increasing by \$90,000 every year. Mr. Stapleton said four years ago the Board adopted a policy that calls for 13-15% of the highway budget to be held in the fund balance at all times. Once that cap is reached, anything over should be spent or put into the reserves. Mr. Fuller said he had not seen that policy, but vowed to have a copy by the morning.

Mr. Jarvis felt the funds should be placed in a reserve account and distributed as needed. Mr. Fuller agreed.

Mr. Fuller asked if there is anything at the garage that needs funding? Mr. Stapleton said the roof membrane needs repairs. But he said the Capital reserve is "Capital Infrastructure" – it is not for buildings. Board members asked to see that as they did not agree.

Mr. Fuller asked Mr. Gulnick to find out if the paving loan was drawn from the \$211,000 surplus or was it to be drawn from the general fund reserves.

The Board agreed to hold on this budget until this fact is known.

9. FY22 Town Clerk Budget

Mr. Fuller asked how department budgets were formulated. Mr. Gulnick said he and FloAnn met twice and FloAnn met with Rosalie. The numbers were reviewed and "everything looks good for the Town Clerk's office". The budget document shows one column of figures proposed by the department and one proposed by the Town Manager. These columns are the same for the Town Clerk's budget. (They may differ in other departments.)

The budget proposes a 6% wage increase. Mr. Gulnick did a compensation study, a copy of which was provided to the Board. Based on appropriate comparisons, the average annual salary is \$41,273 – Weathersfield pays \$42,717. The average hourly rate is \$25.43 – Weathersfield is paying \$27.38. However, Mr. Gulnick said he could justify the requested pay increase. Years of service was not included in the data and he felt it should be. FloAnn currently works 30 hours a week, which would change the proposed hourly rate to \$30/hour, similar to the Treasurer.

Mr. Fuller said he would prefer that all employees receive the same pay increase. The Town has come a long way in the past 5-10 years in trying to upgrade compensations and he wants to remain even.

Mr. Arrison said if the salary is to be raised to \$45,494, then the position should be 40 hours a week.

Mr. Todd did not favor the proposed increase, nor did Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Arrison said he wanted to see more accurate presentation of salary vs hours worked. Some people on salary are working many more hours than they are paid for. Mr. Tillman said things to be

the same across the board.

Because the Clerk is elected, the Board cannot dictate the number of hours per week that the Clerk must work. The Board only controls the salary.

Mr. Gulnick was asked to re-do the budget using a 2% increase and 30 hours per week.

10. FY22 Listers Budget

Mr. Gulnick did a compensation study for the listers office.

The budget numbers before the Board apparently needed to be changed - \$8,000 for benefits needed to be removed and the listers are asking that the line item for town parcel mapping be shared between the listers, the general fund, and land use, which would reduce that line by \$4,000.

In the past, compensation for all three listers was under one line. They each work different hours and have different salaries. In this budget, the three positions were broken out separately.

The listers are proposing a \$12,000 in their budget for FY22.

Mr. Fuller said the Board had been told that the listers had decided that they wanted to change the distribution of their hours. He asked how will voters know which lister position they are voting for with this new change. (The proposed budget show Lister 1 at 10 hours/week; lister 2 at 32 hours/week and lister 3 at 4 hours/week.)

Mr. Tillman asked for confirmation that the listers were increasing the total hours. Mr. Gulnick said the listers had decided amongst themselves to change their hours. Mr. Tillman asked if they work in the Town Office; if there was a job description for each position; and do they all do the same thing. Mr. Gulnick said he could ask them.

Ms. Terrill said there are no job descriptions for elected positions.

Mr. Fuller suggested researching what the Town voted on for listers.

The compensation studies show that Weathersfield pays far more than most towns in the State, but Mr. Arrison said the towns with very low pay may be paying someone else to actually do the work. He said Cavendish voted out their listers a few years ago and now NEMRC does the work.

At 9:00 Mr. Fuller asked for a motion to extend the meeting.

Motion: To extend the meeting by 30 minutes. **Made by:** Mr. Todd **Second**: Mr. Tillman

Vote: All in favor

Mr. Todd felt the Town should have some authority over the distribution of hours.

Mr. Tillman said that if the listers want to increase their hours they need to come with a proposal to itemize and justify the request.

Mr. Arrison said he wanted to be on the record as opposed to putting anyone into a benefit position.

Currently lister 1 was reduced from 24 hours to 13; lister 2 has always been at 8 hours; lister 3 increased from 13 to 28 hours. (Listers 3 and 2 are reversed on the budget document.) Ms. Terrill said the hours for lister 2 have not actually been worked. She has worked 8 hours per year on average for the past 3 years.

The Board tabled this budget until corrected numbers can be provided. They also asked for information on NEMRC services.

11. FY22 Land Use Budget

The land use budget proposes an \$8,865 increase in tax revenue. Land Use Administrator compensation would increase by \$10,166 to move the position from 25 hours/week to 33.5 hours/week. The increase in hours was unanimously approved by the Planning Commission. No benefits are needed.

The legal budget is decreased by \$2000 because the LUA is licensed to practice law in Vermont.

The budget will increase by \$2000 if it shares the cost of Town parcel mapping.

Mr. Tillman said he wants to know what's not getting done that would justify the increase in hours.

The hourly rate would remain the same.

Mr. Todd said he has heard complaints that people cannot easily reach the LUA.

Mr. Fuller said he does not support the increase in hours to 32, but would be willing to compromise at 29 or 30 hours. He said he felt it was a waste of time for the LUA to sit in on Planning Commission meetings as the Commission is competent on its own.

Mr. Fuller understood that the Town had received a \$20,000 grant to digitize the zoning records. Apparently, there was a "mix up" on the grant and it could not be used for this work.

Mr. Arrison felt it unwise to lower the legal budget. Mr. Fuller agreed.

At 9:30 PM, Mr. Todd motioned to extend the meeting another 10 minutes. Mr. Tillman seconded the motion and all were in favor.

12. Move next meeting from January 18th, 2021 to January 19th, 2021

See discussion above.

13. Appointments

No appointments were requested and none were made.

14. Approve Warrants

Motion: To approve the warrants for 1/4/2021 as follow:

General Funds	Operating Expenses Payroll	\$10,941.69 \$14,236.11
Highway Fund	Operating Expenses Payroll	\$14,980.15 \$12,389.84
Solid Waste Mana	gement Fund Operating Expenses Payroll	\$2,085.67 \$1,606.46
Library	Operating Expenses Payroll	\$900.00 \$1,938.51
Grants	Operating Expenses	\$
Special Revenue	Operating Expenses	\$
Reserves		\$
Long Term Debt		\$
Grand Totals	Operating Expenses Payroll	\$28,907.51 \$30,170.92

Made by: Mr. Arrison Second: Mr. Todd

The Board questioned the \$1,675 cost of towing a plow truck that had slid off the road (check #223342, Twin Line Towing). They asked to see the invoice and agreed to hold the check until their questions had been answered.

Amendment to the motion: Remove check #223342

Vote: All in favor

15. Any Other Business

The Veterans Memorial Committee has a reserve fund that was set up for the purpose of creating a memorial. The memorial is now complete but now it has to be maintained. deForest asked if there could be an article on the next ballot to change the purpose of the reserve fund from creating the monument to maintaining it. It was agreed that the original article must first be located before deciding the proper course of action.

16. Adjourn Motion: To adjourn the r Made by: Mr. Tillman Vote: All in favor	0
The meeting adjourned at	t 9:41 PM.
Respectfully submitted, deForest Bearse	

WEATHERSFIELD SELECTBOARD

N. John Arrison, Selector	David Fuller, Chairperson
Joseph Jarvis, Clerk	Paul Tillman
Michael Todd, Vice- Chairperson	

From: <u>Carl Andeer</u>
To: <u>Brandon Gulnick</u>

Subject: RE: Changing the date of Town Meeting **Date:** Thursday, January 7, 2021 2:02:37 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

Hi Brandon,

Currently, unless the proposed house legislation passes (H.48:

https://legislature.vermont.gov/Documents/2022/Docs/BILLS/H-0048/H-

0048%20As%20Introduced.pdf) the only entity that can change the date of town meeting is the town voters via a town meeting – and the only options are to move the meeting to one of the three preceding days of the firs Tuesday in March (i.e. Monday, Sunday, or Saturday). Here is the law on that: https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/section/17/055/02640 (here's the relevant part: "When a town so votes, it may thereafter start its annual meeting on any of the three days immediately preceding the first Tuesday in March at such time as it elects and may transact at that time any business not involving voting by Australian ballot or voting required by law to be by ballot and to be held on the first Tuesday in March....").

The H.48 bill referenced above would allow the selectboard to vote by majority at a regular/special selectboard meeting to move the town meeting day to any other day of 2021. We'll certainly let members know if it passes.

As for school, I'm not sure. VLCT doesn't have school board districts as members and we aren't school law experts. I recommend reaching out to the Vermont School Boards Association (https://www.vtvsba.org/vsba-staff) or the Vermont Sec. of State Elections division (https://sos.vermont.gov/elections/ scroll down to bottom of page for contacts).



Carl Andeer

Staff Attorney II, Municipal Assistance Center Vermont League of Cities and Towns 802.229.9111

vlct.org

*I am currently working remotely. As such, I may not be able to answer all direct calls but note that I check my voicemail throughout the day and will respond. For the latest information VLCT has on COVID-19, please go to our website: https://www.vlct.org/coronavirus.

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only

for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email or telephone and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you

From: Brandon Gulnick < Townmanager@weathersfield.org>

Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2021 1:23 PM

To: VLCT <info@vlct.org>

Cc: dtfullerfarminc@hotmail.com

Subject: Changing the date of Town Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of VLCT's email system. Maintain caution when opening external links/attachments

Hello,

Who has the authority to change the date of Town meeting for both the Town and the School?

Sincerely,

Brandon Gulnick
Town Manager
Town of Weathersfield
P.O. BOX 550 | 5259 Route 5
Ascutney, VT 05030
(802) 230-6262
townmanager@weathersfield.org

TOWN OF WEATHERSFIELD, VERMONT FUND BALANCE AND RESERVE FUND BALANCE POLICY

PURPOSE. The Selectboard of the Town of Weathersfield believes that sound financial management requires that sufficient funds be maintained by the Town for unanticipated expenditures and revenue shortfalls as may be caused by economic downturns, natural disasters, and other unforeseen circumstances. Maintaining such funds will help sustain the stability of the Town tax rate and reduce the need for short-term borrowing.

FUND BALANCE

The Selectboard of the Town of Weathersfield understands that maintaining a fund balance in all funds is an important component in the Town's financial health. The Government Finance Officers Association recommends between 5% to 15% of a municipality's budget be maintained as fund balance, with smaller towns (population under 7000) maintaining 15% of their budget in unrestricted fund balance. The Selectboard understands the need to maintain a sufficient balance of unrestricted funds while not allowing unrestricted funds to accumulate to excessive levels. Because of this, the Selectboard recommends maintaining the Town's unrestricted funds (General Fund Balance, Highway Fund Balance, and Unspecified Reserve) between 13% and 15% of the total General and Highway Fund Budgets.

DOCUMENTING THE MAINTAINING OF FUND BALANCE. In an effort to maintain transparency of fund balance and to maintain compliance with 19 V.S.A. section 312, fund balance will be documented each year during the budgeting process. To maintain a fund balance in any Town fund, fund balance will be shown on both the revenue and expenditure side of the financial statements as a transfer of fund balance in (Revenue) and expenditure of fund balance out (back to fund balance).

UNDESIGNATED RESERVE FUND

Upon recommendation of the Selectboard on March 4, 2013, the voters of the Town authorized establishment of an Unspecified Reserve Fund, not to exceed 10% of the General Fund, in accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 2804(a). The Selectboard's objective is for adequate funds to be set aside in this Unspecified Reserve Fund in a planned and consistent manner, and that these monies not be spent for regular Town expenditures or used to reduce property taxes.

UNDESIGNATED RESERVE FUND EXPENDITURES. The Unspecified Reserve Fund was established by the voters for the purpose of covering unanticipated revenue shortfalls and paying non-recurring and unanticipated general and highway fund expenditures of the Town. To this end, the Selectboard will use the Unspecified Reserve Fund to alleviate unanticipated short-term budgetary issues. Any expenditure of the Unspecified Reserve Fund by the Selectboard for such purposes shall require approval of a majority of Selectboard members after due notice at a public meeting. In accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 2804(a), expenditure of the reserve fund for any other purpose shall require the authorization of a majority of the voters present at an annual or special town meeting.

TOWN OF WEATHERSFIELD, VERMONT FUND BALANCE AND RESERVE FUND BALANCE POLICY

UNDESIGNATED RESERVE FUND APPROPRIATIONS. Annually, the Selectboard may propose funding of the Unspecified Reserve Fund through:

A. reallocation of a General Fund surplus.

or

B. inclusion in General Fund Budget.

٥r

C. a proposed separate article to be voted by the voters by Australian ballot at a Regular or Special Town Meeting.

MINUMUM UNDESIGNATED RESERVE FUND BALANCE. The Selectboard will maintain the balance at a minimum of 5% of the General Fund and up to the maximum (10%) amount authorized by the voters. If an expenditure reduces the Unspecified Reserve Fund balance below 5% of the General Fund Budget, the Selectboard will, as part of its approval, adopt a plan to restore the funds to the minimum level.

SPECIFIED RESERVE FUNDS

The Selectboard of the Town of Weathersfield believes that sound financial management also requires that sufficient funds be maintained by the Town for specified expenditures. The purpose of these reserve funds is to offset the costs of unplanned expenses, anticipated capital expenditures and expenses for specific purposes (i.e. Center Grove Preservation Reserve Fund). Maintaining such funds will help sustain the stability of the Town tax rate and reduce the need for short-term borrowing. For this reason, adequate balances should be maintained in each reserve to help offset planned and unanticipated expenses.

Upon recommendation of the Selectboard, the voters of the Town authorized the establishment of many specified reserve funds, in accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 2804(a). The reserve funds specified for specific purposes were established by the voters with the purpose of saving money, over time, to fund specific expenditures. To this end, the Selectboard will use the Specified Reserve Funds for the purposes of purchasing and maintaining the Towns capital expenditures, or for the purposes in which they were created.

SPECIFIED RESERVE FUND EXPENDITURES. The Selectboard's objective is for adequate funds to be set aside in these reserve funds in a planned and consistent manner and that these monies not be spent for regular Town expenditures. Any expenditure of the specified reserve funds by the Selectboard for such purposes shall require approval of a majority of Selectboard members after due notice at a public meeting. In accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 2804(a), expenditure of a reserve fund for any other purpose shall require the authorization of a majority of the voters present at an annual or special town meeting.

TOWN OF WEATHERSFIELD, VERMONT FUND BALANCE AND RESERVE FUND BALANCE POLICY

SPECIFIED RESERVE APPROPRIATIONS. Annually, the Selectboard may propose funding of the specified reserve funds through:

A. re-allocation of a General Fund surplus

or

B. re-allocation of Highway surplus to Highway Reserve funds only

or

C. inclusion in General Fund

Of

D. inclusion of Highway Reserves in Highway Budgets

or

E. a proposed separate article to be voted by the voters by Australian ballot at a Regular or Special Town Meeting.

Proceeds from the sale of town assets should be placed in the specified reserve for the purchase of similar assets, at the Town Manager's discretion, with approval from the Selectboard, unless otherwise directed per an article at Town Meeting.

The foregoing Policy is hereby adopted by the Selectboard of the Town of Weathersfield, Vermont, this the 16th day of July, 2018 and is effective as of this date until amended or repealed.

Chairperson

Sur Aylor

•			
e ^t			

The Vermont Statutes Online

Title 19: Highways

Chapter 003: Town Highways

(Cite as: 19 V.S.A. § 312)

§ 312. Municipal property tax; highway expenditures; general use of funds; unexpended balances

The funds raised from town highway taxes shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the tax was voted, subject to the provisions of this chapter. If in any year money so voted is not expended, it shall be applied for the same purpose the following year. (Added 1985, No. 269 (Adj. Sess.), § 1.)

Brandon Gulnick

From: Brandon Gulnick

Sent: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 9:43 AM

To: david fuller

Subject: FW: Undesignated Reserve Fund

Attachments: Model Reserve Fund Balance Policy.docx

From: Carl Andeer <candeer@vlct.org> Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 9:30 AM

To: Ed Morris < Townmanager@weathersfield.org >

Subject: RE: Undesignated Reserve Fund

Hi Ed,

State law allows the town voters to establish and fund reserve funds. 24 VSA Section 2804: https://legislature.vermont.gov/statutes/section/24/077/02804. The purpose of the reserve fund is decided by the article/vote at town meeting and is not limited by the statute to any specific purpose. The exact boundaries of what is an acceptable purpose for a reserve fund have never been established in case law either.

On the extreme end, I don't think a town could vote to create a reserve fund that could be used by the selectboard for any reason at any time. That example seems contrary to the purpose of the reserve fund and seems to allow the selectboard to carry a fund forward year to year with no limitations – essentially, this poor example would be no different than an additional budget.

I think the voters can create a reserve fund that has a narrow focus (e.g., "for a firetruck") or broader purpose (e.g., "for unexpected emergency highway work and maintenance"), but couldn't vote to create a reserve fund that had no limitations on use.

I think an emergency reserve fund is bound to some degree (i.e., "emergency" use only), so I don't think it is illegal. The other thing to remember is that the *voters* created this fund at town meeting, not just the selectboard. I think that fact adds weight to its legitimacy.

One thing that we recommend is when towns create a reserve fund is to have a reserve fund policy that more fully describes the purpose and uses of the fund. I've attached one sample reserve fund policy. It should be edited/tailored for each of the town's specific reserve funds.

Regards,



Carl Andeer

Staff Attorney II, Municipal Assistance Center Vermont League of Cities and Towns 89 Main Street, Suite 4 Montpelier VT, 05602

www.vlct.org

Voice: 802-229-9111 Fax: 802-229-2211

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email or telephone and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

From: Ed Morris <Townmanager@weathersfield.org>

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 8:28 AM

To: Info <info@vlct.org>

Subject: Undesignated Reserve Fund

After Tropical Storm Irene, the voters of Weathersfield approved an undesignated reserve fund "rainy day" for unexpected costs and emergency funds not to exceed 10% of the General Fund. This year our auditors questioned the legality of a fund like this nod designated for a specific purpose. Can you let me know if a reserve fund of this type is allowable by statute?

Ed Morris Weathersfield Town Manager PO BOX 550 Route 5 Ascutney VT 05030 (802)230-6262 From: Garrett Baxter
To: Brandon Gulnick

Subject: RE: Highway Department Fund Balance

Date: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 11:03:40 AM

Good morning Brandon,

There was no budget proposal attached in your e-mail, but I don't think they're necessary to answer your questions. It is not illegal to move a highway budget surplus to another line item so long as it is related to highway expenditures. I also just make sure that such practice is in keeping with the board's Fund Balance and Reserve Fund Policy as adopted. As for whether this is common practice around the State, we haven't catalogued data on that point but anecdotally I would say that it's not uncommon.

I hope that helps. Stay safe and take care.

Sincerely,

Garrett H. Baxter

Garrett A. Baxter, Esq.
Senior Staff Attorney, Municipal Assistance Center
Vermont League of Cities and Towns
1-800-649-7915

For the latest information VLCT has on COVID-19, please go to our website: https://www.vlct.org/coronavirus.

Due to COVID-19, the VLCT Municipal Assistance Center (MAC) is experiencing a high volume of questions and therefore it may take longer than usual for MAC to respond. Please also understand that if your question is unrelated to COVID-19 or is not an urgent matter, our response time will be extended. If you have an urgent matter and you haven't received a response from MAC, please contact your municipal attorney.

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email or telephone and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

From: Brandon Gulnick < Townmanager@weathersfield.org>

Sent: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 9:33 AM

To: VLCT <info@vlct.org>

Subject: Highway Department Fund Balance

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of VLCT's email system. Maintain caution when opening external links/attachments

Good afternoon,

The Town of Weathersfield established a "Fund Balance and Reserve Fund Policy" on July 16, 2018. Since that time, any Highway Surplus has been carried forward in the budget to accumulate 13-15% of the total expenditures in the Highway Department. The Fund Balance is entered as revenue and expense in the Highway Department Budget Document. (See attached – FY22 Highway Department Budget Proposal – Third Pass). Under revenue, see "Audited-Fund Balance carry forward – rev \$159,281 and under expenses, see "Audited-Fund Balance carry forward-expense." There is disagreement regarding the Fund Balance at the Select Board level, referencing VSA Title 19 312 "the funds raised from town highway taxes shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the tax was voted, subject to the provisions of this chapter. If in any year money so voted is not expended, it shall be applied for the same purpose the following year."

I have a couple of questions regarding Weathersfield's situation:

- 1. Is it illegal to move the highway surplus to the Highway Fund Balance line as shown in the attached budget document?
- 2. Is this a common practice across other Cities and Towns in the State of Vermont?
- 3. Is there any other best practice that you recommend Weathersfield doing instead of this?

Thanks in advance.

Brandon Gulnick
Town Manager
Town of Weathersfield
P.O. BOX 550 | 5259 Route 5
Ascutney, VT 05030
(802) 230-6262
townmanager@weathersfield.org

From: <u>david fuller</u>

To: Brandon Gulnick; Steve Hier; John Arrison; wattsup@tds.net; Paul Tillman; Joseph Jarvis; Michael Todd; mike todd;

Rosalie McNamara

Subject: Fw: Accounting Dept and Garrett Baxter Staff Atty.

Date: Thursday, January 7, 2021 1:51:11 PM

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

FYI---For Jan 12 2021 meeting

From: Susan Senning <ssenning@vlct.org> **Sent:** Thursday, January 7, 2021 11:31 AM **To:** david fuller <dtfullerfarminc@hotmail.com>

Subject: RE: Accounting Dept and Garrett Baxter Staff Atty.

Hi David,

The relevant law, as you note, is 19 V.S.A. Section 312:

§ 312. Municipal property tax; highway expenditures; general use of funds; unexpended balances

The funds raised from town highway taxes shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the tax was voted, subject to the provisions of this chapter. If in any year money so voted is not expended, it shall be applied for the same purpose the following year.

The law requires that highway funds be used for highway expenditures/purposes. In this way, they are restricted funds. The budget can show this surplus 1) going to another highway-related purpose as a line-item, or 2) being used to fund a new or an existing reserve fund (for highway expenses), to name a few commonly used options.

I hope this helps.

Sincerely, Susan

Note: Due to COVID-19, the VLCT Municipal Assistance Center (MAC) is experiencing a high number of legal questions so it may take longer than usual for MAC to respond. Please also understand that if your question is unrelated to COVID-19 or is not an urgent matter, our response time will be extended. If you have an urgent matter and you haven't received a response from MAC, please contact your municipal attorney.

In light of concerns about COVID-19 I am currently working remotely. Addressing member concerns and questions remains a high priority for all VLCT staff. We appreciate your patience as we adapt to virtual communications. Visit https://www.vlct.org/coronavirus for recommendations and resources from VLCT and links to the CDC and VT Dept. Health.



Susan E. Senning, Esq. Staff Attorney I, Municipal Assistance Center

89 Main Street, Suite 4 Montpelier, VT 05602-2948 1-800-649-7915 www.vlct.org

This transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) to whom it is addressed above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email or telephone and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

From: david fuller <dtfullerfarminc@hotmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 6, 2021 4:51 PM

To: VLCT <info@vlct.org>

Subject: Accounting Dept and Garrett Baxter Staff Atty.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of VLCT's email system. Maintain caution when opening external links/attachments

Sent from Mail for Windows 10 Hello,

My name is David T Fuller and I am Chairman of the Selectboard in Weathersfield.

My question is the same for someone at VLCT in Accounting and for Mr. Baxter Staff Counsel. Highway Fund Budgets are voted on separately at Town Meeting by Australian ballot. There are significant surplus monies audited from FY 21. Some 15%. What is done with these to comply with VSA Title 19 #312?

Thanks.

TOWN OF WEATHERSFIELD



PROPOSED BUDGET FISCAL YEAR JULY 1, 2021 TO JUNE 30, 2022

Draft #3 | 01.11.2021

Weathersfield Select Board

David Fuller, Chair Michael Todd, Vice Chair Joseph Jarvis, Clerk Paul Tillman, Member John Arrison, Member

Town Manager's Office

Brandon Gulnick Susanne Terrill Olivia Savage

Finance

Rosalie McNamara Steve Hier

Table of Contents

Pages 2 – 5	FY22 Highway Department Budget Proposal	
Pages 6 - 8	FY22 Town Clerk Budget Proposal	
Pages 9 - 11 FY22 Listers Budget Proposal		
Pages 12 - 14	FY22 Land Use Budget Proposal	
Pages 15 - 17	FY22 Police Department Budget Proposal	
Pages 18 - 21	FY22 Weathersfield Library Budget Proposal	
Pages 22 - 24	FY22 Finance Budget Proposal	
Pages 25 - 27	FY22 Admin Budget Proposal	
Pages 28 - 30	FY22 WWV Fire Department Budget Proposal	
Pages 31 - 33	FY22 AV Fire Department Budget Proposal	
Pages 34 - 36 FY22 Solid Waste Budget Proposal		
Pages 37 - 38	FY22 Tax Rate Overview	

Attachments

Attachment A	FY22 Highway Department Budget
Attachment B	FY22 Town Clerk Budget
Attachment C	FY22 Listers Budget
Attachment D	FY22 Land Use Budget
Attachment E	FY22 Police Department Budget
Attachment F	FY22 Library Budget
Attachment G	FY22 Finance Budget
Attachment H	FY22 Admin Budget
Attachment I	FY22 WWV Fire Department Budget
Attachment J	FY22 AV Fire Department Budget
Attachment K	FY22 Solid Waste Budget

Highway Department Executive Summary

Due to the State of Emergency the Highway Department is proposing the same tax revenue as FY21. As you will see on Page 3 of this proposal the Highway Department anticipates a \$1,487 increase in State Aid to Highway and a \$23 increase in Permit Revenue. Highway Service to AFD#2 Revenue decreased by \$2,100 because the Highway Department will no longer contract its employees to conduct Water Operator duties and responsibilities to the Ascutney Water District. The cumulative Fund Balance as of June 30, 2020 for this Department is \$211,257. Please note: After we subtract the \$39,000 for the Grader Warranty and Maintenance Plan and the \$12,476 for the Salt Shed Roof Project the Cumulative Highway Department Surplus is \$159,281.

There are some fluctuations in expenses which allowed us to absorb our debt service from purchasing the Motor Grader and Dump Truck. Personnel expenses decreased by \$24,303, Office expenses decreased \$185, Utilities decreased by \$158, Highway Garage & Truck Expenses decreased by \$10,000, and Road Materials & Repairs decreased by \$2,500. Our debt service increased by \$38,049, which includes a \$17,575 payment for the 2021 Dump Truck and a \$16,429 payment for the 2021 Motor Grader. The interest has also been accounted for in this budget. There were no variances in Fees & Permits nor in reserves. This budget includes no decreases/additions in the number of workers.

See Attachment A
[FY22 Highway Department Budget]

See Pages 3 – 5
[Revenues & Expenses / Variance – Highway Department]

Highway Department Revenues Overview

Revenues FY18 - FY22

Local Tax Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	857,736 /		
FY19	922,053 /		64,317
FY20	947,632 /		25,579
FY21	/ 946,770		(862)
FY22		946,770	0

State Aid to Highway

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	142,805 /		
FY19	142,802 /		(3)
FY20	146,340 /		3,538
FY21	/ 142,000		(4,340)
FY22		143,487	1,487

Permit Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual	Projected	Variance
FY18	285 /		
FY19	280 /		(5)
FY20	340 /		140
FY21	/ 281		(59)
FY22		304	23

Service to Other Departments

Fiscal Year	Actual	Projected	Variance
FY18	41,371 /		
FY19	27,987 /		(13,384)
FY20	36,120 /		8,133
FY21	/ 34,750		(1,370)
FY22		34,550	(200)

Fund Balance

	Fiscal Year	Actual	Projected	Variance
_	FY19	97,845 /		
_	FY20	117,756 /		19,911
_	FY21	159,281		41,425
_	FY22		TBA	

Total Revenue: \$1,317,392

Includes 33K Proposed Reserve + Fund Balance

Highway Department Expenditures Overview

Expenses FY18 – FY22

Personnel

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	551,205 /		
FY19	567,680 /		16,475
FY20	563,213 /		(4,467)
FY21	/ 594,998		31,785
FY22		575,404	(19,594)

Office

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	34,035 /		
FY19	29,969 /		(4,066)
FY20	30,354 /		385
FY21	/ 30,406		
FY22		30,221	(185)

Utilities

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	5,800 /		
FY19	6,778 /		978
FY20	5,117 /		(1,661)
FY21	/ 6,435		1,318
FY22		6,277	(158)

Highway Garage & Truck Expenses

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	150,797 /		
FY19	133,464 /		(17,333)
FY20	151,399 /		17,935
FY21	/ 160,500		9,101
FY22		148,000	(12,500)

Road Material & Repairs

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	201,518 /		
FY19	251,450 /		49,932
FY20	407,769 /		156,769
FY21	/ 253,000		(154,769)
FY22		248,699	(4,301)

Fees & Permits

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	18 /		
FY19	1,990 /		1,972
FY20	1,590 /		(400)
FY21	/ 1,350		(240)
FY22		1,350	0

Debt Service

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	260,666 /		
FY19	100,217 /		(160,449)
FY20	68,717 /		(31,500)
FY21	/ 77,112		8,395
FY22		115,161	38,049

Fund Balance

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Total Accumulated	Variance
FY19	97,845 /		
FY20	117,756 /		19,911
FY21		159,281	41,425
FY22		TBA	

Reserves

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY19	57,308 /		
FY20	1,045 /		(56,263)
FY21	33,000		31,955
FY22		33,000	0

Total Expenses: \$1,317,392 Includes 33K Proposed Reserve & Fund Balance

Town Clerk Executive Summary

Due to the State of Emergency the Town Clerk's Office is proposing a \$185 decrease in tax revenue for FY22. As demonstrated on Page 7 of this proposal, the Town Clerks Office anticipates a \$2,970 increase in Operating Revenue. There is no variance in revenues for Computerization, Vault Fee, nor Other.

Personnel expenses have decreased by \$1,188. Office expenses increased by \$3,973 because NEMRC & IT Services were added to the Town Clerks budget. Historically, the Admin budget accounted for NEMRC & IT Services in total. Moving forward, the cost of these services will be spread out across the offices that use these services.

See Attachment B
[FY22 Town Clerk Budget]

See Attachment C
[Wage & Compensation Study]

See Pages 7 – 8
[Revenues & Expenses / Variance – Town Clerks Office]

Town Clerk Revenues Overview

Revenues FY18 - FY22

Tax Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	73,508 /		
FY19	78,337 /		4,829
FY20	66,320 /		(12,017)
FY21	/ 74,154		7,834
FY22		73,969	(185)

Operating Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	19,088 /		
FY19	16,859 /		(2,229)
FY20	25,360 /		8,501
FY21	/ 20,690		(4,670)
FY22		23,660	2,970

Computerization Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	21,818 /		
FY19	5,648 /		(16,170)
FY20	11,138 /		5,490
FY21	/ 8,600		(2,538)
FY22		8,600	0

Vault Fee Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	4,513 /		
FY19	4,082 /		(431)
FY20	4,173 /		91
 FY21	/ 6,000		(1,827)
FY22		6,000	0

Other Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual	Projected	Variance
FY18	0 /		
FY19	26 /		26
FY20	7 /		(19)
FY21	/-		-
FY22		-	-

Total Revenue: \$112,229 Total Variance: \$2,785

Town Clerk Expenditures Overview

Expenses FY18 – FY22

Personnel

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	86,005 /		
FY19	78,848 /		(7,157)
FY20	82,543 /		3,695
FY21	/ 85,009		2,466
FY22		83,821	(1,188)

Office

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	6,591 /		
FY19	6,793 /		(202)
FY20	4,784 /		(2,009)
FY21	/ 10,145		5,356
FY22		14.118	3.973

Computerization

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	17,980 /		
FY19	9,548 /		(8,432)
FY20	15,291 /		5,743
FY21	/ 7,640		(7,651)
FY22		7,640	0

Vault Expenses

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	8,351 /		
FY19	9,263 /		912
FY20	4,181 /		(5,082)
FY21	/ 6,000		1,819
FY22		6,000	0

Transfer to Rabies

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
 FY18	-/		
 FY19	500 /		500
 FY20	200 /		(300)
 FY21	/ 650		450
 FY22		650	0

Total Expenses: \$111,970 Total Variance: \$2,785

Listers Office Executive Summary

The Listers Office is proposing a \$16,199 increase in Tax Revenue to operate the Listers Office in FY22.

Personnel expenses for this department have increased by \$1,615. Due to the Listers Office reorganizing, Lister 1 is proposing to work 11.5 hours per week, Lister 2 is proposing to work 4 hours per week, and Lister 3 is proposing to work 29.5 hours per week.

Office expenses have also increased for this department. Similar to the Town Clerk's Office, NEMRC & IT Services were distributed across the departments that use these services. As noted above, the full expense of these services was historically expensed to the Admin budget. Other expenses contributing to the increase in expenses within this department includes \$6,000 for Town Parcel Mapping. According to the Listers Office, \$3000 was removed from the Town Parcel mapping for FY21, which causes us to need to make a double payment in FY22. Workers Compensation nor Unemployment was budgeted for the Listers since FY18. Moving forward these will be budgeted.

See Attachment D
[FY22 Listers Budget]

See Attachment E
[Listers Wage & Compensation Study]

See Page 10-11
[Revenues & Expenses / Variance – Listers Office]

Listers Office Revenues Overview

Revenues FY18 – FY22

Tax Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	42,386 /		
FY19	42,333 /		(53)
FY20	29,902 /		(17,947)
FY21	/ 42,235		12,333
FY22		57,120	14,885

Act 60 – Listers Revenue & Penalty for Late Homestead

 Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	14,226 /		
FY19	17,704 /		3,478
FY20	15,742 /		(1,962)
 FY21	/ 18,861		3,119
 FY22		19,000	139

Total Revenues: \$76,120 Total Variance: \$15,024

Listers Office Expenses Overview

Expenses FY18 - FY22

Personnel

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	38,692 /		
FY19	36,493 /		(2,199)
FY20	37,945 /		1,452
FY21	/ 43,455		5,510
FY22		45,069	1,615

Office Expenses

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	17,745 /		
FY19	21,534 /		3,789
FY20	7,699 /		(13,835)
FY21	/ 17,641		9,942
FY22		31,050	13,409

Total Expenses: \$76,120 Total Variance: \$15,024

Land Use Office Executive Summary

The Land Use Office is proposing an \$4,967 increase in Tax Revenue and anticipates a \$156 increase in Zoning Permits Income. As demonstrated on pages 13-14, personnel expenses for this department increased by \$6,923 to move the Land Use Administrator from 25 hours per week to 30 hours per week. This increase in hours was voted unanimous in favor by the Weathersfield Planning Commission. Due to the Land Use Administrators previous role in the United States Military, no benefits need to be budgeted for this increase in hours. Similar to the Town Clerk, Listers, and the Police Department, IT Services were distributed across the departments that use these services. In this case, IT Services was budgeted for 1,448 annually. Other variances include a \$100 increase in office expenses and a \$100 increase in Commission & Dues. This office decreased legal expenses by \$2,000 due to the current Land Use Administrators legal education and license to practice law in the State of Vermont.

See Attachment F
[FY22 Land Use Budget]

See Attachment E
[Land Use Wage & Compensation Study]

See Pages 13-14
[Revenues & Expenses / Variance – Land Use Office]

Land Use Office Revenues Overview

Revenues FY19 - FY22

Tax Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY19	52,656 /		
FY20	37,146 /		(15,510)
FY21	/ 49,174		12,028
FY22		55.589	6.415

Permits, Fines, and Penalties

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY19	5,586 /		
FY20	4,291 /		1,295
FY21	/ 5,594		1,303
FY22		5,750	156

Total Revenue: \$59,891 Total Variance: \$4,967

Land Use Office Expenses Overview

Expenses FY19 - FY22

Personnel

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY19	48,252 /		
FY20	31,408 /		(16,844)
FY21	/ 41,587		10,179
FY22		48,510	6,923

Office

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY19	691 /		
FY20	965 /		274
FY21	/ 2,550		1,585
FY22		4,098	1,548

Commission & Dues

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY19	3,917 /		_
FY20	3,646 /		(271)
FY21	/ 4,131		485
FY22		4,231	1,548

Legal

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY19	5,382 /		
FY20	5,419 /		37
FY21	/ 6,500		1,081
FY22		4,500	(2,000)

Total Expenses: \$61,339 Total Variance: \$6,571

Police Department Executive Summary

Due to the State of Emergency the Police Department is proposing a \$7,344 decrease in Tax Revenue for FY22. The Police Department anticipates a \$1,849 increase in police fines and a 270 decrease in Corps of Engineers revenue. There is a 38 decrease in personnel expenses due to an existing FT officer retiring and a plan to hire a new FT officer. Office expenses increased by \$8,342 because State Police Dispatching is now charging municipalities for their services. Insurance expenses decreased by \$270 and debt service decreased by \$32,525.

See Attachment G
[FY22 Police Department Budget]

See Pages 16-17
[Revenues & Expenses / Variance – Police Department]

Police Department Revenues Overview

Revenues FY18 - FY22

Tax Revenue

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	242,757 /		
FY19	240,384 /		(2,373)
FY20	299,352 /		58,968
FY21	/ 304,427		5,075
FY22		304,942	(2,382)

Police Fines

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	6,247 /		
FY19	5,151 /		(1,096)
FY20	4,486 /		(665)
FY21	/ 5,151		665
FY22		7,000	1,849

Corps of Engineers

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Projected	Variance
FY18	9,248 /		
FY19	11,003 /		1,756
FY20	6,615 /		(4,388)
FY21	/ 9,270		2,655
FY22		9,000	(270)

Total Revenue: \$320,942 Total Variance: (\$17,656)

(Variance Includes \$19,750 transfer in from Cruiser Reserve)

Police Department Expenses Overview

Expenses FY18 – FY22

Personnel

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	204,115 /		
FY19	216,706 /		12,591
FY20	249,677 /		32,971
FY21	/ 269,866		20,189
FY22		274,790	4,924

Office Expenses

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	18,658 /		
FY19	15,153 /		(3,505)
FY20	21,897 /		6,744
FY21	/ 18,286		(3,611)
FY22		29,524	11,238

Insurance & Cruiser Expenses

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	19,796 /		
FY19	15,982 /		1,756
FY20	19,093 /		(4,388)
FY21	/ 17,821		2,655
FY22		16,527	(1,294)

Debt Service

Fiscal Year	Actual / Approved	Proposed	Variance
FY18	17,536 /		
FY19	12,246 /		(5,290)
FY20	21,215 /		8,969
FY21	/ 32,625		11,410
FY22		100	(32,525)

Total Expenses: \$320,941 Total Variance: (\$17,656)