

**Enfield Board of Selectmen  
Enfield Budget Committee**

**Public Works Facility  
74 Lockehaven Road  
Enfield, New Hampshire**

**MINUTES of February 8, 2012**

**Board of Selectmen:** Fred Cummings, Chairman (Absent/Excused); Donald J. Crate, Sr.; John W. Kluge

**Budget Committee:** Doug Pettibone, Chairman; Shirley Green, Paul Mirski, Annabelle Bamforth, Sam Eaton, Lori Saladino, Gail Malz, Gayle Hulva, Janet Shepard

**Administrative Staff:** Steven Schneider, Town Manager; Alisa D. Bonnette, Executive Assistant

**Others:** Bob Cusick, Lee Carrier, Dan Kiley, Rob Malz, Marjorie Carr, Francine Lozeau, David Saladino, Pat Carrier, George & April Farewell, Steve Stancek, Jim Taylor, Lori Bliss Hill

**PUBLIC HEARING ON A BOND OR NOTE OVER \$100,000**

Mr. Crate moved to open the public hearing at 6:30 PM for a bond or note over \$100,000 for the proposed Route 4 sewer and water extension, Mr. Kluge seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Mr. Schneider did a presentation for the proposed Route 4 sewer and water extension. The Selectmen will go to Town Meeting for this \$3.2 million project that would extend the sewer from the easterly end of Baltic Street to the Canaan town line. The length of the line is about 1 mile. The water extension would run from Lovejoy Brook Road easterly along Route 4 to the Canaan town line. The multi-year borrowing for this project requires Town Meeting approval.

Mr. Schneider explained the purpose of the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District is to support public infrastructure improvements. The sewer and water extension was the first project on a list of seven project adopted in 2005. The TIF District map was amended in 2009 with the removal of the Laramie Farms/Ironman Development parcel.

The TIF Committee worked with engineers to work out the details of the project. The project went to bid in January 2012. Eight bids were received. A bid was received from Edmunds that

meets our financing capacity, including an added contingency amount bringing the total to \$3.2 million for the project.

In October 2011, a meeting was held with property owners to get feedback. The TIF Committee incorporated their concerns into the final product. The TIF Committee also met with business owners in January. The project could start soon after Town Meeting with construction taking place from April/May – October/November.

The bond/note is to be paid for using TIF funds. In 2011, the TIF District generated \$178,593. The funds going into the TIF fund have been trending upward since the adoption of the District.

The Town has a firm project number of \$3.2 million as well as a firm proposal from a bank that fits within the \$178,000 funding capacity. Funding over a 30 year term is anticipated.

Some changes needed to be made to the Sewer Ordinance. The Ordinance requires a connection if a building is within 300' of the sewer line. \$1,500 connection fees are required for each sewer or water connection. The Board of Selectmen has agreed to waive the connection fees for this extension project if the connection is made within 120 days of the extension installation. The extension will also go by existing, functioning systems. If folks have these, the Board won't require them to hook on as the line goes by. The Board will waive the requirement to connect as long as the system is a working system.

Planning has been done to help the Town get ready for potential development. A build-out study was completed and a design charrette was done. The Town can adjust land use regulations and incorporate designs and concepts from the design charrette. A slide was presented illustrating a concept that adds a few more service streets, etc. The participants in the design charrette do not want Route 4 to look like Route 12A in West Lebanon.

April Farewell said some towns make the buildings pay for it.

Mr. Schneider informed her they will, through the TIF District. Mr. Schneider proceeded to explain how the TIF District works.

Mr. Schneider was asked if financing is based on existing development or future development. Mr. Schneider replied that a sewer connection increases property value by about 10%. As values and TIF revenues increase the Town can accelerate payments on the loan. Growth and development is anticipated in response to the construction of a sewer and water extension. A 30-year amortization schedule can be provided at Town Meeting.

Gail Malz noted the desire to limit the percentage of the Town's budget as debt service. Would this project restrict borrowing for future projects?

Mr. Schneider acknowledged there is a limit to debt service and this could limit future debt capacity, but we don't have a project planned that would be impacted by this.

Mrs. Malz asked about the effect this could have on the new Library. She was informed that this would not impact the debt cap. The Town has already committed Town funds. The remainder of the project will be paid through private funding.

Mr. Kluge moved to close the hearing at 6:45 PM, Mr. Crate seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

### **PUBLIC BUDGET HEARING**

Mr. Eaton moved to open the public hearing at 6:45 PM for the public hearing for the proposed 2012 Budget, Mrs. Saladino seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Lee Carrier, Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee Chairman, made a presentation on the CIP, proposed capital leases and financing of capital projects.

---

#### **Our Capital Purchasing Challenge**

Next 15 Years we will need \$6,700,000  
DPW Equipment forecasted to need \$3,670,000  
and  
we have \$8.00 in DPW Reserves Summary

---

#### **Introduction to Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)**

- Town passed CIP warrant article at Town Meeting in 2007 under RSA 674: 5-8.
- Why?
  1. To focus on Capital Spending
  2. Recognized that Town needed a long term strategy
  3. To eliminate large swings in Tax rates
  4. To adequately reserve for our capital needs
  5. Develop financing strategies

CIP Committee composed of a Selectman, BC Chair, Town Manager, business and financial professionals.\

---

#### **CIP Committee's Strategy**

- To determine needs, costs and timing of capital projects from 2012 to 2026.
  - Apply life cycles of equipment to determine purchase dates and spend needs.
  - Develop a strategic 15 year purchasing plan.
  - Identify outside funding sources
  - Develop a funding strategy to cover the short term capital needs and make it affordable
  - To devise a smooth financial plan through timing purchases, and methods of financing.
-

**Long Term Challenge  
2012 to 2026**

- Raise \$7,020,000
- Appropriate \$6,700,000
- Eliminate Tax spikes
- Build Reserves
- Make it affordable

**Capital Expenses with Interest  
2012 to 2026  
\$6,700,000**

DPW 54%	\$3,670,000
Fire Dept. 22%	\$1,471,000
Jones Hill Road 12%	\$780,000
Police 8%	\$506,000
Salt Shed/Ambulance 4%	\$273,000

**Financing Capital Expenditures  
2012 to 2026  
15 Years**

- Transfer To Capital Reserve every year \$210,168 of the non-recurring 2011 Capital Expenditures. This has a No Tax Increase impact.
- Apply existing Reserve Fund Monies where applicable.
- Increase Tax Rate 5 cents every year and appropriate this money to a Capital Reserve Fund that will be called the “CIP Capital Reserve Fund”
- Implementing above will finance the \$6.7 Million Capital Needs at an Incremental Yearly Tax Impact of Less Than .8% or 5 cents.

**CIP Financing  
Options Available**

- Municipal Taxes
- Undesignated Funds
- Float a Bond
- Bank Loan
- Capital Reserves
- Commercial Leases

**FY 2012 Budget  
CIP Recommendations**

- Establish a Warrant Article to fund a CIP Capital Reserve Fund
- Place in CIP Capital Reserves \$210,168
- Increase Tax Rate by a Nickel \$27,000
- Acquire Equipment & Service:
  - Two Intl. Trucks..... \$300,000
  - Fire Transport Truck (Used)..... \$20,000
  - Jones Hill Road Engineering ..... \$30,000
  - Police Cars..... \$58,000
- Total..... \$408,000

---

**Capital Requirements Short Term Challenge**

2012:

Capital \$408,000

No CIP Plan Tax Increase = \$.818 / 14%

With CIP Plan = \$.05 / .8%

2013:

Capital \$1,145,000

No CIP Plan Tax Increase = \$2.29 / 38%

With CIP Plan = \$.05 / .8%

2014:

Capital \$220,000

No CIP Plan Tax Increase = \$.44 / 7%

With CIP Plan = \$.05 / .7%

TOTAL:

Capital \$1,773,000

No CIP Plan Tax Increase = \$3.548 / 59%

With CIP Plan = \$.15 / 2.3%

---

**Financing Capital Purchases  
2012 to 2026  
6,700,000**

Commercial Lease 62%	\$4,100,000
Future Capital Reserves 21%	\$1,440,000
Bank Note/Bond 11%	\$760,000
Existing Capital Reserves 6%	\$400,000

**Major Advantages of The  
CIP Recommendations**

- Makes it possible to purchase needed Equipment in 2012 and beyond without having a major negative impact on our Tax Rate
- Creates a Plan and sets the foundation that provides the required funding of necessary Equipment and Infrastructure for the next 15 years.
- Going forward we will have a smooth Tax Rate related to the acquisition of Equipment and Infrastructure.
- Eliminating major Tax Rate spikes from year to year
- This Plan limits Tax Rate increases for Equipment and Infrastructure to \$.05 per year.

**Capital Improvement Plan  
2012 to 2026**

This slide illustrated the spikes in capital expenses as compared to steady funding (revenue stream) over the 15 year CIP time frame.

**Town Funding Capital Expenditures  
2012 to 2026  
\$7,020,000**

Tax Increase 5 cents/year 49%	\$3,469,000
Expired DPW Note 26%	\$1,830,000
Apply 2011 Capital Expenditures 19%	\$1,321,000
Existing Capital Reserves 6%	\$400,000

**This Year is an ideal time to put  
this Plan in place**

- We have the expiration of the DPW Bank Note.
- We can take advantage of the very low cost of Leasing.
- We have major commitments on the horizon and this Plan gets us ahead of the curve.
- It provides for years of stability.

### 15 Year CIP Program

- Adds 5 cents a year to tax rate
- Yearly Tax Impact:

House Value: \$150,000 / Tax Increase \$7.50

House Value: \$250,000 / Tax Increase \$12.50

House Value: \$400,000 / Tax Increase \$20.00

There will be annual reviews with the opportunity to make adjustments

---

Following Mr. Carrier's presentation, April Farewell pointed out that the CIP includes work on Jones Hill Road. She asked, "What about Shaker Hill?"

It was explained by Mr. Schneider that Shaker Hill Road is a State road. The Town has had conversations with the State. The State would take over the road if the Town paid for 1/3 the cost of repairs of approximately four miles of road at a cost of about \$1 million/mile. That's a major commitment.

Mr. Kluge added that the Selectmen don't want Shaker Hill as the cost would be too great. They are trying to get the State to do the work.

George Farewell inquired about the size of the proposed DPW trucks as the cost of \$150,000 for each truck seems high. He was informed that the trucks would be about 25,000 GVW and the cost includes the entire package, including wing, plow and salt/sand spreader for each truck. The trucks we have now can't do the work we ask of them.

Mr. Schneider pointed out the cost of repair and down-time. We need reliable, dependable equipment. The size of truck requested was changed to handle the work we need to do.

Mr. Carrier added that the F-550's are lasting only 6-7 years.

A brief discussion followed regarding truck durability, costs of maintenance, and longer life.

Bob Cusick said the CIP Committee looked in detail at the existing stock. The truck cost isn't that much different. The cost of steel is higher. The new trucks will withstand use better than the 550's. The Committee was looking at dependability. Replacing with bigger trucks will save money over the long term. The Committee looked closely at the best utilization of vehicles and saving money over the long term. The Committee looked at every single piece of equipment, both physically and maintenance records. They tried to keep costs down.

Lee Carrier noted that the trucks will be replacing trucks lasting 8 years with trucks that should last 12 years.

Mr. Farewell then said he doesn't see why cruisers need V8 engines; they don't need to go that fast.

Rob Malz asked how the nickel tax increase gives us 49% of funding. He then asked, "Why not ask for a dime or a quarter and have a surplus?"

He was informed by Mr. Carrier that the nickel is compounding and Mr. Pettibone said the CIP Committee and Budget Committee are trying to respect the needs of the taxpayers. Mr. Cusick added they are trying to eliminate spikes in the tax rate. They CIP Committee looked at financing carefully.

The first year of the CIP a nickel would raise \$27,000, the next year, with compounding, would raise \$54,000, etc. My the tenth year it will be 50 cents on the tax rate as it's being bumped up 5 cents each year.

While there could still be spikes if something well out of the ordinary happens, the Town cannot predict the future, the program will be reviewed every year, thus creating a new 15-year forecast. This first year is when all the "heavy lifting" was done so the Town can build on the plan each year by making necessary adjustments.

Gail Malz pointed out that it's a philosophy that's being adopted.

Mr. Mirski voiced his enthusiasm about the program. He addressed the proposed 5 cents vs. 10 cents. Given the stress of potential economic downtimes he's more comfortable with a nickel.

Mr. Pettibone said the Budget Committee has a long history of keeping the tax rate as low as possible.

Steve Stancek said we're only talking about the General Fund – don't forget the school funding. He thinks this is a good, conservative approach.

Mr. Pettibone made a presentation of the proposed 2012 budget.

---

**Enfield Budget Committee  
2012 Budget Proposal  
Public Hearing, February 8, 2012**

**"To assist voters in the prudent appropriation of public funds"**

---

**ENFIELD 2012 BUDGET PLAN**

**End-2011 Town Economic Backdrop**

- Entering 5<sup>th</sup> year of downturn, weak recovery underway
- Non-property tax revenue trending up slightly
- Town now pays all employee retirement costs (NH: 25%-0%)
- Cost to doing business is rising



**Objective:** To develop a responsible budget for the Town

- Maintain services and quality of life
- Resist pressure for higher spending
- Minimize impact on tax rate
- Develop an eye for the future (CIP Plan)

---

### **Town Financials are Fundamentally Sound**

- **Zero debt level**

- \$1M loan for DPW bldg paid off in 2011

- **Undesignated Fund (UDF) is adequate**

- \$890,000 (6.8% retainage: NH guideline 5-15%)
- Hurricane Irene bills still need to be paid (~\$90K)
- No recommended use of UDF for 2012 budget

- **Comparably high rate of property tax receipts (96%) in 2011**

---

### **2011 Town Meeting Summary**

- Approved proposed budget with level tax rate (5.95/\$1000)
  - replaced a police cruiser
  - replaced a sidewalk plow
  - purchased new asphalt reclaimer
  - planned no infrastructure projects
- Recognition that we have capital needs building up
  - big ticket equipment and infrastructure projects
- Avg. tax rate increase 2006-2011 ~ 2.2% per year
  - 8% increase in 2009

---

### **2012 Budget Process**

**Initial Target:** ~2 -2.5% tax rate increase (~ avg. increase last 5 yrs. and ~ rate of inflation)

#### **2012 Early Draft Budget**

- ~\$450K higher vs. 2011 budget
  - ending budget up \$100K (new spending)
-

**FACTORS AFFECTING 2012 BUDGET PLAN**

**2011 was 4th year of stagnant non-property tax revenue**

- car registrations, misc. fees/taxes
- investment/lease income, revenue from NH -2007, \$1.47M; 2008, \$1.17M; 2011, \$1.42M
- expecting small improvement in 2012 as economy improves

**Significant funding challenges continue**

- health insurance premiums up 16% for 2012, future increases
- loss of NH contribution to retirement funds (25% to 0%)
- unchanged staffing level (ambulance proposal would add 2 FTEs)
- energy costs, general cost of doing business (inflation)

**Continued underfunded needs (roads, capital reserves)**

- long-term capital/financing plan (CIP) recommended

**Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee**

- \$6,700,000 in projected capital needs next 15 years
- Underfunded capital reserves (DPW @ \$8)
- Designed long-term financing plan, annual reviews/adjustment
- Avoid ‘big’ tax years (2009, 8% rate incr.), more predictable
- Good timing, sound financials, modest economic recovery in place likely

**Recommended 2012 budget is dependent on CIP plan**

**2012 Final Budget Proposal**

**Estimated Tax Rate\***

Total Appropriations	\$5.31M
Expected revenue (non-property tax)	-\$2.07M
Adjustments (tax abatements, credits)	<u>+\$0.07M</u>
To be raised from property taxes:	\$3.31M

\*incl. water/sewer

***Tax Rate = \$6.05 per \$1000 valuation***

- 1.7% increase vs. 2011; \$20 for \$200K property
- ~ \$100K new spending (\$55,000 net)

**Highlights of Proposed 2012 Budget**

- **Level operating spending across departments vs. 2011**
- all current Town activities and services maintained

- **Maintain spending on road maintenance**

- routine maintenance of roads, no big projects

- engineering study for Jones Hill Road (\$30K, CIP: reconstruction 2013)

- **Recommend to lease new/replacement equipment (CIP)**

- 2 police cruisers (\$57K, 4yr lease @\$15K/yr.)

- 2 heavy dump trucks/plows (\$300K, 10 yr. lease @ \$35K/yr.)

- replace fire transport (used vehicle; \$20K from reserve fund)

- **Significant contributions to capital reserves (CIP)**

- \$210K/year into the future (retired DPW loan; carryover 2011 equipment, and a new 5-cent tax increase each year (\$10 per \$200K property))

### Summary: 2012 Enfield Budget Proposal

The Budget Committee recommends a budget with a tax rate of ***\$6.05 per \$1000 property valuation***

*(1.7% increase vs. 2011; \$20 per \$200K property)*

### 2011-12 Enfield Budget Committees

Fred Cummings (Ex-Officio)

Sam Eaton (Vice-Chair)

Annabelle Bamforth

Shirley Green

Gayle Hulva

Gail Malz

Paul Mirski

Doug Pettibone (Chair)

Lori Saladino

Janet Shepard

*Administration Liaison Steve Schneider, Town Manager*

*Recorder: Gail Malz*

***The Committee appreciates with thanks the Town Administration  
and Employees for their input, cooperation and dedicated service to the Town.***

Paul Mirski moved to close the hearing at 7:31 PM, Lori Saladino seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

A joint meeting of the Board of Selectmen & Budget Committee was called to order at 7:34 PM

The minutes of the Budget Committee were tables until the next regular meeting of the Budget Committee.

The Board of Selectmen and the Budget Committee reviewed the 2012 Warrant. Both the Board of Selectmen and Budget Committee are required to vote whether to recommend or not recommend each monied article.

**Article 5: Bond for Route 4 Sewer & Water Extension / TIF Project:**

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Crate moved to recommend passage of Article 5, Mr. Kluge seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Saladino moved to recommend passage of Article 5, Mrs. Green seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Article 6: Operating Budget:**

Mr. Mirski wished to discuss the order of presentation of the warrant articles. He was informed that Town Meeting is the Selectboard's meeting and the Selectboard sets the order of warrant articles.

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Crate moved to recommend passage of Article 6, Mr. Kluge seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Malz moved to recommend passage of Article 6, Mrs. Green seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Article 7: CIP Capital Reserve Fund:**

Mr. Carrier will make the Town Meeting presentation on this article. Mr. Pettibone mentioned the concern of lumping departments in the one capital reserve fund, but as long as the purposes are specific this is OK.

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Kluge moved to recommend passage of Article 7, Mr. Crate seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Malz moved to recommend passage of Article 7, Mrs. Shepard seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Articles 8-10: Cruisers:**

Mr. Schneider explained that Articles 8 and 9 are basically a loan and are treated as a loan. Article 9 requires annual approval. Article 10, for the outright purchase of a cruiser, was included by the Board of Selectmen in case neither Article 8 nor Article 9 pass as the Board feels we still need a cruiser in 2012.

Mr. Mirski expressed concern about the narrative.

Mrs. Saladino thinks presentation of these three articles will cause confusion.

It was explained that if Town Meeting votes in favor of Article 8, Articles 9 and 10 would be passed over.

Mr. Mirski noted that it's legitimate to talk about all three of these articles with the CIP.

Mr. Schneider agreed and has spoken with the Town's moderator.

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Crate moved to recommend passage of Articles 8, 9 and 10, Mr. Kluge seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Malz moved to recommend passage of Articles 8, 9 and 10, Mrs. Saladino seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Article 11 & 12: DPW Trucks:**

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Kluge moved to recommend passage of Articles 11 & 12, Mr. Crate seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Malz moved to recommend passage of Articles 11 & 12, Mrs. Green seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Article 13: Full-time Ambulance Department:**

Mr. Mirski said Mr. Schneider was going to flesh out the cost and benefit of a full-time ambulance department, including the average response time from Lebanon vs. Enfield over the last year.

Mr. Schneider responded that he did not have the response time from Enfield. He was able to share only low, high and average figures.

Mr. Mirski asked what the net cost would be.

Mr. Schneider said he would include in the narrative a revenue range of \$30,000 - \$50,000. We have about 380 calls per year with 220 transports. We can only bill when we transport. If we collect 70% of billable services it would be about \$30,000 in revenue. If we collect 80% it would amount to about \$50,000 and 90% would bring in about \$70,000. We can mention estimated revenue to offset expenses, but Mr. Schneider is not comfortable putting projected revenue in the Town's budget for 2012. Next year we can do that based on hard data.

Mr. Mirski said that once we start this program we aren't going to stop it.

Mr. Pettibone agreed that we never cancel a program when employees are hired.

Discussion ensued regarding average response time and comparisons between Lebanon and Enfield. Comparisons are difficult because Lebanon has staff at the station while Enfield uses volunteers who must first go to the station before responding.

Mrs. Saladino said Canaan has a private ambulance. Can Enfield reach eastward and pick up business in Canaan?

Mr. Schneider explained there's a mutual aid relationship. It's not typical for local governments to seek out revenue. We could do paramedic intercept and charge for that service, since Canaan has no paramedic.

Mrs. Green asked what would happen if we had a call at that time.

Mr. Schneider noted that we have a paramedic on our current roster.

Mr. Mirski expressed frustration with the estimates that are just guesswork. He will not vote for this article without some kind of spreadsheet. He can't support it for that reason.

Mr. Pettibone said the worst case scenario is we vote on the article assuming no revenue.

Mr. Mirski wants written data.

Discussion ensued regarding the removal of Lebanon response in the budget. Mr. Schneider explained that the proposed budget for full-time ambulance is the worst case scenario. He'd love to be able to provide better revenue figures, but he's not comfortable adding a hard revenue figure into the MS-7 Budget form.

This is why Mr. Pettibone proposed a 2-stage approach: initiate billing and paid on-call for nights and weekends and next year hire the full-time people with good support and good structures.

Mr. Schneider explained the proposal for 2 full-time employees during the day with paid on-call for nights and weekends with per diem personnel to fill in for vacations. He's spoken with the Ambulance Department regarding this. It's their practice now to sign up for shifts, but the relationship becomes employee vs. volunteer with the change. From Mr. Schneider's perspective, revenue is a factor, but the debate should be how we are changing the level of service with full-time staff during the day.

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Crate moved to recommend passage of Article 13, Mr. Kluge seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Mrs. Hulva asked how the \$117,000 cost was determined. She was informed this includes full-time staff for 9 months, on-call employee time, supplies and equipment. This is not a revised ambulance budget, but an additional cost. The tax impact of this article is not included in the proposed tax rate of \$6.05. The \$6.05 proposed rate only includes the operating budget and other monied articles with a tax impact. The \$117,000 would have an impact of about 20 cents/\$1,000 valuation or \$40 for a \$200,000 home.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Saladino moved to recommend passage of Article 13, Mrs. Hulva seconded. Six voted in favor of the motion, three were opposed. The split vote will be indicated in the warrant.

**Article 14: Fire Transport Vehicle:**

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Crate moved to recommend passage of Article 14, Mr. Kluge seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Saladino moved to recommend passage of Article 14, Mrs. Malz seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**Article 15: Wellhead Protection/Land Swap:**

Mr. Schneider asked the Town's Planner to look into this. In summary, no development could or should happen on this parcel.

Mr. Pettibone stated that by recommending this article it's approving a land swap that has no direct benefit to the Town.

Mr. Schneider pointed out that the Town would own it. The State recommends the Town control the property through ownership or easement; we have neither.

Mrs. Green pointed out that may be true but it can't be developed.

Mr. Mirski noted that effectively it has an easement.

In response to a question from Mrs. Saladino, Mr. Schneider informed the Budget Committee that the article has no impact on the 2012 tax rate because Land Acquisition capital reserve funds would be used.

Mrs. Green pointed out that we might want to purchase other land and the funds might not then be available for that purpose.

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Crate moved to recommend passage of Article 15, Mr. Kluge seconded. Mr. Kluge voted in favor of the motion, Mr. Crate abstained. Because Selectman Cummings is not present for this vote there is no recommendation of Article 15 from the Board of Selectmen.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Malz moved to recommend passage of Article 15, Mrs. Saladino seconded, vote unanimously opposed to the motion.

**Article 16: Cemetery Maintenance Fund:**

This article is a housekeeping issue.

Board of Selectmen: Mr. Kluge moved to recommend passage of Article 16, Mr. Crate seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

Budget Committee: Mrs. Malz moved to recommend passage of Article 16, Mrs. Saladino seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**MS-7: Budget Form:**

Mr. Mirski moved to accept the MS-7 as amended to reflect the action taken at this meeting, Mr. Eaton seconded, vote unanimous in favor of the motion.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting of the Board of Selectmen was adjourned at 8:13 PM.

The meeting of the Budget Committee was adjourned at 8:14 PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Alisa Bonnette