



Budget Committee
2020 Town Warrant Public Hearing
Milton Town Hall, Selectmen's chambers
Saturday, January 18th, 2020

Call to Order: The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM

Roll Call of Seating Members: Chairman Tom McDougall, Humphrey Williams, Dennis Woods, Tammy Smith, Peg Hurd, Andrew Rawson, a Quorum was present

Chairman motioned that a 5-minute recess be called to allow time to set up screen so public could view warrants as they were read. Motion was seconded by Mr. Williams; Passed 6-0 Meeting was called back to order at 9:07.

Each Article was read and the public was permitted to ask any question they wished. Few questions were asked.

There were some general questions about wording in the articles: 1) In cases where monies were reduced from either the initial ask or from last year's ask should mention of that be made? 2) Some articles have language about being adjusted when funded by alternative means. This was a bit confusing.

Article 1, no questions

Article 2, Comments were made about a possibly misleading tax impact statement. The way it is worded sounds like it may be a seven dollar and change increase when that is not the case. Comment was made that adopting a default budget means new lines cannot be added to budget which may make things clearer and more transparent.

Article 3, Question about why it is funded by PD department. Easier from a bookkeeping point of view. Monies will all come from taxpayers regardless of what budget it comes from. Calling out in a separate warrant article means monies cannot be used for any other purpose.

Article 4, No comments/questions

Article 5, Question was raised about the number of residents that may be able to take advantage of this tax credit. Not sure how tax impact was calculated. Currently 19 using tax credit.

Article 6, Wording was not quite correct.

Article 7, Question was raised if the people could vote to raise amount at the deliberative session. Tax impact was on full amount raised absent of block grant. Much more than this could be used to maintain roads. If a list of roads could be made public that are being considered it may make folks feel better about this article.

Article 8, Change is expected to be made to take from fund balance.

Article 9, This Article was reduced from amount requested last year. The reason was to try and level the tax rate. Currently about \$31,568.99 in CRF

Article 10, This was reduced from \$49,000 to \$23,000. There is currently \$71,144 in CRF.

Article 11, Reduced by \$10,000 from amount requested last year. There is currently about \$46,068.58 in the CRF. This is intended to fix issues with town buildings such as DPW and Town Hall.

Article 12, This was reduced to \$20K from \$52K. Partly reduced by planning board trying to stay under a self-imposed cap.

Article 13, This was reduced from \$6000 last year. Currently \$21,343.75 in CRF.

Article 14, Currently \$2,660.08 in fund. It was unclear/unknown how many overlays are remaining in GIS package. The overlays need to be upgraded as changes are made.

Article 15, Covers all bridges in community. Requested clarity around statement adjustment by selectmen. Generally, feel that non-standard language should be explained in the voter's guide and at the deliberative session. Mention was made that the separate Townhouse bridge fund has \$176,525.92

Article 16, Comment was made that the planning board was concerned that a firm plan was not in place to eliminate the plants. This was the major driver for the planning board's recommendation.

Article 17, Not applicable to the Budget Committee

Article 18, no meaningful discussion

Article 19, no meaningful discussion

Article 20, Question regarding amount received from lease, is 10K a fair amount? Question about school possibly receiving electricity from array. The town is not directly receiving any electricity from the solar garden it receives lease money.

Article 21, Question about what property they can lease? It is not clear what property the town has that can be leased. Suggested examples be presented.

Article 22, Question about registering buildings. Suggested more description of duties. Comment made that they will work on historical buildings and scenic byway. Question about total number of members and the make-up of the commission members.

Article 23, Not exactly sure what is covered by this article. Recommend the petitioners clarify at the deliberative session. Believe the intent is to encourage the adoption of these technologies.

Article 24, Question about number of voters needed to pass.

Public hearing adjourned at 11:10am, motion to adjourn by chairman and seconded by Ms. Hurd. Passed 6-0

Submitted by Thomas McDougall, Chair