

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING**  
**Minutes of January 10, 2022**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Ross McLeod called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm; opening with the Pledge of Allegiance. Selectmen Bruce Breton, Jennifer Simmons, and Heath Partington were present, as was Town Administrator David Sullivan. Selectman Roger Hohenberger was present via telephone due to illness. Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to allow Mr. Hohenberger to participate remotely. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:** None.

**PUBLIC HEARING - 2022 TOWN BUDGET:** Mr. McLeod read the public hearing notice into the record as attached.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the overall increase in the budget as proposed is 5.2%, which encompasses everything including special warrant articles; adding he has prepared a presentation detailing same that will be posted on the Town website.

*Article 5: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$75,000 to be added to the Property Maintenance Expendable Trust Fund.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mrs. Simmons moved and Mr. Breton seconded to move Article 5 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

*Article 6: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of up to \$32,500, said amount to be withdrawn from the balance in the previously established Searles Special Revenue Fund for payment of both marketing related and maintenance related costs associated with the Searles Building. Approval of this article will have no additional impact on the tax rate.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 6 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”; however, Mr. Hohenberger noted his disapproval of the last sentence.

*Article 7: To see if the town will vote to authorize the expenditure of the unused portion of the bond approved in 2020 – Article 6, for repairing the roof and stone exterior of the tower of the Searles Building, and to raise and appropriate \$98,579 in unused bond proceeds for repairing the flooring structure of the tower and upper tower interior walls per RSA 33:3-a, II. No amount of money needs to be raised by taxation. (60% vote required).*

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 7 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”; however, Mr. Hohenberger noted his disapproval of the last sentence.

*Article 8: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$58,070 for the purpose of hiring a full time Police Officer beginning on or about July 1, 2022. Said sum representing the costs associated with wages, benefits, and equipment needed for a portion of 2022.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mr. Partington seconded to move Article 8 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”; however, Mrs. Simmons noted that she would prefer this be part of the budget rather than a separate article in keeping with the Strategic Plan.

*Article 9: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$20,000 for the purpose of making repairs and renovations to the Town Hall, to include but not limited to, siding repairs and or painting, drainage improvements, moisture control, insulation, and window improvements. This will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32:7, VI and will not lapse until the project is complete or for a period of five (5) years, whichever is less. This article is part of the recommended Capital Improvement Program.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mrs. Simmons moved and Mr. Breton seconded to move Article 9 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

*Article 10: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of purchasing a small excavator for the Highway Department and purchasing ancillary equipment for said vehicle. This article is part of the recommended Capital Improvement Plan.*

General Services Director Dennis Senibaldi advised that, per the Board’s request, he had researched Town expenditures to bring in such equipment when needed, and that approximately \$28,000 has been spent with the current contractor; adding the latter is potentially retiring. He noted he had also looked into rental fees for approximately 16 weeks of work, which would be \$26,400, but does not include transport costs. Mr. Senibaldi felt similar amounts will be spent annually, whereas this machine, if approved, would be paid off in four years and last for twenty.

There being no further public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 10 to the warrant. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

Mr. Breton then moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to “recommend” Article 10. Roll call vote – all “yes” save for Mr. Hohenberger who was opposed, explaining that, while he acknowledged the current contractor is cheaper than others and may no longer be available, he would like to see how the numbers work out should he retire. He also noted the current lack of interior equipment storage at the Highway garage as a concern.

*Article 11: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$185,000 for the purpose of purchasing a five-ton, six-wheel plow truck for the Highway Department and purchasing ancillary equipment for said vehicle. This article is part of the recommended Capital Improvement Plan.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 11 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

*Article 12: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$7,500 to be used towards forest improvements and maintenance within the McIlvaine Town Forest and further to raise the same by withdrawal of seven thousand five hundred dollars (\$7,500) from the Special Forest Maintenance Fund created in accordance with RSA 31:113. This will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32:7, VI and will not lapse for a period of three (3) years. Approval of this article will have no impact on the tax rate.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 12 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”;

*Article 13: To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to convey an easement in favor of Brian Harvey, of MCL, LLC, over a portion of the Town’s Recreational Trail, lot 9-A-770, in the area between Shamrock Road and Anderson Road, for the purpose of allowing a driveway easement to Lot 9-A-825 for a single-family residence. In addition, to authorize the Selectmen to negotiate the terms of such easements as they shall deem appropriate as well as to take any other action related thereto. The ability to grant one driveway easement is in accordance with the deed allowances when the Town acquired the property from the State of NH in 2001.*

Mr. McLeod recused himself as he is an abutter, and Mr. Partington assumed the Chairmanship.

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 13 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes” (4-0). Mr. McLeod resumed the Chairmanship.

*Article 14: Shall the Town adopt the provisions of RSA 79-H which allows the Town to “find it to be in the public interest to authorize municipalities to allow a chartered public school to be able to rent or lease its building or facilities from a property owner which is not exempt from property taxes, and not have the property taxes attributable to the chartered public school facilities be taxed to the owner at the full market value of the facilities?” If adopted qualifying chartered public school facility property would be assessed at no more than 10 percent of its market value.*

Mr. McLeod noted that the Academy had submitted correspondence in support of this article, which noted the savings and benefits they afford the community.

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mr. Partington seconded to move Article 14 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”;

*Article 15: To see if the Town will vote in accordance with RSA 32:5(V-b) to require that the annual budget and all special warrant articles having a tax impact, as determined by the governing body, shall contain a notation stating the estimated tax impact of the article.*

There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 15 to the warrant as “recommended” by the Board. Roll call vote – all “yes”, save for Mr. McLeod who abstained citing concerns that inclusion of this information may result in unintended consequences.

*Article 16: Shall the Town raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$17,583,167.58. Should this article be defeated, the operating budget shall be \$17,071,004.58 which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the town, or by law, or the governing body may hold one special meeting in accordance with RSA 40:13 X and XVI to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.*

Mr. Sullivan noted that the Board had intended to consider a request from the Planning Board to include funding for the Master Plan. Discussion ensued regarding the amount requested, with Mr. Partington noting the proposed figure of \$90,000 had come from the warrant article for the 2005 Master Plan; adding nothing has been put out to RFP as yet, however, that amount does seem to fall in the middle of what other towns have spent. He then noted he thought this was to have been a separate warrant article, indicating he was not sure he supported putting it in the budget.

Betty Dunn, Woodvue Road, approached and urged the Board to include funding either way; noting the Planning Board has been working on this for years, but the totality of the project is so big and complex that they cannot be expected to do this kind of work in addition to what comes before them. She indicated if the Town is to have a useable Master Plan, we have to have a professional help with the framework and provide support to the Planning Board; adding we need to do this, and do so before it is too late.

Peter Griffin, Mockingbird Hill Road, concurred with Mrs. Dunn, adding that the Master Plan is the face of the community, which people will look at and see what Windham represents. He noted it is a good marketing tool for the Town, that cannot be put off anymore and in which we need to invest. Brief discussion ensued regarding the timing of doing this as a separate warrant article.

Wayne Morris, Jordan Road, noted that the 2005 Master Plan had included the whole concept of trail connectivity, which was a big driver behind why the box culvert under 93 had been built; explaining east to west connectivity had been in the Plan and he was not sure we would have gotten the culvert without that. Mr. Morris noted that having any future items we are looking at in the Master Plan will give them extra weight; adding we cannot be penny wise and pound foolish and questioning when the Planning Board would be able to do it. He noted there are many things going on, such as a water line, new Town Hall, and regional planning, that we should get input on for inclusion in the Master Plan.

Mr. Partington noted that, after watching the Planning Board over the last few years, it was clear they will not be able to complete the Master Plan; clarifying that he does not mean the Planning Board is ineffective, because they are very effective, however, the Master Plan is a different skill set and professional input is needed.

Mr. Hohenberger noted that he would want to see any funding pulled out as a separate article; adding that he believes the Master Plan to be a main function of the Planning Board and it is not a good idea to hand it over to someone else.

Mrs. Simmons expressed support for hiring a professional and for a separate article. She then sought clarification as to whether some sections could just be updated, citing several that were redone in 2015-17, and whether \$90,000 was a reasonable amount. Mr. Sullivan noted that, based upon the Community Development Director's research, surrounding Town's spent from \$30,000 to over \$100,000 on theirs; adding he thought \$50,000 at a minimum will be necessary for bona fide assistance. Discussion ensued regarding the Town's previous expense, whether the entire Plan needed to be redone, the Planning Board's work thus far, and the ability to amend the article at the Deliberative Session.

Mr. McLeod expressed support for the funding, noting this is too much to ask of the Planning Board given the amount of work and statutory requirements they face. He noted that, to Mr. Hohenberger's concerns, the professional retained would not write the plan, just gather the information together for the Planning Board's review; concurring with others that this is a key document for the Town.

After further discussion, Mr. Partington moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded that a separate article be included on the warrant for \$50,000 for the Master Plan.

Mr. Sullivan advised that the Board would need to finalize the wording of the article before the end of the hearing, suggesting the following: *"To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$50,000 for the purpose of developing an updated Master Plan and to authorize the Planning Board to engage the services of a consultant to assist in the development of the plan. This will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32:7, VI and will not lapse until the project is complete or for a period of two (2) years, whichever is less."*

After discussion regarding the timing of the funds lapsing, which Mr. Sullivan clarified will not occur provided they have been encumbered, Mr. Partington noted he would support three years. Mrs. Simmons concurred.

Roll call vote – all "yes".

Mr. Partington then moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to "recommend" the article. Roll call vote – all "yes" save for Mr. Hohenberger.

*Article 16, continued:* There being no public input or discussion, Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to move Article 16 to the warrant as "recommended" by the Board. Roll call vote – all "yes"; however, Mrs. Simmons noted that she felt it should include the police officer. Brief discussion ensued.

*Mr. Sullivan then noted the following citizen petition had been received: "A request to the voters to raise and appropriate \$9,500.00 dollars to restore the stonework on the historic Gov. Dinsmore Wall. This represents the third phase of work on the wall located at the corner of Gov. Dinsmore Road and Mockingbird Hill Road. The other phases included extensive tree removal, creation of a historic district, and the restoration of the bronze plaque. The goal is to create a pocket park."*

He indicated the requisite signatures have been verified by the Town Clerk and it will appear on the warrant; adding that as this is a monetary article the Board must include a recommendation.

Mr. Griffin approached explaining this was another phase in the total restoration of the wall and surrounding area; adding he had requested bids from four contractors and only received two responses, with this amount being the best of the two. Mr. Griffin reminded all he had explored with the Board taking these monies from the unexpended fund balance or Mr. Senibaldi's budget, however, neither had been approved; adding he had gone with the citizen petition as recommended and he hoped the Board will support same.

Discussion ensued regarding the overall budget increase with the Master Plan funding and this item, which Mr. Sullivan noted were negligible overall, whether this could be done out of the Property Maintenance Trust at a future time, work completed to date, and that as a petition this must appear on the warrant.

Mrs. Dunn sought clarification as to what would happen should the article fail, and Mr. Sullivan replied that, in that case, no work could be done next year with Town funds; adding, however, that the eligibility for use of ARPA monies had been expanded and the petitioner could amend the warrant article to add that it would be null and void if otherwise funded. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hohenberger moved to “not recommend” the article; suggesting that Mr. Griffin work with Mr. Sullivan on an amendment for the Deliberative Session to incorporate language regarding ARPA funding.

Mr. Breton seconded. Roll call vote – all “yes”, save for Mr. McLeod.

**PUBLIC HEARING – CONSERVATION BOND:** Mr. McLeod read the Public Hearing notice into the record, as follows: *“In accordance with RSA 33:8-A, the Board of Selectmen will hold a Public Hearing on a proposed bond issue in the amount of \$6,200,000 for the purpose of purchasing Conservation Lands, on Monday, January 10, 2022 at 7:00 pm at the Community Development Department. Although the total cost of the land purchases over time would be \$6,200,000, the warrant article would limit the Town to borrowing no more than \$2,000,000 in any one year.”*

He then read the proposed article, as follows: *Article 4: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Six Million Two Hundred Thousand and no 100th Dollar (\$6,200,000.00) to purchase land and easements for conservation purposes, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to issue bonds or notes in compliance with provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33:1 et seq., as amended); provided, however, that notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the Town shall not issue more than two million dollars (\$2,000,000.00) of bonds or notes in any one calendar year, to authorize the Selectmen to negotiate and determine the rate of interest thereon and the maturity and other terms thereof, and to take any other action they deem appropriate to effectuate the sale and / or issuance of said bonds or notes, however, no such bonds or notes shall be issued with a term maturity of not less than ten (10) years or more than fifteen (15) years. Land or property interest to be purchased with bond proceeds shall be acquired in the name of the Town by the Conservation Commission, subject to the approval of the Selectmen, pursuant to RSA 36-A:4. (60% Majority Required)*

Tom Earley, Westchester Road, approached and reviewed the attached, which provided supplemental information and details to his earlier presentation at the 12/20/2021 Board meeting.

Bob Coole, Morrison Road, approached in support of the warrant article as it would give the Town the opportunity to purchase property without waiting for Town meeting and would be a benefit to the Town if passed.

Mrs. Simmons sought clarification as to whether there was a time limit to expend the funds, and Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative. She then inquired as to the purchase process and Mr. McLeod indicated such purchases are usually discussed in non-public under land acquisition. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hohenberger inquired about interest accrual on the funds and Mr. Earley indicated the wording of the warrant article would not allow for investment in higher yield accounts. Discussion ensued, and Mr. Hohenberger inquired whether there were a way to have the funds available without withdrawing any annually and Mr. Sullivan clarified the funds would not be taken out until the time of purchase.

Dave Curto, Conservation Chairman, noted they have several properties in mind, reiterating the intent is not to take the money out and let it sit, but rather having it available to extract when needed. Discussion ensued regarding the process and that there would be a 30-day availability for the funds through a standard bank.

Mr. Breton noted that, as the article is worded the Town could theoretically have multiple bonds out and Mr. Sullivan replied in the affirmative. Discussion ensued regarding using the NH Bond Bank versus a regular bank, that the former offers better rates but no pre-pay options, the Clyde Pond bond payments, and that if large parcels in current use were purchased no use tax would be available to pay the latter.

Mr. Partington and Mr. McLeod expressed support for the article, citing, among other things, the need to know what the voters think and that conservation land plays to our strengths and identity as reasons.

Mr. Hohenberger noted that, in the past, the Conservation Commission has committed to using land use change tax funds to offset such bond payments; inquiring whether they would be willing to state the same in this case. Mr. Curto replied that is his intent, noting there are currently 1,000 acres in current use and land values are increasing; adding, however, that he could not speak for the rest of the members.

Wayne Morris, Conservation Commission member, approached noting that most of these purchases are currently handled by the Commission and Board of Selectmen through current use funds; adding the overarching public decision on same will be on this bond vote. He noted that the Town is no longer a rural oasis, but a suburban one.

Dan Spalinger, Glance Road, expressed support for this effort, noting it was sad Windham only had 12% conservation land where the State recommends having 25%. He cited the Town previously being named “Best Place to Live”, and that we will never be thought such again if we do not protect and conserve land.

Mrs. Simmons then moved and Mr. Breton seconded to move Article 4 to the warrant. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

Mrs. Simmons moved and Mr. Partington seconded to “recommend” the article. Roll call vote – all “yes” save for Mr. Hohenberger who abstained. The latter explained that if the Conservation Commission will vote to use current use funds to pay the bond, he will change his recommendation after the Deliberative Session. Discussion ensued, with Mr. Curto advising he will get this done at their next meeting.

Mr. Sullivan then inquired whether the Board would like to meet immediately following the Deliberative Session to change their recommendations, and it was the consensus to do so.

**PUBLIC HEARING – PLOWING FEES:** Mr. McLeod read the public hearing notice into the record, as follows: *“In accordance with RSA 41:9A, the Board of Selectmen will hold a Public Hearing on January 10, 2022 at 7:00PM at the Community Development Department for the purpose of considering an amendment to the fee charged by the Town to plow approved subdivision roads that have not yet been accepted by the Town in accordance with the Town’s “Snow Removal on Private/ Unaccepted Streets as follows: Existing Charge Per Mile \$6400/mile; Proposed Charge Per Mile \$8600/ mile. New Fees to become effective upon adoption.”*

Mr. Sullivan explained that this fee has not been changed since 2011, and Mr. McLeod sought clarification as to whether this were a per event or per season fee. Mr. Sullivan replied it was per season.

Mr. Senibaldi approached and explained he had averaged ten years of inflation to calculate the proposed increase, and even at the new fee it costs the Town more per mile. He noted that approximately 8 roads are involved, and each of the developers are aware of the potential increase being charged retroactively; adding that each has paid for the season and will receive a supplemental bill if approved.

Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to adopt the new fee as posted. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

**BID AWARD - PAVING PROJECTS:** Mr. Sullivan noted that three bids had been received for paving of nine roads; clarifying that there will not be enough funding to do all, however, Mr. Senibaldi will recommend which to complete.

Mr. Senibaldi noted his recommendation would be to complete Castle Hill, Ministerial, and Faith roads; noting the total cost for same would be \$769,678, and that an additional \$6,000+/- would be needed which will come from his summer maintenance budget.

Discussion ensued regarding ongoing development on Castle Hill Road and related heavy truck traffic, which Mr. Senibaldi indicated he did not believe would impact this project.

Mr. Sullivan noted for the record that the bids received for those three roads were as follows, with Mr. Senibaldi’s recommendation being to award same to the low bidder:

Vendor	Castle Hill Road	Ministerial Road	Faith Road	TOTAL
Newport, Nashua NH	\$536,185	\$267,400	\$268,000	<b>\$1,071,585</b>
R&D Paving, Franklin NH	\$389,919	\$177,486	\$202,273	<b>\$769,678</b>
Busby Construction, Atkinson NH	\$491,846	\$219,913	\$231,542	<b>\$943,301</b>

Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to award the bid for paving of Castle Hill, Ministerial and Faith roads to R & D Paving as bid. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS:** Mr. Sullivan advised that the Planning Board had interviewed Mr. Ed LaPointe as a candidate for the Southern NH Regional Planning Commission, and was recommending the Selectmen appoint him accordingly.

Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to appoint Ed LaPointe to the SNHPC for a term of four years. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

*Mr. Sullivan* advised that the Board needed to sign the abatement approval for the Rock Pond Improvement Association, as well an administrative abatement for lot 8A-63, which had been donated to the Town. The Board executed the documents accordingly.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** *Site bond release:* Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to approve the release in the amount of \$388. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

*Partial site bond release:* Mr. Breton moved and Mrs. Simmons seconded to approve the release in the amount of \$1,120.73, retaining \$1,000. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

**MINUTES:** Mrs. Simmons moved and Mr. Breton seconded to approve the minutes of 11/15, 11/22, 12/13, and 12/27/2021 as written. Roll call vote – all “yes”.

Mrs. Simmons moved and Mr. Breton seconded to approve the minutes of 11/29/2021 as written. Roll call vote – all “yes”, save for Mr. McLeod who abstained due to absence.

**NONPUBLIC SESSION:** Mrs. Simmons moved and Mr. Breton seconded to enter into non-public session in accordance with RSA 91-A:3, II b and c. Roll call vote – all “yes”. The Board and Mr. Sullivan were present in all sessions.

*Personnel #1* – Mr. Sullivan made a recommendation to hire a candidate for the open position of Admin Assistant to Assessing at Grade 14, pending successful background checks.

Mr. Breton made a motion to hire the recommended candidate at Grade 14, seconded by Mrs. Simmons. Roll call vote – all members Yes. Motion approved 5-0.

*Personnel #2* – The Board discussed the process to fill the position of Police Chief as a result of Chief Lewis notifying the Board that he plans to retire as of May 1, 2022. Mr. Sullivan will follow-up.

*Personnel #3* – Mr. Sullivan advised the Board that staff had begun the recruitment process to fill the position of Searles Attendant (for opening and closing of the facility during events / rentals).

Mr. Breton made a motion to support the pay of the position to be \$20 / hour, seconded by Mrs. Simmons. Roll call vote – Mr. Breton, Mr. Partington, Mrs. Simmons and Mr. McLeod voted Yes; Mr. Hohenberger voted No. Motion approved 4-1.

*Reputations* – Mr. Sullivan updated the Board as to the status of POET installations into several properties impacted by the PFAS exceedances in the area of the Town Center. He reviewed a quote for a POET at 2 Lowell Road (Center School) received from the town’s contractor Advance Radon Mitigation.

Mrs. Simmons moved to approve the quote received as an extension of the current contract with ARM, seconded by Mr. Breton. Roll call vote – Mr. Breton, Mr. McLeod, and Mrs. Simmons voted Yes; Mr. Hohenberger and Mr. Partington voted No. Motion approved 3-2.

*Personnel #4* – Mr. Sullivan updated the Board on the status of the Town Administrator recruitment process. No decisions were made.

Mr. Breton made a motion to exit non-public session, seconded by Mrs. Simmons. Roll call vote – all members Yes. Motion approved 5-0.

Mr. Breton made a motion to adjourn at 10:00 pm, seconded by Mrs. Simmons. Roll call vote – all members Yes. Motion approved 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

David Sullivan, Town Administrator  
Wendi Devlin, Administrative Assistant

**LEGAL NOTICE  
TOWN OF WINDHAM, NH  
PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE**

The Board of Selectmen will hold a public hearing on the proposed Town Budget and Warrant for 2022 on Monday, **January 10, 2022 at 7:00 pm** at the Community Development Department, in accordance with RSA 32. A second hearing, if necessary, will be held on Tuesday, January 18, 2022 at 7:00 pm, at the Community Development Department. The proposed budget figures are as follows:

General Government	\$ 2,907,315.00
Public Safety	\$ 9,230,050.00
Highways, Streets and Bridges	\$ 1,223,330.00
Sanitation	\$ 1,391,010.00
Health and Human Services	\$ 52,925.00
Welfare	\$ 45,540.00
Culture and Recreation	\$ 1,823,485.00
Debt Service	\$ 529,512.58
Capital Outlay - Roads	<u>\$ 380,000.00</u>
Total Proposed Budget	<u>\$17,583,167.58</u>

*Note that the Default Budget for 2022 would be \$17,071,004.58*

The Selectmen will also address all Petition and Special Warrant Articles including those appearing below:

(1)	\$ 6,200,000	For the purpose of purchasing conservation land. The funding would be through either a 10 year or 15 year bond with estimated annual payments of \$501,000 based on the full \$6.2M at 15 years; however the article will limit the borrowing to no more than \$2.0M per year. The payments for 15 years at the \$2.0M level are estimated to be \$223,000 annually.
(3)	\$ 75,000	To add to our Property Maintenance Trust.
(4)	\$ 32,500	For the Coordination, Marketing and Maintenance associated with the Searles Building. Funding to come from Searles Revenue Fund. Article has no additional impact on Tax Rate.
(5)	\$ 98,579	For the purpose of repairing the flooring structure and upper interior walls of the Tower. Funding for this article would come from the remaining 2020 bond proceeds, which were approved for repairs to the roof and stone exterior of the Tower. Article has no additional impact on Tax Rate.
(6)	\$ 58,070	For the purpose of hiring a new, full-time police officer effective July 1, 2022
(7)	\$ 20,000	For the purpose of repairs and renovations to the Town Hall, to include but not limited to, siding repairs and or painting, drainage improvements, moisture control, insulation, and window improvements. This article is part of the recommended Capital Improvement Program.
(8)	\$ 100,000	For the purpose of purchasing a small excavator for the Highway Department and ancillary equipment for said vehicle. This article is part of the recommended Capital Improvement Plan.
(9)	\$ 185,000	For the purpose of purchasing a five-ton six-wheel plow truck for the Highway Department and ancillary equipment for said vehicle. This article is part of the recommended Capital Improvement Plan.
(10)	\$ 7,500	For improvements within the McIlvaine Town Forest. Funding to come from the Forest Fund established for this purpose. Article has no additional impact on tax rate.

(11)	\$ -	To authorize the Selectmen to convey an easement in favor of Brian Harvey, over a portion of the Town's Recreational Trail, lot 9-A-770, in the area between Shamrock Road and Anderson Road, for the purpose of allowing a driveway easement to Lot 9-A-825 for a single-family residence.
(12)	\$ -	Shall the Town adopt the provisions of RSA 79-H which allows the Town to "find it to be in the public interest to authorize municipalities to allow a chartered public school to be able to rent or lease its building or facilities from a property owner which is not exempt from property taxes, and not have the property taxes attributable to the chartered public school facilities be taxed to the owner at the full market value of the facilities?
<b>\$ 6,776,649</b>		<b>Subtotal Special Articles</b>

	<u>2022</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>\$ Inc/(Dec)</u>	<u>% Inc/(Dec)</u>
Operating Budget	\$ 17,583,167.58	\$ 16,766,922.82		
Special Articles	\$ 6,776,649.00	\$ 1,146,370.00		
Gross Appropriation	\$ 24,359,816.58	\$ 17,913,292.82	\$ 6,446,523.76	35.987%
Less: Revenues	\$ (6,338,579.00)	\$ (782,500.00)		
<b>Total Budget (Net)</b>	<b>\$ 18,021,237.58</b>	<b>\$ 17,130,792.82</b>	<b>\$ 890,444.76</b>	<b>5.198%</b>

As exhibited above, if all special articles are approved (total \$6,776,649), the gross appropriation will increase by \$6,446,523.76 or 35.987% over 2021. The total gross budget for 2022 would then be \$24,359,816.58 before use of other revenue sources.

The 2022 net budget, on which the tax rate is set, would be \$18,021,237.58 which represents a total net budget increase of \$890,444.76, or 5.198% after taking into account the use of \$6,200,000 in Bonds for the Conservation Lands, \$98,579 in Remaining Bond Proceeds from the 2020 Searles Bond, \$32,500 from the Searles Trust for coordination, marketing and maintenance costs, and \$7,500 from the Forest Maintenance Fund. Total of \$6,338,579.

**Posted December 21, 2021**

**by: David Sullivan**  
**Town Administrator**