

**TOWN OF ENFIELD
ENFIELD BOARD OF SELECTMEN
MEETING MINUTES FEBRUARY 3, 2021**

TIME: 7:00 PM

LOCATION: via Zoom Teleconference

PRESENT

Board of Selectmen: Katherine D.P. Stewart, John W. Kluge, Meredith Smith

Budget Committee: Erik Russell, Dominic Albanese, Jean Patten, Shirley Green, Sam Eaton, Kate Stewart (BOS), Nancy Smith, Dimitri Deserranno, Mike Diehn

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: Alisa Bonnette, Assistant Town Manager; Jack Wozmak, Interim Town Manager

OTHERS: Emily Curtis, recording secretary; Melissa Hutson, Librarian; Mike Crate, Enfield Police Department; Luke Frye, Enfield Police Department; Chief Holland, Enfield Police Department; Jim Taylor, Dept. of Public Works; Candace Frye, Terri Crate, Jeremy Ford, Wendy Piper, Francine Lozeau, Bridget Labrie,

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Russell called the Budget Committee meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

Ms. Stewart called the Selectboard meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

Virtual Meeting Preamble

As Chair of the Selectboard for the Town of Enfield, due to the COVID-19/Coronavirus crisis and in accordance with Governor Sununu's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

We previously gave notice to the public of how to access the meeting using Zoom, and instructions are provided on the Town of Enfield's website at: <https://enfield.nh.us>.

If anybody has a problem, please call 603-442-5401

Let's start the meeting by taking a Roll Call attendance. When each member states their presence, also please state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-to-Know law.

ROLL CALL OF ATTENDEES

PUBLIC BUDGET HEARING— 7:00 PM

Mr. Russell opened the Public Hearing regarding the proposed 2021 Budget. He stated that he prepared slides to review the process for the budget to be followed by comments and discussion.

Mr. Russell presented a Power Point presentation regarding the proposed budget by the Budget Committee for 2021. After the presentation, Mr. Russell opened the floor for public comments and questions.

Mr. Deserranno requested to discuss Articles 7 and 8. He stated that both items got voted down at the last meeting and inquired if there was a preference to which one might be more important to move forward.

Mr. Russell stated that there are plans regarding Article 7 and 8 on the Town website, and maintenance has been deferred for a long period of time and need to be addressed. He added that the wording of the articles also expressed that the financial impact is to users but not general taxpayers.

Mr. Albanese stated that he believed that article should express that it is the first part of a \$6 million project. He added that he believed it was Town infrastructure and that it should be paid by the entire Town and not just the users.

Mr. Russell stated that the communications of the warrant and the narrative are directed by the Selectboard.

Ms. Stewart stated that the Water Department Asset Management Plan and the Wastewater System Asset Management Plan are located on the Town website. She added that each document included a full overview of the current systems with additional information regarding the proposed improvements.

Mr. J. Taylor stated that the Department of Public Works (DPW) worked with the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) assisted in the creation of the asset management plan for the water and the sewer systems. He stated that the plans were put in place to assist in avoiding catastrophic failures can lead to unplanned major expenditures. He noted that the town of Whitefield faced \$6 million worth of repairs that had to be completed in one year, which caused the water rates to drastically increase in one year as well. He added that the proposed plans aim to avoid major expenditures and water rate increases.

Mr. Kluge inquired if the expenditure of \$1.9 million was to be expected each year for three years.

Mr. J. Taylor stated that the asset management plan outlines the plan of one project, about \$1.9 million each, every five years to phase it in and aim to avoid major failures. He added that the goal was not to do them in immediate succession, but space them out by five to seven years apart and that water would be two parts and the sewer would be three.

Mr. Deserranno stated that the water fund balance is positive, but the sewer fund balance is still negative. He stated he believed it needed to be rolled out in a slower fashion. He suggested putting water or sewer forward instead of both at the same time.

Mr. J. Taylor stated that the costs of the projects from last year has gone up 5%, and the longer they wait the higher the costs will be for the work to be completed. He stated he would be happy to further discuss

Mr. Wozmak stated that it would be beneficial to get information out to residents ahead of time and to hear from users who have been inconvenienced by breaks that have occurred in the water system.

Mr. Kluge stated that he agreed it would be important to reach out to the users to get their support.

Members of the BOS and Budget Committee agreed that visual details would be important, as well as direct examples of Towns that have faced major water or water waste system failures.

Ms. Piper inquired what is the proposed tax rate increase for this budget.

Mr. Russell stated that the proposed tax increase includes assumptions made in the revenues, in particular a reduction in state revenue – mainly related to uncertainty around rooms and meals taxes. He added that the state assisted with some of that in 2020, but it is unclear what that will look like in the coming year. He stated that there are three calculated rates based on the valuations:

- assuming no changes in the valuations - \$7.53
- if there was an increase of .5% would anticipate \$7.49
- if there was an increase of 1% would anticipate \$7.45

Mr. Russell added that the 2020 rate was \$7.10, and the 2019 rate was \$7.33. He stated that the changes from the 2020 rate would be a 6% increase from \$7.10 to \$7.53; and the changes relative to the 2019 rate would be 2.7% increase from \$7.33 to \$7.53.

Ms. Piper inquired what the estimated Undesignated Fund Balance is currently.

Mr. Russell stated that the estimated Undesignated Fund Balance at the end of 2020 was \$1.59 million. He stated that, per the governing policy of the Town being to have the fund at 12% of the operating budget, it is a healthy balance.

Ms. Piper inquired how many budgets were presented by each department and which budget was chosen to work with.

Mr. Russell stated that four budgets were presented by each department: a preferred budget, a level funded budget, a decrease of 2.5%, and a decrease of 5%. He noted that the Budget Committee worked with the preferred budget requests with some deductions.

Ms. Piper excused herself from the meeting.

Mr. Deserranno stated that he cannot correlate the blue line on the chart regarding the General Fund Unassigned Fund Balance with any information he could find in Town audit reports.

Ms. Stewart stated that assistance from the Town offices may be helpful to understand how the chart correlates with information presented in the audit as there are items that float in and out of undesignated funds, including holdovers from prior years, which can make it difficult to make a direct match even though it is accurate data.

Mr. Russell stated he asked Ms. Bonnette if the auditor could attend a Budget Committee meeting to give them the opportunity to learn more about the audit reports.

Mr. Albanese stated that it was important to note why the numbers were different between 2019 and 2020, as the budget for 2020 was purposely cut because of COVID. He stated that the current budget was a better comparison to 2019.

Mr. Russell agreed with Mr. Albanese, stating that 2020 was an anomaly.

Members of the Committee and public moved on to discuss the water and water waste articles.

Mr. Albanese requested clarification, regarding Article 14 and the Retirement Trust Fund, the current balance and projected usage.

Ms. Bonnette stated that the balance at the end of 2020 was about \$41,000. She stated that there are a couple of retirements coming in 2021, and there are estimated employee benefits to come out of the account, which totals around \$36,000 to be used. She stated that the Town will be expending more than they would put in in 2021.

Ms. Aufiero inquired if there was a diagram of the sewer and water system, and if there were dates to indicate what has been replaced over the years and recommended that visuals be utilized for the Town Meeting to show people.

Mr. Russell requested any further discussion regarding the public hearing.

Mr. Eaton stated his concern for the 6% increase and stated that the Budget Committee has discussed utilizing the surplus to offset the tax rate. He stated that, after the audit is finalized, he would like to see the BOS discuss the possibility of using last year's surplus to offset the fall tax rates.

Mr. Kluge inquired if the Budget Committee was in favor of using the surplus to offset the tax rate.

Mr. Russell stated that it has been discussed but has not been voted on. He noted that the subject was recommended to be put on the agenda after the audit and before the next tax rate is set. He stated that spreadsheets have been developed to understand the possibilities of offsetting taxes and would be available for the Committee to revisit as a part of the discussion.

Mr. Eaton stated that he believed this year is just as uncertain as the previous year and more hardships could come. He stated that the Town should continue with cautious spending, nothing that departments have done well staying in their budgets and look further into the surplus.

Ms. Stewart expressed concern that the Town has run into the surplus into the negative more than once and wished to be mindful of how the surplus was used.

Members of the Budget Committee discussed the possibility of a percentage-based number instead of a specific dollar amount. It was noted that there was no formal vote or position held by the Committee, but discussions had been held.

Mr. Deserranno expressed his agreement with Mr. Eaton and Ms. Stewart and added that the fund balances should be regularly reviewed and tracking them throughout the year.

Mr. Russell requested any further discussion regarding the public hearing. With no further discussion, Mr. Russell closed the public hearing at 8:20pm.

Mr. Russell requested to hold off on the administrative approval of the minutes to after the discussion of Town Warrant Articles.

Mr. Russell requested to review the Warrant Articles in order as listed, with a vote to recommend or not recommend and time for discussion of each article. Mr. Russell noted that items in Article 1, 2, and 3 were not relating to monied articles to be discussed and moved on to request comments regarding Article 4.

Article 4 related to borrowing up to \$570,000 to replace Engine 4.

Mr. Russell requested any discussion regarding Article 4. With no comments, Mr. Russell requested a motion from a member of the Budget Committee to recommend the article.

Ms. N. Smith made a motion to recommend Article 4. Mr. Diehn seconded.

The Budget Committee discussed the motion on the table.

Mr. Eaton stated that he would not usually vote yes, but due to the factors of getting an excellent truck, using the same vendor, and having a very low interest rate, he chose to support the purchase. He added that CIP has the funds to purchase the engine outright, if desired.

Ms. Patten inquired why a stainless-steel body is necessary. She stated that the engine it is replacing only left the garage between 12-18 times during the year.

Mr. Ford stated that the stainless steel is the preferred material as it greatly increases the longevity of the frame and the truck chassis components. He stated that there are issues with the where the aluminum diamond plate meets the steel plate on Engine 4 and noted that the components are rotting at the fasteners on current equipment, which should not occur with stainless steel.

Mr. Diehn inquired if the stainless steel is more expensive than aluminum.

Mr. Ford stated that it was quoted in aluminum first, but when updated to the stainless steel the price difference was negligible.

Mr. Albanese stated that he did not entirely understand the discount being offered for the project.

Mr. Ford stated that there were issues with the previous build the company did that were not satisfactory but not detrimental to operation. He added that the issue related to oversights on both sides and the company is choosing to provide the discount to retain the business. Mr. Ford stated that the manufacturer suggested retail price for the truck being requested is \$700,000, so it is a considerable discount. He added that there is also a prepayment option to deduct an additional \$13,000 if the truck is paid for within 20 days of the signed order.

Mr. Ford stated that the truck that only responded to about 18 calls is a 30-year-old truck and has had limited use in the past. He stated that the truck that would be purchased would be put into the rotation and would replace Engine 5, which responded to roughly 80 of 270 calls. He stated that the plan includes moving the current Engine 5 to the role of the current Engine 4 in the rotation, which would reduce the wear and tear and increase the longevity of that truck as well. He added that the new truck will be an automatic transmission which will make it more accessible for any trained member of the department to operate.

Members of the Budget Committee discussed details of the proposed engine.

Mr. Albanese stated that he could not get behind the decision to support the purchase. He stated that a \$130,000 discount did not make sense. He added that, with a new chief coming in and challenges in the fire department, he would like to take a step back and look at all the equipment. He stated that there is a large fire Department in Lebanon, a large department in Canaan, and a department in Enfield, and we need to find a way to do things better.

Mr. Ford stated that two trucks are being eliminated with the request for the one engine, adding that the rescue truck request will come out of CIP as the engine requested will be replacing Engine 4 and the rescue truck. He stated that the current forestry truck is a military surplus vehicle that formerly belonged to the highway department. He stated that the body of the rescue truck is in good shape but does not fit the need so the cab and chassis of the rescue truck will be transitioned to a forestry truck. Repurposing the current rescue truck will remove the necessity to request a replacement forestry truck in the future. He stated that grants are being applied for to assist with the cost as well. He understands that a new chief may want to do things differently, but the equipment is necessary for the department to perform their duties.

In response to an inquiry regarding mutual aid given and received by the Town in 2020, Mr. Ford stated that the Enfield received mutual aid for 40 calls and gave mutual aid for 48 calls.

Mr. Wozmak stated that the decision is a departmental decision that is supported and fostered by the chief, but not made exclusively by the fire chief.

Mr. Eaton added that there was a department committee involved in the process and the proposal was signed off on by all the assistant fire chiefs as well.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (7-2).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to recommend the article as presented. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 5 regarding \$195,000 for a Public Works 10-wheel dump truck with a plow package.**

Ms. Patten made a motion to recommend Article 5 as printed. Mr. Eaton seconded.

Mr. Eaton noted that the article is a part of the structured 15-year CIP plan.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to recommend Article 5. Ms. M. Smith Seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 6 regarding \$133,793 for Public Works facility improvements.**

Ms. Green made a motion to recommend Article 6. Ms. Patten seconded.

Mr. Russell stated that, as a member of the Municipal Facilities Advisory Committee, he directly observed the deficiencies and expressed his support for the necessity of the improvements.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to recommend Article 6. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 7 regarding \$1.9 million for improvements to the municipal water system.**

Mr. Albanese made a motion to recommend Article 7. Ms. N. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to support Article 7. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 8 regarding \$1.9 million for improvements to the municipal sewer system.**

Ms. Green made a motion to recommend Article 8. Mr. Eaton seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Ms. M. Smith made a motion to recommend Article 8. Mr. Kluge seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 9 regarding \$47,000 to replace a police cruiser.**

Ms. Patten made a motion to recommend Article 9 as printed. Mr. Albanese seconded.

Mr. Albanese confirmed that this was a replacement vehicle and not an expansion of the current fleet.

Chief Holland confirmed it is a replacement vehicle.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to support Article 9. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 10 regarding \$50,000 to purchase fire department car 1.**

Mr. Eaton made a motion to recommend Article 10. Mr. Diehn seconded.

Mr. Albanese inquired if this was a replacement of an existing vehicle.

Mr. Ford confirmed that it is a replacement for a 20-year-old pickup truck, with about 45,000 miles. He stated that it was discussed to trade the current vehicle in rather than auction it as it would have greater financial benefit to the town to do so.

Members of the Budget Committee and Mr. Ford discussed the current vehicles within the department, where they are located, and their typical use.

Mr. Ford noted that car 1, which is being requested for replacement, responded to 58 calls, car 3 responded to 22 calls last year.

Ms. Patten inquired if it would be feasible to share the vehicle in Enfield Center.

Mr. Ford stated that theoretically, he agrees with the idea, but the concern is mainly the response time to be able to respond as quickly as possible to both sides of Town. He stated that if the vehicle were shared it would add to the complexity of response times depending on where the vehicle is housed.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (7-2).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to support Article 10. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (2-1).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 11 regarding \$50,000 for the purchase of a Public Works F-350 truck.**

Ms. Patten made a motion to recommend Article 11 as printed. Mr. Diehn seconded.

Mr. Albanese requested to confirm that the vehicle is a replacement for a current vehicle.

Mr. J. Taylor confirmed that the proposed truck is a replacement vehicle.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to recommend Article 11. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 12 regarding raise and appropriate the recommended sum of \$7,149,460 for general use for operations.**

Mr. Diehn made a motion to recommend Article 12. Ms. N. Smith seconded.

Mr. Eaton stated 6% is still a large increase and he is interested in trying to lower it in the fall.

Ms. Patten, Mr. Deserranno, and Ms. Green agreed with Mr. Eaton's statement.

Members of the Budget Committee clarified that the vote was to recommend the number as printed in Article 12.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to support Article 12. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 13 regarding appropriating \$519,568 for the CIP Reserve Fund.**

Mr. Eaton made a motion to recommend Article 13. Mr. Albanese seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (8-1).

Ms. Patten stated that her reasoning to oppose was because she does not like the idea of additional money coming out of Unassigned General Fund balance. She stated if that had been left out, she would have voted yes.

Ms. Bonnette clarified that in 2020 there were CIP Capital Reserve funds utilized to pay for IT infrastructure improvements. She stated that a grant was received in the amount of \$45,000 to cover the cost of the improvements and the money is being put back where it came from to replenish the fund.

Mr. Kluge made a motion to accept Article 13. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 14 regarding appropriating a sum of \$30,000 to be placed in the Employee Retiree Expendable Trust Fund to be appropriated from the Unassigned Fund Balance.**

Mr. Albanese made a motion to recommend Article 14 as printed. Ms. Patten seconded.

Mr. Russell stated that it is a good use of the undesignated fund balance.

Mr. Eaton inquired how long it was anticipated to put money into the account and what goal is associated with it.

Mr. Russell asked Ms. Bonnette if there was a target value for the fund.

Ms. Bonnette stated that she was not aware of a specific target, but the goal was to have funds available for retirements without affecting the overall budget. She stated the goal was to be prepared for unanticipated retirements so it would not be taken out of the budget, but also using it for planned retirements. She stated that it is the ones that are not known about in advance that it is even more important to be prepared for. She added that unexpected departures can also result in a significant sum that is paid out of unused vacation that needs to be paid out.

Mr. Russell supported developing a target value in a future meeting, but that the amount was valid based on past years.

Ms. Bonnette stated that, based on the usage, the fund has not been growing but supported the future discussion.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to support Article 14. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

Mr. Russell moved on to **Article 15 regarding raising and appropriating \$35,000 for community Master Planning with funds from the Unassigned General Fund balance.**

Ms. N. Smith made a motion to support Article 15. Mr. Russell seconded.

Mr. Russell stated that the funding would be utilized to support the process of executing the Master Plan. He stated that the Planning Board has constituted a Committee, and the professional services would support both the Committee and the Planning Board in the writing of the document. He stated that, even with the skilled group of the Committee and Planning Board, professional planners would be an important element in the writing and development of the plan.

Mr. Kluge stated that, as a Selectboard representative of the Planning Board, he completely supported Mr. Russell's point.

Ms. Patten asked if there will be a need for the professional help in the current fiscal year if the project is only just starting now.

Ms. Stewart stated that when something is authorized at Town Meeting it is a standing authorization. She noted that if it were approved but not expended in 2021, it would be encumbered in the following year. She added that the authorization was for 'up to' a dollar amount and that it is possible that not all the funds would be utilized.

Mr. Albanese stated it was funded two years ago and did not happen. He stated he would support \$5,000 for analytics, but he did not support the full \$35,000 requested.

Mr. Russell stated that the funding was encumbered and was used to put together the preplanning and a facilitator for a group of citizens. Mr. Russell stated that money from two years ago was expended, but perhaps not all of it, and the article was tabled in 2020 due to the inability to know what meetings could safely be held and to be reserved about any spending. He added that some of the plans involve professional surveys in the community, outreach, and he believes the planning is to spend a significant portion of the request in 2021, and to not have the funding would drastically slow the progress.

Mr. Russell stated that a year ago quotes were requested from several contractors, and they were all over \$35,000. He added that the Planning Board had evaluated the quotes and noted that not all components being offered in the quotes would be necessary.

Mr. Eaton stated that it was standard for someone to come in and assist with the process.

Mr. Kluge stated that he understood that our Planning Board was doing more of the process than most.

Mr. Wozmak stated that a good Master Plan is a significant amount of work and he would be shocked if there was someone on the Planning Board that could do it all themselves. He stated the process to collect the information from the community to develop the material is time consuming but also very valuable as it is a major resource for planning, zoning, and development departments.

Ms. Labrie stated she is on the Master Planning Committee and a lot of work will be put into it, but the Committee cannot be expected to put the final product together without professional guidance. She added that there were quotes for a much higher amount, but the Committee plans to meet for the entire year – and it is ongoing.

Ms. M. Smith stated that she would like to know what services would be received for \$30,000.

Mr. Russell stated he would need to go back to the quotes and proposals to review the list of deliverables and noted that the information would be a part of the Town Meeting presentation.

Mr. Wozmak stated deliverables, hours involved, and number of meetings may be a part of it and typically, the proposals are specific in what will be produced and when it will be delivered.

Mr. Kluge stated that, if the professional help is not received, he did not know how the Committee could do it themselves. He expressed he is impressed with the devotion and energy by the volunteers and members of the subcommittee involved.

Ms. M. Smith inquired where the full-time Town Planner fits into the work.

Mr. Russell stated that the Town Planner is supporting the effort and coordinating the meetings but noted that Master Planning is a specialty project that does not fit into the scope of his current job description or duties.

Members of the Budget Committee and BOS discussed details of the request. It was noted that there is a separate website for the Master Planning project.

Ms. Stewart stated more information regarding the process would be provided to the Budget Committee prior to Town Meeting.

Ms. Patten stated that she had a hard time wrapping her head around asking for more money when there are surpluses every year.

Mr. Russell stated that it is written to come from the undesignated fund balance and would be a usage of past surpluses.

Ms. Patten stated people keep looking at undesignated as ‘free money’ and it is not.

Mr. Russell agreed with Ms. Patten’s statement.

Ms. Stewart stated that part of the discussion held regarding the request was to balance the growth of the undesignated fund balance by utilizing the funds to work for projects that benefit the town. She stated the intention was included in the article.

Mr. Russell requested any further discussion regarding Article 15. With no further discussion members of the Budget Committee voted regarding the motion on the table.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (7-2).

Mr. Kluge made a motion to support Article 15. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes in favor of the motion (2-1).

Mr. Russell stated the conclusion of the review of monied Warrant Articles and recommendations from the Budget Committee. He inquired if the BOS wanted to stay for the rest of the meeting or finalize their portion of the meeting.

Members of the BOS agreed to adjourn their meeting.

Mr. Kluge made a motion to adjourn the BOS meeting at 9:40pm. Ms. M. Smith seconded. A roll call was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (3-0).

With the conclusion of the joint meeting, Mr. Kluge and Ms. M. Smith excused themselves from the meeting. It was noted Ms. Stewart would remain in attendance for the final portion of the Budget Committee meeting.

Mr. Russell moved on to review Budget Committee meeting minutes for January 6th and January 14th.

MEETING MINUTES

January 6, 2021

Mr. Diehn made a motion to approve the minutes from January 6, 2021. Ms. N. Smith seconded.

Mr. Deserranno noted his name is misspelled in the minutes.

A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

January 14, 2021

Mr. Diehn made a motion to approve the minutes from January 14, 2021. Ms. N. Smith seconded.

Mr. Deserranno noted his name is misspelled in the minutes.

Ms. Curtis apologized for the misspellings and noted that the information was sourced from the Town website. It was noted that Mr. Deserranno's name is spelled wrong on the Town website and updates would be made accordingly.

Ms. Patten noted that Mr. Russell's name is misspelled on page 4, in the third paragraph down under Cemetery Budget review.

Ms. Patten wished to add the following statement for the record: 'I feel that the Budget Committee has worked hard to make reductions and it doesn't make sense to add monies back when we keep having large surpluses.'

Mr. Russell requested a vote to approve the minutes as amended. A roll call vote was taken. Vote unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Aufiero stated she believed they have done an excellent job with the budget. She has read the minutes and she wished to express her appreciation.

Ms. Stewart stated that the group established to assist in the Master Planning process is Enfield LEAPS, which can be found at: enfield-leaps.org. She stated that LEAPS stands for Live, Earn, Applaud, Play, Sustain.

Mr. Diehn stated that, as a member of the public, and he forgot to register to run for office this year, therefore you will not see his name on the ballot but expressed he did wish to continue his service on the Budget Committee.

It was noted his name could be written in on the ballot.

Mr. Diehn stated that, while he did not register on time, he was still very interested in being written in both for the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) and Budget Committee.

Mr. Deserranno stated he wrote in with hopes to be elected for the two-year slot. He stated he hopes that the group can develop metrics to measure cash flow and fund balances and that they are reviewed regularly.

Ms. Bonnette stated that all open positions and those registered to run were listed in the February newsletter.

Mr. Russell expressed his appreciation to the Budget Committee for the hard work that has been put in.

Ms. Labrie stated that she supported Mr. Deserranno's statement regarding having the matrix. She added that House Bill 594 is currently in the state legislature and encouraged people to look on the state website for more information. She stated that support for the bill would allow the Mascoma School District to apply for state aid for the building project approved in 2014, when no building aid was available. She stated that, if approved, money would be sent directly to the district for bond payments and would result in a drop in the tax rate.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Patten made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:48pm. A roll call vote was taken. Vote passes unanimous in favor of the motion (9-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 9:48 pm.

Katherine D. P. Stewart, Chair

Meredith C. Smith

John W. Kluge
Enfield Board of Selectmen