

David Ormiston

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 9:11 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders
Subject: designated fund questions

Hello,

I have been reviewing the info on reserved/designated funds dated 11/7/2016. I have a few questions:

1. Is there a separate non-designated town fund? I believe there is, but do not see it listed. If yes, what is the balance?
2. Of the funds listed (from affordable housing to Tracy Hall building) have any of these funds been used? If yes, for what purpose? I recall funds being used for the purchase of a laptop but has there been other funds used?
3. If no funds have been used, then the total of the designated fund balance with the proposed FY2018 appropriations would be \$2,747,875, correct?
4. Can you provide a table showing the current balance as of December 31, 2016 with the proposed FY 2018 appropriations? I believe some of the FY 2018 appropriations have increased since the original presentation.

Thank you,
Claudette Brochu

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Saturday, December 31, 2016 10:01 AM
To: claudette brochu
Subject: Re: designated fund questions

Claudette,

In number 1 I believe your referring to the unassigned fund balance. This is not a reserve fund. However, Norwich has a very strict written policy relating to the unassigned fund balance.

Yes, other uses have been made from some of these funds. For example the purchase of the new Police Cruiser and new Fire Equipment was purchased using Reserve Funds.

I'll need to look at what your looking for on Tuesday when we reopen the offices. In the meantime I have noticed that you are not always getting your facts right. Most noticeably, your last list serve post, states that this budget starts July 1st, 2018. That is incorrect, it begins July 1st, 2017.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

Sent from my iPhone

> On Dec 30, 2016, at 9:11 PM, claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Hello,

> I have been reviewing the info on reserved/designated funds dated 11/7/2016. I have a few questions:

> 1. Is there a separate non-designated town fund? I believe there is, but do not see it listed. If yes, what is the balance?

> 2. Of the funds listed (from affordable housing to Tracy Hall building) have any of these funds been used? If yes, for what purpose? I recall funds being used for the purchase of a laptop but has there been other funds used?

> 3. If no funds have been used, then the total of the designated fund balance with the proposed FY2018 appropriations would be \$2,747,875, correct?

> 4. Can you provide a table showing the current balance as of December 31, 2016 with the proposed FY 2018 appropriations? I believe some of the FY 2018 appropriations have increased since the original presentation.

>

> Thank you,

> Claudette Brochu

>

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 3:30 PM
To: 'claudette brochu'
Subject: Designated Fund Table
Attachments: designated funds 123116.pdf

Claudette,

Please find attached an updated table of designated fund balances as of December 31,2016. Please note that the balance includes one half of the FY17 appropriation. The second half of the appropriation will be transferred after we receive the second property tax payments from the residents.

An updated proposed FY18 designated fund appropriation is also included. The unassigned fund balance is not a part of, nor is a designated fund. Therefore, it is not included. I will be sending that information – most likely tomorrow.

Thank you,

Dave Ormiston
Interim Town Manager
Town of Norwich
P.O. Box 376
Norwich, VT 05055
802-649-1419 x102

Please note that any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Vermont Public Records Act.

**Reserve/Designated Funds
Town of Norwich**

	Balance * December 31, 2016	FY17 Appropriation	Proposed FY18 Appropriation	Delta FY18-FY17
Affordable Housing	\$45,331	\$0	\$0	\$0
Bandstand	1	0	0	0
Building & Grounds Equipment	19,276	15,000	7,000	(8,000)
Citizens Assistance	2,548	1,000	1,000	0
Communications Project	28,240	0	0	0
Fire Apparatus	424,060	65,975	63,000	(2,975)
Fire Equipment	59,019	4,000	20,610	16,610
Fire Station	18,846	4,000	0	(4,000)
General Administration Equipment	23,677	5,500	5,500	0
Generators	7,514	5,000	5,000	0
Highway Bridges	26,162	35,000	35,000	0
Highway Equipment	273,239	135,000	90,000	(45,000)
Highway Garage	50,324	63,460	50,000	(13,460)
Facility Studies	4,143	17,000	0	(17,000)
Paving	10,378	275,000	275,000	0
Police Cruiser	54,457	10,000	10,000	0
Police Special Equipment	13,563	2,500	2,500	0
Police Station	5,740	3,500	0	(3,500)
Records Restoration	28,139	9,000	9,000	0
Sidewalks	51,754	10,000	10,000	0
Solid Waste	42,037	8,000	8,500	500
Tennis Courts	16,912	4,500	4,500	0
Town Pool	4,451	0	0	0
Tracy Hall Building	14,916	0	20,000	20,000
Total	\$1,224,726	\$673,435	\$616,610	(\$56,825)

* Only one half of the FY 17 appropriation has been deposited into the funds as of December 31, 2016 except for the Paving Fund and the Long Term Facility Fund which have received the entire amount.

8c

Miranda Bergmeier

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 01, 2017 8:35 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: retirement info

Hi Dave,

Another budget question:

I have been looking at the information posted by VMERS re: pensions. Can you provide information on which type of plan Norwich employees are currently enrolled (Group A, B, C, or D)? Are all employees enrolled in the same plan?

Yes, I know the employment contract covers employees (at least contracted employees) through June 30th, 2017. Just looking to be an informed voter.

Thank you.

Claudette

8c

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 3:10 PM
To: claudette brochu
Subject: Re: retirement info

Claudette,

We have employees in VMERS B, C and VMERS DC.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 1, 2017, at 8:35 PM, claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Hi Dave,

> Another budget question:

> I have been looking at the information posted by VMERS re: pensions. Can you provide information on which type of plan Norwich employees are currently enrolled (Group A, B, C, or D)? Are all employees enrolled in the same plan?

> Yes, I know the employment contract covers employees (at least contracted employees) through June 30th, 2017. Just looking to be an informed voter.

> Thank you.

> Claudette

Miranda Bergmeier

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 01, 2017 8:48 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: another budget question

In looking over the 12/2/16 budget (quiet weekend up here in the hill), the revenue for FY2016 was reported to be \$4,534,748 and expenditures \$3,950,955 for a positive balance of \$583,793. Did these excess funds go into the general, non-designated fund? If yes, these monies should be reflected in the total town non-designated fund, correct?

I know you were not here then, but am wondering what happened to the money.

Thanks
Claudette

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 3:13 PM
To: claudette brochu
Subject: Re: another budget question

Claudette,

Not sure of the numbers but no not all of a positive balance goes to the unassigned fund balance. By policy, anything over a 15% unassigned fund balance goes back to the tax payer thus lowering the tax rate.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 1, 2017, at 8:47 PM, claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> In looking over the 12/2/16 budget (quiet weekend up here in the hill), the revenue for FY2016 was reported to be \$4,534,748 and expenditures \$3,950,955 for a positive balance of \$583,793. Did these excess funds go into the general, non-designated fund? If yes, these monies should be reflected in the total town non-designated fund, correct?

> I know you were not here then, but am wondering what happened to the money.

> Thanks

> Claudette

>

8c

Miranda Bergmeier

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 01, 2017 9:03 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: sorry, one more question re: budget

The 12/2/2016 budget proposal had a line item for TM health insurance of \$\$39,695 (page 1 of 12/1/2016 draft). Not knowing who our new TM will be or who he/she will be covering, by my math, based on the proposed health care spending, even if the new TM were to select either the family Platinum or Gold plan, the cost to the town would be just under \$20,000. Why is the line item almost \$20,000 more than the town payment?

Thanks,
Claudette

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 3:15 PM
To: claudette brochu
Subject: Re: sorry, one more question re: budget

Claudette,

The TM section of the budget is for the TM and his/her assistant. Therefore, that amount is for two people.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

Sent from my iPhone

> On Jan 1, 2017, at 9:03 PM, claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> The 12/2/2016 budget proposal had a line item for TM health insurance of \$\$39,695 (page 1 of 12/1/2016 draft). Not knowing who our new TM will be or who he/she will be covering, by my math, based on the proposed health care spending, even if the new TM were to select either the family Platinum or Gold plan, the cost to the town would be just under \$20,000. Why is the line item almost \$20,000 more than the town payment?

> Thanks,

> Claudette

Miranda Bergmeier

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 01, 2017 9:34 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: sorry, one more question/comment re: budget

The Fire Chief presented the board with a replacement schedule for equipment listing the equipment, number of devices, costs, replacement costs, and life expectancy of each piece of equipment. IMHO, what is missing from the spreadsheet is the current age of the equipment as well as the condition of the equipment. I would also expect that the life expectancy is predicated on usage and/or availability of replacement parts.

Again, IMHO this info is needed in order for the board to make an accurate assessment of the funds needed for replacement. Just because a newer, fancier model of something may be available, that doesn't mean we need to replace a perfectly functional piece of equipment.

Claudette

8c

Miranda Bergmeier

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 9:29 PM
To: David Ormiston; Dan Goulet; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Linda Cook; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: yet another question(s)

Looking for info on disability insurance: terms of short-term and long term disability (eg: how long does an employee need to be out before disability kicks in) as well as percentages of wages paid for both short term dis and long term disability.

How is paid sick leave allocated? How many days/year? Is there a maximum number of days that can be accumulated? Is there a pay-out for un-used time or is it "use-it-or-lose-it"?

How is vacation time allocated? How many days/year? Does the number of vaca days increase with length of service?

Thanks,
Claudette

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 10:55 AM
To: 'claudette brochu'
Subject: RE: yet another question(s)

Claudette,

For short & long term disability:

The employee needs to be out for 8 days before the disability will kick in.

Short term disability pays out at 66% of their salary – this is paid by the insurance company directly.

Long term disability pays out at 60% of their salary – this is paid by the insurance company directly.

Sick Leave:

An employee accrues 1 sick day per month.

Unused sick leave may accumulate to a maximum of 36 days.

An employee is not paid for sick days if they leave employment.

Vacation days:

Vacation days accumulated depends on time of service.

1-5 years of service they can accumulate 10 days' vacation in a year. An employee cannot accumulate more than 20 days' vacation time.

6-10 years of service they can accumulate 15 days' vacation in a year. An employee cannot accumulate more than 30 days' vacation time.

11-25 years of service they can accumulate 20 days' vacation in a year. An employee cannot accumulate more than 40 days' vacation time.

26+ years of service they can accumulate 25 days' vacation in a year. An employee cannot accumulate more than 40 days' vacation time.

An employee will be paid for their accumulated vacation time if they leave employment.

It will take me some additional time to get you the information pertaining to the designated funds.

Thank you,

Dave Ormiston
 Interim Town Manager
 Town of Norwich

From: claudette brochu [<mailto:cbrochu30@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 9:29 PM

To: David Ormiston; Dan Goulet; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Linda Cook; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders

Subject: yet another question(s)

Looking for info on disability insurance: terms of short-term and long term disability (eg: how long does an employee need to be out before disability kicks in) as well as percentages of wages paid for both short term dis and long term disability.

How is paid sick leave allocated? How many days/year? Is there a maximum number of days that can be accumulated? Is there a pay-out for un-used time or is it "use-it-or-lose-it"?

David Ormiston

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 8:43 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders
Subject: Re: Designated Fund Table

Thank you for the updated designated fund table. I do have one question about this table. Page 12 of the Nov 7th budget packet states: "In FY 17 there was an appropriation of \$36,460. to go along... in the Highway Building Designated Fund to be used...". The table does not show a fund labeled Highway Building Designated Fund. It does show a "Highway Garage" designated fund. Is this the fund referenced? If yes, the FY 17 appropriation to this fund shows \$63,460, not \$36,460. I expect that the two funds are the same and numbers were just transposed, but this does change the numbers.

Claudette

On Wed, Jan 4, 2017 at 3:30 PM, David Ormiston <DOrmiston@norwich.vt.us> wrote:

Claudette,

Please find attached an updated table of designated fund balances as of December 31,2016. Please note that the balance includes one half of the FY17 appropriation. The second half of the appropriation will be transferred after we receive the second property tax payments from the residents.

An updated proposed FY18 designated fund appropriation is also included. The unassigned fund balance is not a part of, nor is a designated fund. Therefore, it is not included. I will be sending that information – most likely tomorrow.

Thank you,

Dave Ormiston

Interim Town Manager

Town of Norwich

P.O. Box 376

Norwich, VT 05055

802-649-1419 x102

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2017 1:58 PM
To: 'claudette brochu'; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders
Subject: RE: Designated Fund Table

Claudette,

Yes, the Highway Building Designated Fund is the same as the Highway Garage Fund.

No, that is not a transposition. The total amount put to the Highway Garage Fund in FY17 was ultimately \$63,460. The discussion on Page 12 of the November 7th Budget Packet is only half of the discussion as it pertains to the Highway Garage Fund. This was the amount budgeted in the FY17 General Fund Budget.

For FY17, the Town also put as a separate article (Article 6) for Town Meeting - the question to raise an additional \$27,000 for a larger Highway Garage Project. This amount was to cover a portion of the local share of the full \$432,968 Garage Project that FEMA Federal Money is going to help pay. Therefore, 36,460 + 27,000 is \$63,460.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

From: claudette brochu [<mailto:cbrochu30@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 8:43 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders
Subject: Re: Designated Fund Table

Thank you for the updated designated fund table. I do have one question about this table. Page 12 of the Nov 7th budget packet states: "In FY 17 there was an appropriation of \$36,460. to go along... in the Highway Building Designated Fund to be used...". The table does not show a fund labeled Highway Building Designated Fund. It does show a "Highway Garage" designated fund. Is this the fund referenced? If yes, the FY 17 appropriation to this fund shows \$63,460, not \$36,460. I expect that the two funds are the same and numbers were just transposed, but this does change the numbers.

Claudette

On Wed, Jan 4, 2017 at 3:30 PM, David Ormiston <DOrmiston@norwich.vt.us> wrote:

Claudette,

Please find attached an updated table of designated fund balances as of December 31,2016. Please note that the balance includes one half of the FY17 appropriation. The second half of the appropriation will be transferred after we receive the second property tax payments from the residents.

8c

David Ormiston

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:11 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: designated fund table

I have yet another question re: designated fund table "Highway Equipment".
The most recent budget draft dated 12/13/16 and the designated fund table from the Nov 7th, 2016 budget packet show and proposed FY 18 appropriation of \$140,000. The proposed FY 18 appropriation to the same fund in the table you sent me today, shows a drop in the appropriation to \$90,000. I do not recall (although I may be mistaken) a discussion at the Dec 14th meeting that this proposed appropriation was being decreased. Did I just miss this, or will this be presented at the Jan 11th, 2017 meeting? But again, the total will alter the final numbers.
The Tracy Hall designated fund was reduced by \$11,077 from June 30th, 2016 to Dec 31, 2016. Just wondering what the money was spent on since there is no explanation in the Nov 7th budget packet or in the explanation for additional funds to support Tracy Hall. One would think that an appropriation of \$11,000 from the designated fund would/could be used to help justify a \$20,000 appropriation for FY 2018.
Claudette

8c

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Friday, January 06, 2017 2:16 PM
To: 'claudette brochu'; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: RE: designated fund table

Claudette,

The Selectboard had a discussion, I believe on December 7th, regarding the proposed upgrades to the Highway Garage. These upgrades are a part of the FEMA Alternative Projects that has now been approved. During that discussion we talked about some items that still need to be ironed out. Due to that discussion it was communicated that if the FEMA Alternative Projects came to fruition than we would then designate \$90,000 to the Highway Equipment Fund and \$50,000 to the Highway Garage Fund instead of the full \$140,000 going all to the Highway Equipment Fund. I was even directed to make an article for Town Meeting addressing this very issue.

This is because the purchase of a new Loader is also a part of the FEMA Alternative Projects and therefore the full purchase of the Loader will not be coming out of the Equipment Designated Reserve Fund.

The \$11,000 from the Tracy Hall Designated Fund was to pay for the re-sanding of the gym floor. No discussion was necessary of this with the Selectboard since they approved the withdrawal from the Designated Fund for the purposes of redoing the gym floor. Despite this, I believe we still held a full extensive discussion on the expense of the sanding along with possible work needed to be done to the Fire Alarm System in Tracy Hall before finally deciding that the \$20,000 infusion to the Designated Fund would be a good idea. Especially since, if we do the Fire Alarm work, this will leave the Tracy Hall Designated Fund near \$0.00

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

From: claudette brochu [<mailto:cbrochu30@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 10:11 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: designated fund table

I have yet another question re: designated fund table "Highway Equipment".

The most recent budget draft dated 12/13/16 and the designated fund table from the Nov 7th, 2016 budget packet show and proposed FY 18 appropriation of \$140,000. The proposed FY 18 appropriation to the same fund in the table you sent me today, shows a drop in the appropriation to \$90,000. I do not recall (although I may be mistaken) a discussion at the Dec 14th meeting that this proposed appropriation was being decreased. Did I just miss this, or will this be presented at the Jan 11th, 2017 meeting? But again, the total will alter the final numbers.

The Tracy Hall designated fund was reduced by \$11,077 from June 30th, 2016 to Dec 31, 2016. Just wondering what the money was spent on since there is no explanation in the Nov 7th budget packet or in the explanation for additional funds to support Tracy Hall. One would think that an appropriation of \$11,000 from the designated fund would/could be used to help justify a \$20,000 appropriation for FY 2018.

Claudette