CITY OF MONTPELIER MONTPELIER, VERMONT

Agenda for City Council Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011
07:00 P.M.

1) 11-063. Call to Order by the Mayor

2) 11-064. Opportunity for the new City Council Member, and the two members re-elected, to be sworn in by the City Clerk

3) 11-065. Election of President, Vice President and Parliamentarian of City Council

12) 11-074. District Energy Update

   a) Planning Director Gwen Hallsmith, and possibly members of the Montpelier Energy Advisory Team, will provide this update.

   b) Recommendation: Receive update; opportunity for discussion; possible direction to staff

13) 11-075. Consideration of replacing the City's retiring Fire Chief.

   a) Chief Schneider has notified management of his intent to retire as of April 30th.

   b) Staff has already advertised for his replacement but at the Council's February 23rd meeting, Councilor Alan Weiss asked that time be set aside at this meeting to discuss the hiring process, the possibility of combining this position with additional responsibility, etc.

c) Recommendation: Discussion led by City Councilor Weiss; possible direction to staff.

4) 11-066. Review and discuss "City Council Overview"

4) 11-066. Review and discuss "City Council Overview"

5) 11-067. Re-adoption of City Council's Ethics Policy

6) 11-068. Re-adoption of City Council Rules of Procedure

7) 11-069. Discuss process for updating Council's Goals/Priorities

7) 11-069. Discuss process for updating Council's Goals/Priorities

8) 11-070. Committee Assignments

9) 11-071. General Business and Appearances

10) 11-072. Consideration of the Consent Agenda:

a) Consideration of the Minutes from the January 5th; January 20th; February 9th; and February 23rd, 2011 City Council Meetings.

b) Summary Budget Report by Department for General Fund and Detailed Budget Status Reports for General Fund, Water Fund, Sewer Fund, Cemetery Fund, Parks Fund, Parking Fund and Senior Center Fund for a seven-month period beginning July 1, 2010 and ending January 31, 2011.

c) Consideration of approving a professional engineering contract with the design team of Marsh Engineering Services & Knight Consulting Engineers to conduct a geotechnical assessment and develop a slope stabilization system with related road repairs for a section of Ridge Street. The Ridge Street Stabilization project is an identified Capital Improvement Project (CIP) in fiscal year 2011. The design work requires the involvement of the specialized field of geotechnical engineering. The Public Works Department solicited competitive proposals using the RFP process and received six technical and cost proposals. A memorandum of recommendation to award the contract to the Marsh Engineering/ Knight Consulting team was prepared and submitted to the City Manager's office detailing the proposal evaluation process a copy of which was provided to members of the City Council. A maximum limiting contract amount (MLA) of $30,330 is recommended which is to be funded through the "professional services" portion of the CIP. DPW staff further requests that the City Manager be designated as the City's duly authorized agent for all contractual matters.

d) Consideration of an Application for a Taxicab Vehicle License from David Pecor, Jr., d/b/a Twin City Taxi, LLC. Address of the business is 10 Diane Lane, Graniteville, Vermont.

e) Consideration of three Applications for Taxicab Operators' Licenses from David Pecor, Jr.; Cathy Owen; and Daniel Casavant.

f) Acting as the Liquor Control Commission, City Council Members may now consider the following permits:

1) Annual renewal of Liquor Licenses (City Clerk will distribute list of applications at the meeting.)

2) Annual renewal of Tobacco Licenses (City Clerk will distribute the list of applications at the meeting.)

3) Application for a Catering Permit from Langdon Street Pub Company, d/b/a McGillicuddy's Irish Pub, for a Legislative Open House at the lobbying firm of MacLean, Meehan & Rice on Thursday, March 24th, from 4:00 P.M. to midnight at their 12 Court Street location.

g) Payroll and Bills.

11) 11-073. Appointments to Montpelier's Tree Board

a) The terms of Jean Jolley and Clare Bootle Rock expire this month; staff advertised and as of the deadline, e-mails had only been received from Jean and Clare, both seeking reappointment.

b) Recommendation: Appointments, both are 3-year terms.

8) 11-070. Committee Assignments

14) 11-076. Council Reports

15) 11-077. Mayor's Report

16) 11-078. Report by the City Clerk-Treasurer

16) 11-078. Report by the City Clerk-Treasurer

17) 11-079. Status Reports by the City Manager

18) 11-080. Agenda Reports by the City Manager

Adjournment

CITY OF MONTPELIER
MONTPELIER, VERMONT

Addendum to Agenda for City Council Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2011

18) 11-080. Request for an Executive Session in accordance with Title I, VSA §313, Executive Sessions, (a) (1) "*Contracts, labor relations agreements with employees, arbitration, mediation, grievances, civil actions, or prosecutions by the state, where premature general public knowledge would clearly place the state, municipality or other public body, or person involved at a substantial disadvantage",* for the purpose of discussing contract negotiations with Police and Public Works Unions and a civil rights complaint filed by an employee.

Request to Cater Malt and Vinous Beverages & Spirituous Liquors

Caterer's Permit Number 2398-01-CATR-01

APPROVED	DISAPPROVED Date:
Reason:	
(for department use only)	

To: Board of Selectmen/Alderman at catered location and Vermont Liquor Control Board.

From: Licensee name: Langdon St. Pub Co

d/b/a: McGillicuddy's Irish Pub

Street: 14 Langdon St. Town/City: Montpelier

Contact name and phone number: David Nelson

Email or Fax # (802)229-6228 or Nelliepub@aol.com

BE SURE TO READ INSTRUCTIONS BELOW, BEFORE COMPLETING APPLICATION.

(Each catered affair must have a recommendation from the local Board of Selectman or Alderman acting in their capacity as local control commissioners and must have the approval of the State Liquor Control Board.)

Please answer the following questions:

1. Describe type of party to be catered: Open House MacLean, Meehan + Rice – Legislative Open House – (Annual)
2. Location of catered party (street, town or city; if no address, describe location): 12 Court St. Montpelier
3. Date of catered party (not more than five days, unless specifically authorized: 3/24/11
4. Hours of operation Beginning 4:00pm hrs. Ending Midnight hrs. No. of Persons 100±

Signed: [signature] (caterer) Date: 3/1/11

We recommend: approval disappproved

If you recommend disapproval, please state reason(s):

Town/City Clerk's signature Of CATERED location. Town/City Fax Number or email address: Date

---

SUBMIT AT LEAST 5 DAYS PRIOR TO DATE OF FUNCTION

Submit to Town/City Clerk for recommendation.
Town/City Clerk will email, fax or mail to Vermont Liquor Control Board, 13 Green Mountain Drive, Montpelier, VT 05602 email address: { HYPERLINK "mailto:DLC-Licensing@state.vt.us" } Fax number is 802-828-1031

LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD'S PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CATERER'S PERMIT HOLDERS:

1. All liquor control laws and regulations that apply to 1st and 3rd class licenses also apply to caterer's permits.
2. Before a catered event is approved in any open area, the following requirements must be fulfilled:
   a) A defined area, for serving and consumption of alcohol beverages, designated with physical barriers.
   b) Separate toilet and lavatory facilities available for both men and women.

COMMITTEES WITH COUNCIL/STAFF REPRESENTATIVES
(As of March 2008, 2007, 2006, 2009, 2010)

Ad Hoc Committee on Revenues & Expenditures	**Sarah Jarvis Andy Hooper Alan H. Weiss**	**Bill Fraser, City Manager**
Americans with Disabilities (ADA)	**Jim Sheridan**	**Bill Fraser, City Manager Tom McArdle, Adm. Ass't. to DPW Director**
Building Code Committee	**Mary Hooper**	**Ges Schneider, Fire Chief Glenn Moore, Building Inspector Garth Genge, CD Specialist**
Capitol Complex Committee	**No Council Rep**	**Paul Carnahan**
Capital Projects Committee	**Sarah Jarvis Andy Hooper Alan Weiss Planning Comm. Rep**	**Todd Law, DPW Director Tom McArdle, DPW Assistant Director Sandy Gallup, Finance Director Bill Fraser, City Manager**
Carr Lot Committee	**Sarah Jarvis**	**Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director**
Central Vermont Core Communities Regional Public Services Committee	**Tom Golonka**	**3 Representatives from each Community Bill Fraser, City Manager**
CVRPC	**Nancy Sherman, Alt.**	**Dave Borgendale, Vice Chair, PC**
CVRPC/TAC	**Nancy Sherman**	**Bev Hill, Assistant City Manager, Alt.**
Central Vermont Solid Waste	**Andy Hooper, Alt.**	**Mia Moore**
Citizen Advisory Board for Community Justice Center	**Sarah Jarvis**	**Yvonne Byrd, CJC Director**
District Heating/Biomass Study Committee	**Andy Hooper**	**Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director**
Green Mountain Public Transit Advisory Board	**Nancy Sherman**	**--------**
Housing Task Force	**Sarah Jarvis**	**Nina Thompson, Housing Specialist**
Kellogg-Hubbard Library Board Rep	**Tom Golonka**	**Suzanne Hechmer**
Montpelier Alive		
Board Meetings &Design Committee	**Mary Hooper**	**No City staff representation**
Festival Committee	**Andy Hooper *(is going to be recruited!)***	
Montpelier Business Loan Fund Committee	**No Council Rep**	**Garth Genge, CD Specialist**
Montpelier Energy Team	**Alan H. Weiss**	**Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director**
Montpelier Foundation	**Chuck Karparis has continued to serve**	**Beverlee Pembroke Hill, Ass't. City Mgr.**
Montpelier Housing Task Force	**Sarah Jarvis**	**Garth Genge, CD Specialist Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director**

Montpelier Senior Center Advisory Board	Jim Sheridan	Beverlee Pembroke Hill, Ass't. City Mgr.
Montpelier Senior Services Coordinating Committee	Sarah Jarvis Jim Sheridan	Garth Genge, CD Specialist Beverlee Pembroke Hill, Ass't. City Mgr.
Regional Bike Path Committee	Alan H. Weiss	Bev Hill, Assistant City Manager
River/Flood Mitigation Committee	Jim Sheridan	Bill Fraser, City Manager Todd Law, DPW Director
Sprinkler/Code Appeals Committee	Alan Weiss Tom Golonka Jim Sheridan	Ges Schneider, Fire Chief Bill Fraser, City Manager
Technical Review Committee (reviews development applications early in process and provides coordinated feedback to the applicant and DRB as to issues and impacts associated with the proposed activity)	No Council Rep	Tom McArdle, Adm. Ass't. to DPW Dir. Tony Facos, Police Chief Clancy DeSmet, Zoning Administrator Glenn Moore, Building Inspector Geoff Beyer, Parks Director
Traffic Committee	No Council Rep	Todd Law, DPW Director & Chair Tom McArdle, Adm. Ass't. to DPW Dir. Tony Facos, Police Chief Ges Schneider, Fire Chief Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director
Telecom Committee	Tom Golonka Andy Hooper	Bill Fraser, City Manager
Water Rate Study Committee	Jim Sheridan Andy Hooper Sarah Jarvis	Sandy Gallup, Finance Director Todd Law, DPW Director Bill Fraser, City Manager
enVision Steering Committee	Sarah Jarvis Jim Sheridan Nancy Sherman Mayor Mary Hooper	Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director
T.W. Wood Art Gallery Board	Mary S. Hooper	--------

ETHICS POLICY
City of Montpelier Vermont
Adopted by City Council on February 10, 1999
Passed after two public hearings on April 21, 1999
Re-affirmed by new Council on March 8, 2000

Whereas the residents of Montpelier deserve the finest municipal government possible and;

Whereas the Montpelier City Council desires to maintain the public trust by conducting all municipal operations in the most ethical and fair manner possible and;

Whereas the Montpelier City Council appoints many various boards, commissions and committees as well as the City Manager, and;

Whereas the Montpelier City Council recognizes that conflicts of interest will occasionally arise in the course of the conduct of municipal affairs, and;

Whereas the Montpelier City Council desires to provide ethical guidelines and standards for all branches of city government;

Now be it resolved that the Mayor and City Council of the City of Montpelier, Vermont for the purpose of promoting public accountability and trust hereby adopt the following policy concerning ethical conduct and conflicts of interest for itself and for all subordinate boards, commissions, agencies, committees and employees:

I - Recusal from Official Action

A. A public officer shall not take any official action if he or she has a conflict of interest in a matter that could result in the officer receiving direct or indirect financial benefit.

B. In matters involving a conflict of interest other than those previously set forth above, a public officer shall not take any official action on any matter in which he or she has a conflict or interest. A public officer shall not take any action on any matter in which he or she has an appearance of a conflict of interest unless in his or her own estimation, he or she is able to do so fairly, objectively and in the public interest in spite of the appearance of conflict of interest.

C. It is recognized that Montpelier may have a large number of Vermont State Employees as members of local public agencies. These individuals may generally participate in matters involving state government but should consider recusal or disclosure when matters involve their specific work responsibilities or employment unit.

D. Public officers shall not offer their individual professional services to applicants after an application is filed.

II - Disclosure

A. A public officer who has reason to believe that he or she has a conflict of interest shall recuse themselves. A public officer who has reason to believe they have an appearance of a conflict of interest but believes he or she is able to act fairly, objectively and in the public interest in spite of the appearance of conflict of interest shall, prior to taking any official action on the matter involving the conflict, disclose to other board members during an official public meeting of the board the nature of the potential appearance of conflict of interest, the action required by the board and the reason why the official believes he or she is able to take such action fairly, objectively and in the public interest in spite of the potential appearance of conflict.

B. In the event a public officer personally (or through any member of the household, business associate, employer or employee) represents, appears for or negotiates in a private capacity on behalf of any person or organization in any cause, proceeding, application or other matter pending before the public body in which the officer holds office, the public officer shall disclose his/her relationship to that public body. In such cases, the officer shall not sit with the remaining members of the public body nor be included in any deliberations other than to the extent that all applicants/members of the public are included.

C. If a public officer does not voluntarily withdraw from official action on any matter in which that public officer has or may have a conflict of interest, another member of the same public body or any interested party to the matter being heard may request that the public body consider the issue of whether that member should recuse him/herself because of conflict of interest. Upon such request the members of the public body, excluding the member with the potential conflict, shall act on the following motion.≅Should _____ recuse him/herself because of a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict of interest?≅ If a majority of those voting vote in favor of the motion and if the member with the potential conflict does not recuse him/herself, the chair of the public body shall refer the action of the public body to the City Council.

D. Violations of this ethics regulation may be grounds for removal from public office, except if such removal is prohibited by law.

III - Emergency

A. The provisions of Section I shall not apply if the City Council has voted that an emergency exists and that actions of the public body or agency otherwise could not take place. In such cases, a public officer who has reason to believe he or she has a conflict of interest shall disclose such conflict as provided in Section II - A.

IV - Definitions

A. **AConflict of Interest≅** means a personal or pecuniary interest of a public officer or his or her relative (as defined in 12 VSA 61 (a) and 24 VSA 1203), member of the household, business associate, employer or employee, in the outcome of a cause, proceeding, application or any other matter pending before the public body in which he or she holds office or is employed. AConflict of Interest≅ does not arise in the case of votes or decisions on matters in which the public officer has a personal or pecuniary interest in the outcome no greater than that of other persons generally affected by the decision (such as adopting a bylaw or setting a tax rate) who are residents of Montpelier.

B. **AEmergency≅** means an imminent threat or peril to the public health, safety or welfare.

C. **APublic body≅** means the City Council of the City of Montpelier as defined in the City Charter and all other boards, councils, commissions or committees under the administrative control of the City Council.

D. **APublic Officer≅** means a member of the City Council and/or members of all other boards, councils, commissions or committees under the administrative control of the City Council elected or appointed to perform executive, administrative, legislative or quasi-judicial functions as a member of or for a public body.

E. **AOfficial Action≅** means engaging in a vote, entering into a contract, authorizing the issuance of a permit, deliberating in connection with or rendering a written or recorded decision, conducting a criminal or disciplinary investigation, or taking any formal action in a quasi-judicial capacity in the course of a public officer=s performance of the duties and responsibilities of his or her office.

Montpelier, Vermont

CITY COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE

Adopted April 10, 1963
(Amended March 9, 1977; May 28, 1980; May 11, 1983;
May 13, 1987; March 8, 1989; March 17, 1992;
March 9, 1994; March 27, 1996; March 11, 1998; March 10, 1999; March 8, 2000; March 28, 2001;
March 12, 2008)

1. The Chair shall preserve order in the meetings and regulate its procedure by applying the rules of order impartially to all members and the public. Absent objection, the Chair may determine the order in which the City Council considers items on the agenda. Absent such unanimous consent, the provisions of Rule 8(c) below shall control.

2. The Mayor will vote only if there is a tie vote and for appointments and bond resolutions of necessity or to create a tie vote, or to create a fourth vote.

3. No one other than the Mayor may normally address the meeting unless called upon or recognized by the Chair. If members of the City Council or staff wish to speak, therefore, they must first be recognized by the Chair.

4. Members of the audience must be recognized by the Chair as well, and are required to state their name and address.

5. No vote is required unless a motion is involved.

6. Any discussion should be limited to the to the agenda item under consideration and not more than one person should be speaking on the same item at one time.

7. Any items discussed in the agenda under the heading of general appearances should be limited to not more than 10 minutes per subject, unless extended by majority vote of the Council.

8. Definitions:

    (a) <u>Regular meetings</u> shall mean the meetings provided by the Charter to be held on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month, and may be adjourned to a date and time certain.

    (b) <u>Special meetings</u> shall mean all meetings of the Council other than regular meetings; notice thereof shall be given as provided by statute.

    (c) <u>Agenda</u> shall mean a table of items of business for consideration at a Council meeting. Upon motion duly seconded and adopted, agenda items may be added, deleted or passed over at any time.

    (d) <u>Executive Session</u> shall mean meetings as provided for in V.S.A., Title I, Section 313, Subsection (a), for the purpose of discussing contracts, labor relations, agreements with employees, arbitration, grievances, civil actions at law or prosecutions by the State where premature general public knowledge would clearly place the state, municipality, other public body or person involved at a substantial disadvantage; the negotiating or securing of real estate options; the appointment or employment or evaluation of a public officer or employee; a disciplinary or dismissal action against a public officer or employee; but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to impair the right of such officer or employee to a public hearing if formal charges are brought; a clear and imminent peril to the public safety; discussion or consideration of records or documents excepted from the access to public records provisions of section 317(b) of this title, or any other purpose allowed by statute. Discussion or consideration of the excepted record or document shall not itself permit an extension of the executive session to the general subject to which the record or document pertains. The substance of matters discussed in Executive Session shall not be disclosed by any participant, nor shall minutes of Executive Sessions be maintained.

9. The agenda shall be prepared by the City Manager and shall include such items of business as the Mayor may wish to bring to the attention of the Council, and also such items as may be requested by any member of the City Council before 12:00 noon on a Friday preceding the regular Council meeting.

10. The agenda for the regular meetings shall be closed at 12:00 noon on Friday preceding the regular Council meeting and a copy of the same shall be hand-delivered to each Council member at his/her home address on such Friday.

11. Citizen=s may request that items be placed on the Council=s agenda by submitting written requests. In the event that the nature or timing of the item is such that it must be discussed at the next regular Council meeting, the written request must be submitted to the City Manager by 4:30 PM on the Thursday preceding the next Council meeting. With other requests, the Manager may determine the appropriate meeting date based on criteria including but not limited to items already scheduled, continuity with other issues and required deadlines or time lines.

12. The agenda shall indicate the name of the official proposing the item and whether or not such official anticipates voting action on it.

13. Each agenda may contain a section entitled Consent Agenda. Items listed on the Consent Agenda may be voted upon collectively. Examples of such Consent Agenda items are the minutes, vendors' licenses, routine approvals and other non-controversial matters. If desired, the request of a single Council Member will be sufficient cause to remove an item from the Consent Agenda and vote on it separately.

14. Items on the agenda not indicated for vote are not to be brought on for vote without the consent of two-thirds of the Council members present at the meeting. Matters not on the agenda of a regular meeting may be brought on for discussion and vote by the unanimous consent of all Council Members present.

15. Special and emergency meetings may be called by the Mayor. The Mayor, or, in case of his/her failure, the City Clerk, shall call special or emergency meetings on the request of three (3) members of the City Council.

16. Notice of special meetings, including a statement of the business proposed to be transacted, shall be given to each member of the City Council at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the time of the meeting. Notice of special meetings need not be in writing, but in event of failure of actual notice, written notice mailed or delivered to the home of the Council members not otherwise contact and posted at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the meeting shall be sufficient.

17. Special emergency meetings may be held without formal notice, providing not less than five (5) members of the Council voluntarily agree to assemble for that purpose, but such meeting shall be held only after all reasonable means have been used to notify any Council Member not present, with reasonable opportunity given to such Council Member to attend, and the minutes of such meeting shall state the means used to notify or attempt to notify such absent members that the meeting was to be held.

18. Application for Council permits shall be considered as agenda items.

19. The rules of procedure to be followed by the City Council shall be Robert's Rules of Order, most recent revision, when otherwise not specified in the Rules of Procedure and City Charter.

20. Nothing in these Rules of Procedure shall conflict or alter the Rules and Procedures granted by the Montpelier City Charter and/or State Law.

21. A parliamentarian shall be elected at the same time as the President and Vice President of the City Council.

I:\CITY COUNCIL-RULES OF PROCEDURE

CITY OF MONTPELIER
MONTPELIER, VERMONT

Agenda for City Council Meeting

City Council Chambers, City Hall
Wednesday, March 9, 2011
7:00 P.M.

1) 11-063. Call to Order by the Mayor

2) 11-064. Opportunity for the new City Council Member, and the two members re-elected, to be sworn in by the City Clerk

3) 11-065. Election of President, Vice President and Parliamentarian of City Council

4) 11-066. Review and discuss *"City Council Overview"*

5) 11-067. Re-adoption of City Council's Ethics Policy

6) 11-068. Re-adoption of City Council Rules of Procedure

7) 11-069. Discuss process for updating Council's Goals/Priorities

8) 11-070. Committee Assignments

9) 11-071. General Business and Appearances

10) 11-072. Consideration of the Consent Agenda:

a) Consideration of the Minutes from the January 5th; January 20th; February 9th; and February 23rd, 2011 City Council Meetings.

b) Summary Budget Report by Department for General Fund and Detailed Budget Status Reports for General Fund, Water Fund, Sewer Fund, Cemetery Fund, Parks Fund, Parking Fund and Senior Center Fund for a seven-month period beginning July 1, 2010 and ending January 31, 2011.

c) Consideration of approving a professional engineering contract with the design team of Marsh Engineering Services & Knight Consulting Engineers to conduct a geotechnical assessment and develop a slope stabilization system with related road repairs for a section of Ridge Street. The Ridge Street Stabilization project is an identified Capital Improvement Project (CIP) in fiscal year 2011. The design work requires the involvement of the specialized field of geotechnical engineering. The Public Works Department solicited competitive proposals using the RFP process and received six technical and cost proposals. A memorandum of recommendation to award the contract to the Marsh Engineering/ Knight Consulting team was prepared and submitted to the City Manager's office detailing the proposal evaluation process a copy of which was provided to members of the City Council. A maximum limiting contract amount (MLA) of $30,330 is recommended which is to be funded through the "professional services" portion of the CIP. DPW staff further requests that the City Manager be designated as the City's duly authorized agent for all contractual matters.

d) Consideration of an Application for a Taxicab Vehicle License from David Pecor, Jr., d/b/a Twin City Taxi, LLC. Address of the business is 10 Diane Lane, Graniteville, Vermont.

e) Consideration of three Applications for Taxicab Operators' Licenses from David Pecor, Jr.; Cathy Owen; and Daniel Casavant.

f) Acting as the Liquor Control Commission, City Council Members may now consider the following permits:

    1) Annual renewal of Liquor Licenses (City Clerk will distribute list of applications at the meeting.)

    2) Annual renewal of Tobacco Licenses (City Clerk will distribute the list of applications at the meeting.)

    3) Application for a Catering Permit from Langdon Street Pub Company, d/b/a McGillicuddy's Irish Pub, for a Legislative Open House at the lobbying firm of MacLean, Meehan & Rice on Thursday, March 24th, from 4:00 P.M. to midnight at their 12 Court Street location.

g) Payroll and Bills.

11) 11-073. Appointments to Montpelier's Tree Board

a) The terms of Jean Jolley and Clare Bootle Rock expire this month; staff advertised and as of the deadline, e-mails had only been received from Jean and Clare, both seeking reappointment.

b) Recommendation: Appointments, both are 3-year terms.

12) 11-074. District Energy Update

a) Planning Director Gwen Hallsmith, and possibly members of the Montpelier Energy Advisory Team, will provide this update.

b) Recommendation: Receive update; opportunity for discussion; possible direction to staff

13) 11-075. Consideration of replacing the City's retiring Fire Chief.

a) Chief Schneider has notified management of his intent to retire as of April 30th.

b) Staff has already advertised for his replacement but at the Council's February 23rd meeting, Councilor Alan Weiss asked that time be set aside at this meeting to discuss the hiring process, the possibility of combining this position with additional responsibility, etc.

c) Recommendation: Discussion led by City Councilor Weiss; possible direction to staff.

14) 11-076. Council Reports

15) 11-077. Mayor's Report

16) 11-078. Report by the City Clerk-Treasurer

17) 11-079. Status Reports by the City Manager

18) 11-080. Agenda Reports by the City Manager

Adjournment

CITY COUNCIL OVERVIEW
March 2011
William Fraser, City Manager

The City Charter is the document which defines the local government authority and operations. The current version is Effective June 20, 1994". The charter and any amendments are adopted by Montpelier voters then approved by the legislature. Issues not specifically addressed by the charter are governed by the general laws of the state concerning municipalities. These are found in Title 24 and other places in Vermont statutes. The Powers and Duties of the Mayor and City Council are enumerated specifically in Titles III and IV of the City Charter.

Powers & Duties:

Council Voting: All of the Council□s authority flows from actions of the group as an entity and not from unilateral actions of individual members. A minimum of four council members present is required to have a quorum to conduct business. Any action requires an affirmative vote of four city councilors regardless of attendance at a meeting. The Mayor only votes to break a tie or create a fourth vote. The charter also provides veto authority to the Mayor with five votes required to override a veto.

Appointments**:** The City Council directly appoints the City Manager, City Attorney, Regional Planning Commission representative, Regional Planning Transportation Advisory Committee representative, Solid Waste District Representative, Public Library Trustee, Housing Authority Board members, Planning Commissioners, Development Review Board, Design Review Committee, Tree Board, Conservation Commission and other ad hoc committees. The Council generally advertises for applicants to fill vacancies in any of the above committee assignments. Applicants are offered the opportunity to speak to the council about their application and respond to questions from the Council. Voters recently passed a charter change which would have the Council appoint the City Treasurer but that change has not yet been approved by the legislature.

Ordinances: The Council adopts and amends municipal ordinances after two public readings, which are really public hearings. Zoning ordinances and zoning amendments must be considered by the Planning Commission prior to Council action. There are also specific warning requirements for zoning amendments. The Council often holds a concept discussion on a potential ordinance before directing that specific wording be drafted for consideration. State law provides citizens the opportunity to disapprove ordinances adopted by the Council. This can be done through a petition and special election process although it rarely happens in practice.

Policies: The City Council is the policy making body of the city government. As with ordinances, general discussion sometimes precedes a formal policy draft. Proposed policies may be initiated by the City Manager or staff based on perceived need. Policy can also be established through Council decisions on various issues or through initiative of a Council Member.

Budget: The City Council approves an annual budget which is then presented to the voters for consideration on Town Meeting Day. The process by which that budget is developed is lengthy and requires additional time spent by Council Members. In September/October the City Manager provides Council Members with a questionnaire about various aspects of city operations and finances. Council members complete the survey which includes an opportunity for general comments. In some years, the City has developed specific finance and budget policy from the surveys, in other years the surveys have been used as broad guidelines.

Based on a Council approved schedule, the City Manager and Finance Director compile the budget, review departmental requests and make an assessment of community needs. The City Manager presents the Council with a recommended budget in early December. The Council conducts public budget workshops with Department Heads to discuss operations, budget requests and specific issues. These workshops are held in December. During or immediately after these workshops, the Council may make changes to the Manager□s recommended budget. The Council then conducts televised public budget hearings in January which include the ability for citizens to participate by telephone. Throughout the process, city staff provides budget information to the public through press releases, an article in the Montpelier Bridge, website and other opportunities. After the public hearings, the Council adopts the budget and places it on the annual City Meeting Warning for voter consideration. The annual report details the proposed budget for the public.

City Council Operations:

Meeting Schedule: Regular Council Meetings are held on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month. There are occasional special meetings held outside of this time frame such as the budget and goals workshops and others as necessary. The schedule is sometimes switched to accommodate vacations, anticipated absences, etc. When feasible, one meeting during the summer is cancelled.

Meeting Agenda: The City Manager prepares the agenda for Council meetings. The agenda and packet of supporting information is usually prepared by the Friday preceding a Wednesday meeting. Any council member can place an item on an agenda by request. Such requests are most helpful when they are as specific as possible and received by the Manager□s office by the Thursday preceding a meeting. The weekly packet will contain a tentative schedule of upcoming agenda items so that Council members can anticipate certain discussions. One method of introducing items for the agenda is to raise the issue during a member□s Council report. This provides others an opportunity to react, allows the Manager to schedule the item as appropriate and gives staff time to prepare back up information for the Council. Citizens may request agenda items as well.

Consent Agenda: Virtually all Council meetings contain a consent agenda item. This item is used to handle routine or administrative matters in one vote. Typical consent agenda items are meeting minutes, license approvals, bid awards, authorization for contract signatures, etc. Any item can be pulled off of the consent agenda for full discussion at the request of any individual council member. The consent agenda is intended to be used for convenience and time savings, not to sidestep discussion or deliberation.

Council Reports: Each council meeting contains a Council Reports agenda item. At this time, each council member is provided the opportunity to speak on any topic they feel is relevant. This time has been used to request agenda items, relay communications from citizens, present initiatives or state concerns/positions on issues. It is also often used to offer congratulations, thanks or acknowledgments.

Citizen Comments: Each council meeting begins with General Business and Appearances. This provides an opportunity for anybody to raise an issue or make a comment about something not on that night□s agenda. In addition, citizens are generally offered an opportunity to participate in deliberation of agenda items - especially during public hearings. City staff makes an effort to contact citizens known to be interested in or directly impacted by particular agenda items, council members are urged to do the same with their constituents.

Weekly Packet: The City Manager□s office prepares and distributes a weekly packet of information for Council Members. The packet has generally beeen delivered to the member□s home by the Police Department on Friday evenings unless the member makes other arrangements. However there is a pending proposal to convert this to electronic transfer and eliminate the written packets. The packet includes meeting agendas and supporting information for agenda items. The packet information is posted on the city’s website on Friday afternoons or Monday mornings.

The packet includes a weekly memo from the Manager updating the council on various activities. Please read this memo as soon as you can as it often contains time sensitive information - for example the Manager may inform the council of an action that will be taken on a certain date unless objections are received earlier. The packet also contains copies of correspondence and other matters of interest to the council. Council members may provide material to the Manager□s office that they□d like included in the packet. All material in the Council packet is considered public information unless clearly marked otherwise with proper statutory citation. Items that are confidential are typically restricted to active litigation, contract negotiations or personnel issues consistent with the public records law.

Public Hearings: Public Hearings are required for a variety of issues including some ordinances, grant applications, bond issues, budgets and warning articles. Public Hearings are different from regular agenda items in that they are specifically designed to elicit public comment and are warned as such on the meeting agenda. During a public hearing, the Mayor usually calls for an explanation of the issue being considered then will officially open the hearing. Council members ought not to deliberate during the public hearing since that is the time for input from the general public. If an unusually large crowd wishes to speak, the Mayor may ask for people to sign up and may impose time limits on speakers. Council members may add comments and take action after closing the hearing.

Goals and Priorities: Both Council and Staff have found that issues move forward more efficiently when the Council as a whole establishes some clear goals, objectives and priorities for the City. The work plan for the year as well as the pacing of council agenda items is then geared toward accomplishing these priorities. To develop these goals, the Council, Manager and key staff schedule a workshop with no other business. The workshop is open to the public but may be held somewhere other than the council chambers to provide a more informal environment. The session consists of brainstorming, discussion, compromise and prioritization. The Council has typically identified five major policy goals with specific activities/objectives designated for each goal. Once developed, these goals are reviewed at a regular Council meeting and formally adopted. The Manager is provides the council with progress reports on the goals.

Legislative Priorities: A similar, although simplified, process occurs with the formulation of legislative priorities. City officials have in the past drafted a list of some top priorities. Prior to the legislative session, the city□s legislative delegation (3 Washington County Senators and 2 Montpelier Representatives) have been invited to review the priorities with either the full Council or a smaller group and discuss the upcoming session. As issues arise during the session, the council may be asked to take positions. This process has changed and not been closely followed in recent years. The council may wish to revisit how and if they want to take positions on legislative issues.

Lobbying: In an effort to maintain consistency in the city’s voice or position, legislative advocacy efforts are coordinated through the City Manager’s office. The Assistant City Manager, Beverlee Hill, maintains a regular presence at the State House during the legislative session. She typically functions as the city□s chief legislative liaison. The City Manager also visits the State House frequently and generally testifies on behalf of the city on significant issues or priorities. The Mayor and/or Council Members are called in for major items. In addition to the city□s direct efforts, the Vermont League of Cities and Towns (VLCT) represents the interests of municipal governments in Vermont. The city works closely with the League to coordinate efforts and tracking of issues. VLCT adopts a municipal policy which directs its advocacy work. At the present time, the City Manager is a member of the VLCT Board of Directors.

Communications with public: Council members will receive communications from residents in the form of phone calls, letters, e-mail and sidewalk conferences as well as citizen participation at council meetings. If the communication involves a direct complaint about city services, Council members should relay the information to the City Manager□s office as soon as reasonably possible. Staff will address the concern, contact the citizen directly (or work through the council member whichever is preferable) and either develop a path for resolution or an explanation of the city□s actions/decision/policy etc.

Letters or comments dealing with broader city policy should be shared with other council members. This can be done through the council packet and/or council reports. It is still advisable to contact the City Manager□s office immediately so that the Council member can obtain as much information for response as possible. It is good general policy to copy all council members and the City Manager on e-mail correspondence concerning city business. The City Manager will provide paper copies of relevant information in either the weekly packet or by some other method if information is time sensitive (phone call, fax, personal delivery, etc).

Communications with city staff: The city operates in a Council-Manager form of government. In the strictest sense of the form, the council should communicate with city staff solely through the City Manager (Title X, section 9 of the charter). In reality, Council members occasionally contact department heads directly for the purposes of obtaining information or sharing information. Council Members should be aware that Department Heads are expected to inform the City Manager of the content of all such contacts. Council Members are urged to begin their inquiries with the Manager who may refer them to the appropriate staff member. This maintains open lines of communication. Council members should exercise restraint and discretion with regard to official contact with all other city employees (excluding the Manager□s office staff) unless absolutely necessary and should inform the Manager if and when such contact occurs.

Whenever possible, inquiries from individual Council members will be followed up with a written summary so that all Council members receive the same information. Council members should be clear that electronic mail communications between municipal officials, particularly between fellow members of elected bodies, are considered public information and should be treated as such. The city provides an e-mail address for council members so that all city related communications can be maintained on the city's server.

Communications with the press: Statements to the press on behalf of the official city government are generally made by either the City Manager or Mayor. Such statements are intended to communicate the policy or philosophy of the council as a whole and not necessarily nuances that each individual member may be concerned with. Council members may speak individually of course but need to be clear whether they are expressing their personal opinion or speaking as an authorized representative of the entire council.

In addition to responding to regular questions from the press as matters arise, City staff occasionally issues press releases about council actions or city government activities. The Manager also writes a regular article for the *Montpelier Bridge* newspaper and the city maintains a world wide web site (www.montpelier-vt.org) to provide public information. The city is also initiating Facebook and Twitter accounts. Council members are welcome to contribute to this if they desire.

Legal Issues: In matters involving legal issues - especially active litigation, the council usually adopts a motion referring all press or public inquiries to the City Manager and/or City Attorney.

This maintains a consistent line of communication and reduces the opportunities for statements which may disrupt resolution of the matter.

City Attorneys: The City uses three main law firms. McKee, Giuliani & Cleveland in Montpelier, is the city□s general law firm. Paul Giuliani and Glenn Howland handle matters of general municipal law as well as contracts, collections, ordinance enforcement, etc. Steven Stitzel, of Stitzel, Page & Fletcher in Burlington, handles land use cases and specialized matters. That means he, or another member of the firm (usually Joe McLean), handles zoning appeals and advice, permit issues, Act 250 issues and other cases as requested. John Klesch has been handling insurance cases. Scott Cameron, of Zalinger, Cameron & Lambek in Montpelier, handles labor issues such as collective bargaining questions, arbitrations, and compliance with employment related laws. Steve Cusick handles some of this work as well. In addition, the city is occasionally covered by our liability insurance carrier when general liability suits are brought against the city. The carrier will hire an attorney for the city who works in conjunction with the City Attorney□s office.

Legal Case Management; If the city is sued or if a local board decision is appealed to court, the council will receive immediate e-mail notice and a copy of the suit. If the case involves unusual issues or will require an extraordinary expenditure of funds, the case attorney will meet with the City Council in executive session to review the facts, options and strategies. The Council generally provides broad guidance to the attorney and delegates case management to the attorney and City Manager. The matter is brought back to the council as updates are necessary or key decisions are required.

If the city is about to commence a legal action such as a law suit or major enforcement action, the Council must be directly involved in the decision. The council also directly makes decisions about appeals of Superior Court decisions to the Supreme Court.

Open Meeting Law: As a public body, the City Council is subject to the provisions of the open meeting law. Over the last few years, the Council has attempted to utilize executive sessions as infrequently as possible. The Council has adopted a formal statement regarding open meetings as guidance for city committees. It is particularly important to avoid deliberation and decision making on substantive matters either electronically or in non- public meetings. (i.e. four or council members standing on a sidewalk or at a social event or even in the council chambers after a meeting has formally adjourned). Council meetings are televised on local cable TV, streamed live on the web with the video archived on the web so that they can be viewed after the factl

Public Records: Similarly, the City is subject to the state's open records law. Generally all city documents or records are considered open to the public. The law contains some specific exemptions. There is evolving law developing on electronic records and communications. As stated earlier, any e-mail you send or receive in your capacity as a City Council Member may be considered a public record and could be released to a member of the public or press.

Rules of Procedure: The Council adopts Rules of Procedure for itself for the ensuing year. This generally occurs at the first meeting after March elections. A copy of the current rules of procedure are included.

Vermont League of Cities & Towns: The city is a member of VLCT. The League is an association of all municipal governments in Vermont. Their mission is to strengthen and serve Vermont local government. They are the lobbying voice of municipalities and also provide many direct services, products and training. The city purchases health insurance through the VLCT health trust, for example.

City Manager:

Montpelier operates under the Council-Manager form of city government. Under this system, the City Council is the legislative body with responsibility for adopting policy (including financial policy) for the city, making certain board/commission appointments and enacting ordinances and regulations. The City Manager is appointed by the City Council to implement council policies, appoint/remove city staff, enforce local ordinances and regulations and run the local government. Title X of the City Charter details the duties and authority of the City Manager. In practical terms, the relationship between Council and Manager is similar to that of School Board-Superintendent or a Board of Directors and an Executive Director.

In this system, all city employees (except the City Clerk/Treasurer) report directly or indirectly to the City Manager and the Manager has administrative authority over all departments. This includes appointment and removal authority. The Manager is the link between the elected representatives of the community (the Council) and the administrative and service delivery end of government (the departments/employees).

Interaction with City Council: The Manager has very frequent interaction with the Council at meetings, in writing, by e-mail and by telephone. The Manager provides reports, updates and action recommendations to the council. As mentioned earlier, Council actions are a product of the group as a whole. As such, priority is placed on those issues which have been endorsed, supported, approved or directed by the group. Requests from individual council members are handled as appropriate and may be referred to the whole council for consideration. Constituent complaints, however, will be responded to directly unless they involve policy decisions. The Manager□s office also receives many direct citizen comments and is handling any number of internal operational issues at a given time.

Annual Performance Review; The City Council conducts an annual performance review of the City Manager in January and February (prior to elections and potential changes on the Council). Each Council member receives a written evaluation form which they complete and return to the Manager□s office. A compilation of all responses is made and distributed to the Council for review. The Council and Manager then meet in a special workshop executive session to discuss the written comments, the manager□s performance and the performance of all city operations.

This has proven to be a very productive and constructive process for both the Manager and the Council.

Employment Agreement; The City Manager has a written employment agreement with the City Council. The agreement is reviewed in conjunction with the Manager□s annual review.

Municipal Operations; The City government is responsible for the following operations.

Elections/Licenses/Revenues/Cash Management - *City Clerk/Treasurer Charlotte Hoyt 223-9500 choyt@montpelier-vt.org*
Fire/Ambulance/Building Inspection/Emergency Management/Health- *Fire Chief Gesualdo Schneider 229-4913 gschneider@montpelier-vt.org*
Police/Parking/Dispatch - *Police Chief Anthony Facos 223-3445 afacos@montpelier-vt.org*
Public Works incl. Streets, Water, Sewer, Equipment - *Public Works Director Todd Law 223-9508 tlaw@montpelier-vt.org*
Planning/Development/Zoning/Housing - *Planning Director Gwendolyn Hallsmith 223-9506 ghallsmith@montpelier-vt.org*
Finance/Risk Management/Information Systems - *Finance Director Sandy Gallup 223-9510 sgallup@montpelier-vt.org*
Property Assessment - *Assessor Stephen Twombly 223-9504 stwombly@montpelier-vt.org*
Tax Collection/Legislative-Community Liaison - *Assistant City Manager Beverlee Hill 223-9512 bhill@montpelier-vt.org*
Parks & Parks Commission – *Elected Parks Commission*, *Parks Director Geoff Beyer 223-7335 gbeyer@montpelier-vt.org*
Green Mount Cemetery – *Elected Independent Cemetery Commission, Cemetery Superintendent Patrick Healy 223-5352 gcemetery@montpelier-vt.org*

The City Clerk/Treasurer is elected directly by public, all others appointed by City Manager except Cemetery Superintendent who is appointed by the Cemetery Commission.

City Manager□s Office
City Hall - 39 Main Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
802-223-9502 Phone
802-223-9519 Fax
wfraser@montpelier-vt.org

City Manager□s Residence
93 Towne Hill Road
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
802-223-5936 Phone
802-522-5846 Cell Phone

The City Manager□s Executive Assistant is Sandy Pitonyak and the other Staff Assistant is Jane Aldrighetti. City Hall Hours of operation are 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM Monday through Friday.

Montpelier City Council

2010-2011 Goals and Priority Initiatives

Adopted July 14, 2010

Human and Social Well-Being: ***Maintain and enhance the quality of life in Montpelier for the present and future generations by improving Montpelier's downtown, neighborhoods, and public services for businesses, residents, and visitors.***

1. Determine future direction of the Senior Center and Senior Services – local or regional, what is the scope of services offered? Present location or new facility? How are user fee structure managed?
2. Perform fiduciary duty and review role of the City Council with regard to the Recreation Department, their facilities and program management.
3. Maintain cost-effective and high quality public services by answering fire and police calls, maintaining roads and sidewalks, providing clean water and functioning sewers, providing housing and other community facilities, and supporting local businesses.
4. Support the creative initiatives in the community that provide cultural and artistic opportunities for residents and visitors.
5. Complete the ADA Transition Plan and implement improvements for accessibility.

Efficient Infrastructure, Services and Built Environment: ***Maintain and enhance the City's Infrastructure and Services.***

1. Decide how to proceed on Transit Center project.
2. Adopt a capital plan net of debt service that protects, preserves and invests in the City.
3. Continue efforts to improve pedestrian and bike access, create bike paths, and maintain sidewalks and bridges.
4. Work with State to assure a safe railroad system which does not harm existing businesses, residents or disrupt municipal projects.
5. Evaluate alternatives for street lighting expenses.
6. Continue to support the city workforce and provide excellent services.
7. Decide the future of City buildings – 58 Barre St, Rec. Center, Main St. School.

Good Governance: ***Engage citizens in decision-making to insure that the city continues to provide quality infrastructure and services that are cost-effective, fiscally prudent, and sustainable.***

1. Investigate Shared Services, Planning and Regionalization with neighboring communities.
2. Continue efforts through technology and good practices to make city government (and related information) as open and accessible to the public as possible.
3. Complete the reappraisal and appeal process so that the property tax system is based on fair and equitable values.
4. Decide whether to propose alternate revenue sources such as local options taxes.
5. Complete the enVision Montpelier process to establish long-term goals, targets, and strategies to make Montpelier an economically successful and sustainable state capital. Adopt a new Master Plan.
6. Engage outside consultant to assist the City Manager in an operations review.
7. Conduct a follow up National Citizen Survey in 2011.
8. Review the entire Committee structure within City government.
9. Address the water fund deficit including reconsideration of merger with Berlin Fire District #1, securing agreements with large customers, reviewing the rate structure and opening discussions with Berlin about a shared water system.
10. Establish a process to review existing ordinances and possible amendments to the city charter (such as appointing the Treasurer and District Energy authorization).
11. Continue to strive for excellence in government by treating all citizens with respect and dignity.

Economic Security and Wealth Creation: ***Support and encourage responsible and safe economic growth and development for the city.***

1. Recognize housing as a primary economic development activity. Take affirmative steps to develop 500 new housing units in the city over the next five years. Such steps may include a TIF district, use of the housing trust fund or discussions with the housing task force and developers to create an effective strategy.
2. Develop a common definition of economic development (such as increasing the grand list or assisting with business location) and establish an strategy consistent with the definition.
3. Pursue and support a District Energy initiative to provide stable and renewable heat to institutions, businesses, and residents and to take advantage of emerging technologies for power production.
4. Recognize, support, and maintain the city's historic character as well as support local businesses and institutions. Consider impact of vacant properties.
5. Work to develop Sabin's Pasture to enhance the natural and recreational amenities for residents while encouraging family housing.
6. Continue emergency planning for city residents, including the CAN program.

Healthy Natural Environment: ***Conserve and enhance the city's natural resources.***

1. Take action to prevent ice jam flood risks and continue with flood mitigation efforts. Work with the Army Corps of Engineers and the State of Vermont to complete the flood mitigation study.
2. Continue and expand practices which result in energy conservation, reduced consumption of fossil fuels, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and waste reduction.
3. Continue with water conservation efforts and improvements in the water system to account for lost water.
4. Take action to protect and preserve Berlin Pond as the city's water source.

On Wednesday evening, February 23, 2011, the City Council met in the Council Chambers.

Present: Mayor Hooper; Council Members Weiss, Golonka, Sherman, Hooper, and Sheridan. Council Member Jarvis and City Manager Fraser were away.

Call to Order by the Mayor:

Mayor Hooper called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

11-053. General Business and Appearances

Elizabeth Dodge from the Montpelier Senior Center appeared before the Council to thank Council Member Sheridan for everything he had done for her as a constituent. The Senior Center's Advisory Board appreciates his work and said he was going to be missed.

11-054. Consideration of the Consent Agenda

a) Consideration of the Minutes from the December 22, 2010 meeting.

b) Approval of the City Manager's Contract renewal for March 13, 2011 through March 12, 2014.

c) Consideration of authorizing and approving the submittal of a grant application from the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation, through the financial assistance program, for the construction of Municipal Water Pollution Control Facilities and to authorize the City Manager to execute the grant application on behalf of the governing body.

d) Consideration of becoming the Liquor Control Commission for the purpose of acting on the following:

1. Ratification of the issuance of two Catering Permits from Yebba, Ind., d/b/a The Abbey Pub & Restaurant for:

(a) A Cocktail Reception held on Tuesday, February 15th, from 3:00 to 7:00 P.M. in the Cedar Creek Room of the State House.

(b)A Cocktail Reception scheduled to be held on Wednesday, February 23rd, from 3:00 to 7:00 P.M. in the Cedar Creek Room of the State House.

2. Ratification of the issuance of a Special Event Permit to *Go America, Go Beverages, LLC,* d/b/a/ "Whistle Pig Whiskey," for a Legislative Tasting Event scheduled to be held on Thursday, February 24th, from 2:30 to 6:30 P.M. in the State House Cafeteria.

3. Application from Hyzer Industries, Inc., /d/b/a Three Penny Taproom, for a Cheese Reception/Concert scheduled to be held on Friday, March 4th, from 7:00 to 11:00 P.M. in the City Hall Auditorium.

Additional Item

Application from El Portico submitted by Angelo and Joanna Caserto for a liquor control license at LaPizzaria in Montpelier.

c) Payroll and Bills.

General Fund Warrant dated February 9, 2011 in the amount of $285,725.84. Payroll Warrant dated February 17, 2011 in the amount of $34,989.64 and $120,817.99.

Motion was made by Council Member Sheridan, seconded by Council Member Weiss to approve the consent agenda. The vote was 5-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-055. Appointment to Planning Commission.

a) Following the resignation of Missa Aloisi, staff advertised to fill this position; listed below are the names of those who submitted letters of interest and/or resumes:

Michael Tarrant	Kimberly Cheney, Esq.
144B Main Street, Apt. #2	c/9 Cheney, Brock & Saudek, PC
	159 State Street

b) Recommendation: Opportunity to meet applicants; possible Executive Session in accordance with Title I § 313, Executive Sessions, (3) *The appointment or employment or evaluation of a public officer or employee;* appointment to fill the unexpired 2-year term until August 2012.

Michael Tarrant had withdrawn his application for the appointment to the Planning Commission.

Kimberly Cheney, Esq. reported he was happy to be back in Montpelier. He thinks a lot of people put a lot of work into the Master Plan and really tried to cover all of the bases you need to make a city work. He would love the opportunity to be involved in the city. He thinks there is a big job ahead to make the Master Plan work. He would welcome the appointment.

Motion was made by Council Member Sheridan, seconded by Council Member Sherman to appoint Kimberly Cheney to the Planning Commission. The vote was 5-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-056. Presentation of the City's Audit Report for FY July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010.

a) Steve Love of Love, Cody & Company, CPA's, will present the Audit Report to the Council.

b) Recommendation: Receive report; opportunity for discussion; acceptance of the City's FY 10 Audit Report.

Finance Director Gallup introduced the Finance Department's staff .

Steve Love from Love, Cody & Company, CPA's appeared before the Council to present the Audit Report. He reviewed the Management's Discussion and Analysis and went over some of the financial reports. Excerpts of the Independent Audit Report will be made a part of the minutes.

Mayor Hooper said in his notes he said while the city has a great deal of debt he also noted we have the annual revenues that more than cover these costs. Is this a flag to them? Are they concerned?

Mr. Love said he would say the city has a higher percentage of debt than some of the other municipalities he is auditing. That is why he brought up the fact that the finances of this year were certainly covering the debt service requirements and since those are staying consistent going forward he doesn't see it as an issue. He would caution the city not to incur a great deal more debt if it can be avoided. It is not an easy black and white question though when you compare different municipalities. What you don't see there is the condition of the infrastructure is how new the sewer treatment plant is compared to some other towns. You always have to think about how you are going to pay it back when you take on new debt.

Council Member Golonka said the city's deficit in the water and sewer fund how would he advise them to get out of that hole?

Mr. Love said it looked like they hadturned the corner on some of that. The deficit for those funds is largely how you present the net of capital assets so they are showing up as a piece of the fund balance. Looking at cash flows he thinks they are in decent shape. Where you have an issue is where you do tax anticipation borrowing and can't retire it.

Council Member Weiss said he has a comment about whether there are benchmarks. If we look at the year 2011 the principal is roughly $1,400,000. Project that out to the year 2020 and the total there is $7,200,000. Something has to end in order for that magnitude of principal payments and interest to be made, and those numbers are going to come back to haunt them.

Motion was made by Council Member Weiss, seconded by Council Member Golonka that the Council receive the Annual Audit Report for Fiscal Year 2010. The vote was 5-0, motion carried unanimously.

Council Member Hooper said during the budget process they were wondering when they were going to receive the Audit Report and wondering if there was a way to accelerate the process so they can have the report earlier.

Mr. Love replied he hoped so because they don't like doing audits once they get into the tax season. They first saw the draft statements on January 11th and that was why there report was late.

11-057. Consideration of approving and authorizing the City Manager to contract for technical support services regarding the development of the District Heat Plant.

a) The City applied for, and received, an $8 million grant from the Department of Energy Community Renewable Energy Program funded by ARRA to develop a district heating system fueled with locally harvested renewable biomass energy.

b) The project would be developed in partnership with State Government/Buildings and General Services (BGS) which currently operates a central heating plant in Montpelier.

c) For the City to develop the proposed routing, preliminary design and cost estimates of the heat distribution system along with providing BGS critical information for sizing and selecting the boilers which will replace the current aged boilers at their central heating plant, the City proposes to contract for assessment and preliminary design services with Community Biomass Systems.

   Recommendation: Authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with Community Biomass Systems, Inc. for the necessary technical services up to the amount of $95,490.

Harold Garabedian and Planning & Development Director Hallsmith were present to answer questions about the district heating plant.

Mr. Garabedian said they were moving ahead with their discussions with the State of Vermont. The State is moving ahead with the heat plant development so the city will move ahead with the distribution heat element of it. In order to do that they would like to have a limited scope of services to help them identify the connected load, design the optimum routing, understanding the permitting requirements for the piping and to convey the information about the connected load back to the state so they can size boilers. They did come up with a default route for the purposes of some planning, but as they move towards making some final decisions it is best to identify what a final route would be and get a cost estimate to put together with the boiler plant. They are looking for the technical support to get that work done.

Mayor Hooper said this is a process to enable us to gather some more information so the Council can then make a decision about how to move forward.

Mr. Garabedian said it would be refining the design of the routing primarily the pipes in the ground to distribute the heat.

Council Member Golonka inquired about $95,000 how much is the city responsible for that and how much will the federal grant cover?

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith replied the federal grant involves a 50 percent cost share so the city will pay half and they will pay half. Our share comes from a combination of the money we received from the Community Development Fund and the money the voters voted to authorize the permitting, designing and siting of the facility. The Phase I cost of the project, including the DOE allocation, allows about ¾ of a million dollars for this phase and we aren't there yet. This is an alternative that was proposed by McMillan, which was one of the three bidders we had in that process.

Council Member Weiss reported the Energy Committee met on Tuesday, February 15th, approved that which is before the Council, and if it isn't a conflict of interest he will move that they authorize the City Manager to enter into a contract with Community Biomass Systems for an amount up to $95,490. Council Member Sherman seconded the motion.

Council Member Golonka inquired if they would be at a decision point at the end of this process.

Mr. Garabedian replied this is part of the decision making process. This information about the distribution heat has to feed into the information about the heat plant to come up with an overall financial figure for the project. They expect to have that in May or June.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion. The vote was 4-0, with Council Member Sheridan abstaining.

11-058. Council Reports

Council Member Sheridan thanked everyone on the Council and spoke about his experiences serving on the City Council.

Council Member Sheridan said Council Member Sherman will become the senior representative on the Council. She is the only other person who has served longer than 10 years, and that is incredibly admirable. She did the right thing about changing his vote on the bus, and it is worked out well. She has always been good about taking on committee assignments that nobody else wanted, including the upcoming negotiations.

Council Member Sheridan told Mayor Hooper that since she has become Mayor that no one has given more time to the city than she has. Her dedication and commitment is incredible. She goes to tons of meetings and all kinds of things representing the city. She is highly visible and available to the people of the city. She is very intense and passionate about her love of the city. He really respects how much she cares about this city.

Council Member Sheridan thanked Council Member Golonka for becoming the hammer three years ago. It is a wearing and tough position to maintain. He asks the hard questions and gets into peoples' faces sometimes. He took the lead on the railroad issue. He plays an important role. The time he gives the city is incredible. He has five kids, a wife and a business and home and yet he sits on as many committees as anybody and takes them intensely serious.

Council Member Sheridan told Council Member Hooper he probably didn't realize how he helped him transition out of the role of the hammer. He is always so even keel in here and never gets worked up. He used him as an anchor to learn from. Thanks for being his hockey buddy and he will forgive him for cheering for the wrong team.

Council Member Sheridan told Council Member Weiss he made him chuckle when he told him he was his inspiration and mentor. He was looking at his high school diploma the other day and Superintendent of Schools Alan Weiss had signed it – this was in 1969, 40 years ago! Alan is an inspiration to all of them. At a time in life when most people sit on their laurels and are happy with what they have done he is still giving to his community and his mental sharpness is incredible. He hopes Alan will embrace and work with whomever replaces him on the Council.

Council Member Sheridan told City Clerk-Treasurer Hoyt that she has got to be the most dedicated committed employee of the City of Montpelier he has ever known. There was only one meeting he remembers her not being there. She is so committed the Council had to institute a policy to make her take a vacation because she wouldn't take her vacation.

Council Member Sheridan told Assistant City Manager Hill she is the epitome of class and grace in this city. How she handles people is just amazing. She knows when to be firm, when to negotiate and to be empathetic. She is an incredible example of how wonderful our city is. When she was asked to take over the Senior Center not only did she not complain but she did a phenomenal job.

Council Member Sheridan said he thinks he is leaving at a good time because we have a great set of department heads that the city's hands are in and great employees. He thanked all of them for making the Council and the City look good.

Council Member Sheridan said on a private level he needs to thank his two best fans and two best friends, his Mom and Dad. He relied on them so much over these last seven years for feedback and his triumphs, failures, hopes, dreams and frustrations. They have always given him good constructive criticism. They gave him the foundation in life to become the person he is.

Perfect attendance for 12 years is a very important thing for him. He doesn't think anybody out in the city can question his dedication and commitment and he is very proud of that. He wanted to come here and not be the same old kind of politician because he wanted to set an example but you have to be effective. People really are watching the Council Members and paying attention. He got on the Council in 1999 and in 2000 they added two people and it meant he got to be part of this exclusive club of five that just being in the right place at the right time he got to be part of the last Council of the old millennium and the first Council of the new millennium.

Goodbye, good luck and God Bless!

Council Member Weiss told Jim Sheridan that those of them who are here tonight signed his last agenda.

Council Member Sherman told Council Member Sheridan it has been a great eleven years! She has already blown the possibility of having perfect attendance and she is sure it will be hard to live up to his other standards as well.

Council Member Golonka said he is impressed by Council Member Sheridan's service to the city.

Council Member Hooper said he certainly doesn't agree with all of Council Member Sheridan's positions but he never questioned where his heart was or his love of the city.

11-059. Mayor's Report

None.

11-060. Report by City Clerk-Treasurer

City Clerk-Treasurer Hoyt reminded members of the Council and viewing public that the Annual City Meeting would be held next Tuesday, March 1, 2011 and the polls will be open from 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M.

11-061. Status Reports by City Manager

None.

11-062. Agenda Reports by the City Manager.

None.

Adjournment:

After motion was duly made by Council Member Sheridan, seconded by Council Member Sherman the council meeting adjourned at 8:24 P.M.

Transcribed by: Joan Clack

Attest: ________________________________

Charlotte L. Hoyt, City Clerk

On Wednesday evening, February 9, 2011, the City Council Members met in the Council Chamber.

Present: Mayor Hooper; Council Members Hooper, Golonka, Jarvis, Sheridan, Sherman and Weiss; also City Manager Fraser.

11-038. Call to Order by the Mayor

Mayor Hooper a called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

11-039. Consideration of entering into Executive Session in accordance with Title 1, §313, Executive Sessions, (3) *The appointment or employment or evaluation of a public officer or employee*, in order to conduct the City Manager's Annual Review.

Motion was made by Council Member Jarvis, seconded by Council Member Sherman to go into executive session in accordance with Title I, Sec 313, Executive Sessions, (3) to conduct the City Manager's annual review. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

Present: Mayor Hooper; Council Members Jarvis, Sherman, Sheridan, Weiss, Hooper and Golonka; also City Manager Fraser.

After motion duly made by Council Member Jarvis, seconded by Council Member Sherman the Council came out of executive session at 7:00 P.M., in accordance with Title I, Section 313, Executive Sessions, (a) whereby they had conducted the City Manager's annual review. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

TELEVISED PORTION OF MEETING BEGINS … 7:00 P.M.

11-040. General Business and Appearances

Ann Marie Kapel, Coordinator for the Montpelier Fashion Show came before the council to say they were hosting the seventh annual fashion show. She would like to have State Street from Main to Elm Street closed on the first Saturday of June, June 4th from 7:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. A tent will be pitched in the middle of the street which is about 80 feet long and 20 feet wide. The Fashion Show starts off with designers on the runway and the local downtown businesses participate as well.

There will be live music, hopefully the Glee Club from the Middle School will be performing on the street and the contemporary dance and fitness studio plans on doing a couple of dance numbers.

Mayor Hooper asked her to work with the Farmer's Market so they are aware this is happening. The event has been embraced by everyone.

Council Member Golonka said there was a concern he had heard about last year. There are a lot of kids present. Has that been addressed?

Ms. Kapel said it will absolutely not be there. It has been growing each year and as the crowd grows new things start popping up. There will be a rehearsal so there will be no surprises.

Council Member Weiss said if they coordinated with Montpelier Alive he would be satisfied.

Council Member Jarvis said it is really a fun event and it is nice to see that it is growing and something that people come to Montpelier to see.

11-041. Consideration of the Consent Agenda:

a) Consideration of the Minutes from the City Council's December 8th and December 15th, 2010 Meetings.

b) Consideration of approving the Annual Highway Mileage Certificate for State Fiscal Year 2012. The certificate is required annually by the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) – Division of Planning, Outreach & Community Affairs (formerly Policy & Planning Division). The certificate provides a formal documentation of the length in miles of public highways owned and maintained by the City of Montpelier for each of the four highway classifications. The certificate is the basis for determining the amount of state aid participation a town receives for highway maintenance. Note that there is a slight change this year in our Class 1 mileage due to construction related realignment measurements at the Rte. 2 / Rte. 302 intersection. The document must be returned to VTrans by no later than February 20, 2011. A majority of City Council will need to sign the certificate in the space provided. The City Clerk will record the document upon return receipt of the approved certificate from the Agency.

c) Consideration of authorizing the Police Department to purchase two new parking vending machines; these machines would be replacements for the 60 State Street and Capitol Plaza parking lots. Cale Parking Systems submitted a proposal for $27,810 (initial cost for the two machines plus installation/training); this would allow the Parking Division to have these units operational in the spring of 2011.

d) Consideration of authorizing the City Manager to sign a "Reservation of Rights" for the *Walker Motors, Inc. et al v. City of Montpelier, VT, et al* case. The City has coverage under the Vermont League of Cities and Towns Property and Casualty Intermunicipal Fund, Inc. ("PACIF") program. This means PACIF is willing to assign defense counsel (McNeil, Leddy & Sheahan) to defend the claims, under a reservation of rights, if agreeable with City Council.

e) Consideration of leasing three updated digital imaging systems:

1) Due to incentives that are currently being offered by digital imaging system providers, the City has the opportunity to have newer digital imaging equipment with added functions and save money when compared to our current costs.

2) Staff recommends accepting OCE's proposal for a five-year lease for three digital servicing systems at the monthly cost of $1,150.00. This proposal includes consolidating and improving the printing, copying, scanning and faxing functions in the Finance, Planning and Clerk/Treasurer's Offices. (See memo from Finance Director dated January 14, 2011.)

3) This item was pulled from the January 20th Consent Agenda due to a question about the current lease buyout. The question has been answered, and staff continues to recommend accepting OCE' North America's proposal.

f) Acting as the Liquor Control Commission, City Council Members may now consider the following:

1. Ratification of the issuance of a Catering Permit to Yebba, Inc., d/b/a The Abbey Pub & Restaurant, for a Cocktail Reception on Thursday, February 10th, from 3:00 to 7:00 P.M. in the Cedar Creek Room of the State House.

2. Ratification of the issuance of a Catering Permit to Vermont Hospitality Management, d/b/a New England Culinary Institute, for a Dinner on Thursday, February 10th, from 4:30 to 8:30 P.M. at National Life's Hopkins House.

3. Ratification of the issuance of a Catering Permit to Hyzer Industries, Inc., d/b/a Three Penny Taproom, for a *"Customer Appreciation Party"* on Friday, February 11th, from 6:00 to 8:00 P.M. at Onion River Sports, 20 Langdon Street.

4. Application for an "*Educational Sampling Event"* Permit from Vermont Brewers' Association for a Vermont Grocers' Association Legislative Reception scheduled to be held on Thursday, February 24th, from 4:00 to 8:00 P.M. in the State House Cafeteria.

g) Approval of Payroll and Bills

General Fund Warrant dated January 27, 2011 in the amount of $377,954.20.
Payroll Warrant dated February 3, 2011 in the amount of $33,154.48 and $113,095.18.

Motion was made by Council Member Sheridan, seconded by Council Member Weiss to approve the consent agenda.

Council Member Sherman said she had a question about the parking vending machines. There is always a lot of confusion about whether people have to pay on weekends. She would like to pull that.

Council Member Golonka said he needs to recuse himself from voting on the the Walker Motors issue.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion after removing the parking vending machine. The vote was 6-0, except on the Walker Motors issue where Council Member Golonka had recused himself.

11-041(A) Consideration of authorizing the Police Department to purchase two new parking vending machines; these machines would be replacements for the 60 State Street and Capitol Plaza parking lots. Cale Parking Systems submitted a proposal for $27,810 (initial cost for the two machines plus installation/training); this would allow the Parking Division to have these units operational in the spring of 2011.

Council Member Sherman said in response to the confusion about the current vending machines if these would also not be used on weekends because parking is free on weekends. If so can that be clearly marked.

City Manager Fraser said that would be their intent.

Council Member Weiss asked if the $27,000 included the training for the new vending machines.

City Manager Fraser replied it is inclusive.

Motion was made by Council Member Jarvis, seconded by Council Member Sherman to authorize the Police Department to purchase two new parking vending machines. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-042. Consideration of approving, and authorizing the City Manager to sign, the Efficiency Vermont Contract; formally endorse the forming of a committee to help the City move forward in improving the efficiency of its street lighting; and appoint citizens who have indicated an interest in serving on this committee.

a) This process will involve both eliminating unnecessary streetlights and converting remaining lights to more energy efficient technology.

b) The committee will guide the City through the process of developing an accurate inventory of lighting, assessing lighting needs and levels, and developing a project scope and budget; staff anticipates a six-month time commitment.

c) Staff advertised and will provide Council with the names of those individuals who are interested in serving.

d) Recommendation: Approve the contract with Efficiency Vermont and authorize the City Manager to sign the document; formally endorse the forming of a committee; and make the appointments to this "temporary" committee.

City Manager Fraser said the Council over the last year or two has included looking at street lighting as part of its priorities and looked at some options for doing that. In the spring they received a Letter of Intent from Honeywell and they worked up some preliminary numbers for us and they basically decided that wasn't the way to go. It didn't look like it was going to be cost effective for the city. In the meantime there have been some other programs including Efficiency Vermont and the Town of Hartford on their own did some new lighting. They started looking at alternatives. Paul Markowitz, does contract work Efficiency Vermont and he offered to volunteer as a citizen to head this up. He is interested in leading the city through this process. The idea is we would enter into an Efficiency Vermont contract with the idea to create a committee to take a look at the process. Tom McArdle will talk about some of the options available to us. They are asking the Council to approve the contract with Efficiency Vermont and approve creating a committee and going forward with this effort.

Tom McArdle, Assistant Director of Public Works said the city recently received a letter from Green Mountain Power saying that as mercury is a hazardous product, they were phasing out those lights. Montpelier has a rate 16 for our lights, which is $10 per month for a 100 watt bulb. Green Mountain Power notified us they are going to be replacing the lights for us with LED, and have already done so in several locations. This would move us to a rate 18 which is about a 30 to 40 percent increase in cost depending on what the equivalent is.

That is really forcing our hands because we are looking at a substantial increase. The problem with Green Mountain Power's conversion to LED lights is that although they will be paying much less in electrical costs there is no payback. We are at rate 18 forever. The cost of the fixture are about $500 or $600 each. They were looking at a process or program where we would purchase the lights and own them and contract with the utility company to install them. They have exclusive domain over the utility pole. Only they can be on the pole and work in the area where the power is. The city would enter into an agreement with Green Mountain Power as Hartford did to do any maintenance. Of course, with LED lights maintenance is nothing. In fact the first five years they are under warranty and have a 20 year life cycle and maintain their lumines throughout their life. They are a cluster of LEDs with a whole bunch of little lights so if you lose a few diodes you still have decent lighting.

The idea would be to purchase them, use the Efficiency Vermont grant of about $300 a fixture and then develop a financing arrangement so we would pay that down eventually and have about $100,000 a year in lighting bills and hope to get that down to 70 percent of that cost. One thing that Hartford did which we really need to do, is do an inventory of our lights. The grant they would sign with Efficiency Vermont would include 10 or 12 hours of engineering consulting services which is another benefit that is provided free with this arrangement to help evaluate it. Hartford ended up eliminating about 30 percent of their total light inventory which decreased the time in payback. We would be well advised to do the same thing and do a light inventory. There are more areas in town that are more rural like Upper Elm Street and Upper Terrace Street where maybe our headlights are good enough and we don't need street lights.

Lighting is all about security and convenience. The Police Department would probably like to double the amount of lights because it is an important crime deterrent. The committee should be comprised of somebody from the Police Department, Fire Department, Public Works and a couple of citizens and a Member of the City Council.

City Manager Fraser said they should also include a member from the city's Energy Committee.

Assistant Public Works Director McArdle said Green Mountain Power is in the process of replacing our mercury vapor lights with LEDs now. The one he has

been using to show the difference is located at Main and Brown Streets. At that intersection there is an LED and on either side. The first one they put in was a demo. Green Mountain Power called and asked if they could replace a light with an LED down near the cemetery. The city owned downtown lights Honeywell thought those lights could also be replaced with LEDs.

Mayor Hooper said the Energy Committee talked about this and she wondered if Council Member Weiss had anything he wanted to add.

Council Member Weiss said the Energy Advisory Committee did not discuss this and that is one of the reasons they are asking for a seat on the committee.

Council Member Hooper said Public Works Director McArdle said Green Mountain Power shows the increase brightness of our lights meaning we have to pay more even though they take less electricity.

Discussion followed. Motion was made by Council Member Weiss, seconded by Council Member Sherman to approve authorizing the City Manager to sign the Efficiency Vermont Contract and appoint a committee at a later date. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

Assistant Public Works Director McArdle said one of the things the committee needs to do is develop criteria for keeping lights and if there are going to be some minimum light levels and housing density.

Council Member Weiss asked if they could just authorize the City Manager in conjunction with Tom to form a committee. Council Member Weiss made a motion authorizing the City Manager in conjunction with Assistant Public Works Director McArdle to form the committee. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-043. Carr Lot Update

a) Jeff Tucker, P.E. from DuBois & King, Inc., will provide this update to City Council Members.

b) Recommendation: Receive update; opportunity for discussion.

Jeffrey Tucker, from DuBois & King, the city's Municipal Project Manager of the Multi-Modal and Transit Center Project, and Andy DeForge from VTrans, appeared before the council for this agenda item.

City Manager Fraser said this summer they outlined a plan to move forward with the Carr Lot. This is an opportunity to update Council Members on the status of the project.

Jeffrey Tucker reviewed information in his memorandum that he had provided to the Council on this project. This will be made a part of the minutes. He also reviewed maps of the project area.

Mayor Hooper said she had some questions about how they were going to move through the design stage of the Carr Lot itself which does include the bike path to some degree. This was adopted five years ago by this group and looked at even more years by the community. We need to think about a process as we enter the preliminary design phase to reengage the community. The Farmer's Market is interested in this space so we need to make sure it accommodates their needs. Concerns she has always had with public space development is we pay careful attention to how people use the space as opposed to how we choose to put buildings on the space and assume people will behave around it. They are talking about creating a significant green space that is in an area we are not used to using and we don't want to create something that doesn't work well for the community. She is excited about the project and the opportunity to redesign the intersection at Main and Barre Streets.

Mr. Tucker said this project ends at the sidewalk on Main Street so it doesn't include any improvements to the intersection of Main and Barre.

Mayor Hooper said this is such a wonderful opportunity to look at that intersection she would like to see them line up the resources to do that. Then they have to figure out how the bike path gets across the street.

11-044. Flood Study Update:

a) Jeff Tucker, P.E. from DuBois & King, Inc., has provided City Council Members with a "Winooski River Flood Damage Risk Reduction Project Status Report", as well as summary maps.

b) Recommendation: Receive update from Jeff; opportunity for discussion.

Jeff Tucker from DuBois & King presented an updated report on the Winooski River Flood Damage Risk Reduction Project and Flood Study Update to the Council in a memorandum dated February 2, 2011 to the City Manager which is included as a part of the minutes.

City Manager Fraser said they have talked about the flood study at length during the budget process

Mr. Tucker said to refresh everyone's memory that when the ice jam of 1992 happened following that in 1996 a pretty detailed reconnaissance study was completed through the Army Corps of Engineers laying out a number of potential alternatives to reduce the potential for future ice jam flooding events. That laid dormant for awhile and with some recent high water marks and potential serious flooding again there was renewed interest and the Army Corps of Engineers partnering with the City of Montpelier as well as the State of Vermont has launched into the next phase of a feasibility study. He is assisting the city with in-kind services that can be done at the local level.

City Manager Fraser said after the flood of 1992 the city and the Army Corps of Engineers did a reconnaissance study and then in 1994 or 1995 the Council decided not to do much more with it so it sat dormant. Then, when they had the flood scare in 2007 they reactivated the old project.

Mr. Tucker said there are some maps included which show the floodplain. One of the key recommendations in the reconnaissance study in 1996 is what they referred to as ice retention piers which are concrete piers put into the river, spaced about 12 feet apart so there is still a natural river flowing between, and as the ice lifts up and breaks it is caught at the piers and allows the ice to run further downstream to flush itself out.

11-045. District Energy Update

a) Planning Director Gwen Hallsmith and the Montpelier Energy Advisory Team will provide this update.

b) Recommendation: Receive update; opportunity for discussion; possible direction to staff.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith and Carl Etnier from the Energy Advisory Team appeared before the Council to provide an update on the district energy. Mr. Etnier said they have been talking to the state about how the business arrangement will work between the city and the state as they move forward with the project. One of the proposals at this point is to look at the state's plant as the "state plant" and the state would continue to control what happens there.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said the state has been encouraging the city to look closely at setting up a municipal utility and working hard to recruit a lot of the building owners on our side of the street to join into the plant before we build it, to sign letters of commitment, because part of the struggle right now is how to plan for future capacity. If we do a fairly extensive effort right now to recruit that people who are already ready and willing to sign up for the facility now that they are zooming in on what the likely price that will make us better able to plan for future capacity. Harold Garabedian has been in touch with the General Services administration of the United States government who control the Post Office and Social Security buildings. There is a new Executive Order out for them that requires them to shift from fossil fuels as quickly as possible so the district energy plant fits very neatly into those plans. They are really poised to sign a letter of commitment to be on the system. It is another public building and there is nothing risky about that. If they make a commitment to it, it is a fairly sizeable building in terms of square footage. She understands the City Manager has been approached by some of the big building owners in the downtown as well saying they are ready to sign on. They are trying to get as many of those commitments as they can so they can adequately size the facility as they move into the next phase. The state right now is focused on their end and the city needs to focus more on our end. To that end Carl has a recommendation for the Council from the Energy Committee.

Carl Etnier said they still see it as desirable to continue looking for a way to make the district heating plant work for the city. They are by no means confident that an alternative that does work will come forward. They are not ready to recommend the project go forward because they don't have a concrete project. The recommendation is that the city pursue the option of collaborating with the state on the biomass district heating plant by buying steam or hot water from the state, which will own the new plant, while the city builds and maintains the distribution pipes for the city portion of the system. This basically says if this is the way the negotiations are going then follow them and see what we come up with.

Council Member Weiss said he was one of the 10 people that Gwen has appointed to that committee and they have been beyond faithful. There has been close to 100 percent attendance and they are only supposed to meet once a month but have been meeting most times twice a month and sometimes more. The committee has divided itself into some subcommittees. Gwen has nominated a good group of people, the Council has appointed them and they are doing a great job.

Mayor Hooper said they have suggested the Council adopt the statement that if everything works we enter into an agreement.

City Manager Fraser said the statement simply says we will pursue it.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said one of the shift this new direction represents which is a slight divergence of what they have been discussing so far is the initiative is to try and identify more of the buildings on our side of the city that will be willing to hook up and get their commitment as soon as possible. That is one of the things that is really critical about capacity planning. It is likely that when they come to the Council when the project is solidified that there will be a number of those commitments as part of the city's end of the bargain, and that is important.

Council Member Weiss said they aren't going to know anything until the Legislature adjourns because they for the moment are controlling this project. They are still subject to what the Legislature will include in their capital budget and what the Legislature will provide as conditions for the use of those dollars.

The city is not going to receive periodically interim reports which will be much like the committee adopted and Carl presented until May at the earliest.

City Manager Fraser said Council Member Weiss is correct. There is nothing that can officially happen at the city's end on a big scale until the Legislature has acted. There are some things we may need to do in the meantime because in order for Buildings and General Services to put forth something for the Legislature as far as a project proposal the city will be partners to that so we may have to agree on what is being presented. The Council may be asked to sign on or vote to approve a proposal that is going to the Legislature. It doesn't mean we are bringing it to the voters until you see what comes out of the Legislature. The city is trying to negotiate a framework. The current operating model is what was articulated by Carl. We still like the idea of it all being one project but politically they aren't sure how that is going to end up so they are looking at a lot of options. The other piece is while they do not think they will be asking for authorization to sign on for any big commitment of construction the Technical Review Committee is still looking at this. They are feeling the need to bring on greater technical expertise than what they have available to them as they start talking through the options. They may be looking to recommend one of the bidders as a partner to the city while not making any commitment for future design or construction. Council Member Weiss is correct. The plant is the state's plant and last spring and summer they have indicated to the city they were open to other options as far as it being owned privately, city or jointly, and more recently they have said they would like to retain ownership. He thinks from their perspective in terms of selling a bill to the Legislature they are going to say to the Legislature they need this money to fix their plant and as part of that Montpelier is going to do their project.

Council Member Weiss said going back to the City Manager's first point about the Legislature they would invite him to come and attend committee meetings as he sees fit to discuss with the committee the various plans that may be presented.

City Manager Fraser said Buildings and General Services has a deadline of February 22nd to get something to the Legislature.

Mayor Hooper said Legislature will be off Town Meeting week which begins February 28th and Buildings and General Services needs to be saying to the Institutions Committee here is the plan. Historically, the House has tried to get the capital plan out to the Senate immediately after Town Meeting week. The Governor has recommended a capital budget with a sum of money for the state to spend on the steam plant which is on the order of $2 million. The Governor has made a significant commitment.

Council Member Jarvis said at this point the thought is the state owns the plant, the city pays for additional capacity, and the city does the capital investment improvements for laying the pipes and become a utility and full purchaser from the state to resell to the federal government and private property owners.

Mr. Etnier said the latter phrasing would meet with more approval from Dick Saudek who attended the last meeting. He didn't like the word utility used in conjunction with this thermal energy distribution entity because it would not be regulated.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said there is a bonding issue there also.

Council Member Jarvis asked where we were in terms of our bidders for the original RFP.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said they are all still holding their breath.

City Manager Fraser said what staff is thinking is they would like to engage one of them in a consulting role. They have all indicated a willingness to stay in.

We would bring one on as our partner to provide the technical assistance for now with a consulting type contract. We aren't going to make any kind of multi million dollar commitments until they know they can have a project. The city's parameters remain pretty similar to what they have been saying all along. Their plan is that the city's costs would be taking a look at our current capital needs and what we need to replace over the next 20 years and seeing how that amortizes out. We don't want to add new costs. We don't want to speculate on unknown customers. The committee said if we have a firm commitment either from public or private customers and they sign that then they are in. With just the city and their three buildings and a couple of schools it's a lot of pipe for not a lot of heat although the grant certainly helps. That's a struggle to work out with the state who has to make a significant investment and upgrade to their plant.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said the issue of capacity is if they say they are going to project an additional 20 percent on top of what we know we need but the cost of carrying that capacity on our heating bills makes it more expensive.

Council Member Golonka asked the City Manager if he had engaged the school in this. We don't control the schools or the school buildings. If we don't have the schools on board then we are in much worse shape.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said Harold Garabedian has been in touch with the facility managers about the capacity and capital plan.

City Manager Fraser said the plan right now is for the High School and the Elementary School but not Main Street School. They have in the past indicated they would participate.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said they imagine the schools and businesses are similar to us. They want it to work financially. If they can offer the schools good prices for heat and more stable prices over the life of the boilers that's a smart decision.

Council Member Hooper said he is curious about what the commitments would look like from other property owners.

City Manager Fraser said he wouldn't expect someone to make a commitment and then find out it wouldn't work financially for them. Once they get a feel of what the cost would be then they could find out what their capacity was.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said right now the prices they are projecting for the district heat are comparable to the price of oil. One of the things they have had to stay on top of through the process are the projections for energy costs. Right now the current predictions for oil heating costs are that they will be back to 2008 levels by the beginning of 2012. Once you are into the $4 per gallon price for heating fuel this plant works for everybody. 2008 was when it spiked up to over $4 per gallon. The projections they are using in the model are very conservative and they have a very conservative increase over the 20 year period of less than 2 percent. She is comfortable with the existing financial models.

Mr. Etnier said he thinks it is worth pointing out that to live is to speculate so they can assume that oil prices are going to stay constant and plan the infrastructure on that.

Council Member Sherman said she heard them say hot water and steam combined.

Mr. Etnier said hot water or steam is the way the resolution was phrased with the idea there would be the state plant and it would be making thermal energy and then it would come over to the city side in either the form of hot water or steam and be transported by the pipes as hot water in the pipes.

Council Member Weiss said he would like to respond to Council Member Hooper. Not only would anybody who signs on have to determine whether economically the cost of what is being delivered is reasonable but they are going to also have to factor in the cost of hooking up.

Council Member Jarvis said she is still really unsure about this because she has all of these assumptions in her head. She is assuming there is all of this support out there in the community but she has not heard it. She knows the committee is really pushing this project but all she has received personally in feedback is don't do it. She is looking for some expressions of support. Her assumption all along have been is that this is the project that environmentally makes sense but again it is an assumption and she hasn't had this information given to her. Her assumption is that it is a project that will enhance the perception of Montpelier, what people think about it as a place to live, how forward thinking we are about our concerns about the environment. Her assumption is that it will actually enhance Montpelier in terms of the kind of place that people want to develop and want to inhabit. Then, lastly she has been coping all along that what the plant might mean is a decrease in our energy costs and what the city actually spends on energy costs. It sounds like now the goal is sort of looking at a revenue neutral over the long term which may be as good as it gets. The project feels like we the city, Gwen, Bill, Mary and the Committee has put so much time and effort into this project it is getting smaller and smaller and more difficult and less appealing to her personally. She needs some bolstering. She thinks others of the Council have also had a lot of negative feedback from the community. She just wants to express that and should have expressed it a long time ago.

City Manager Fraser said he is also hearing a lot of intrepidation, and a part of it is that people hear there is a $20 million project and assumes the city is going to be paying $20 million, and that is not the case. If oil goes to $3.80 or $4 per gallon then it isn't revenue neutral and we are saving a lot of money. As far as citizen support he notes that when they initially proposed a $250,000 bond for this a number of years ago it passed overwhelmingly. When we recently had a restatement of the bond to reallocate it for this it passed overwhelmingly. Then, when we proposed the charter changes this fall to authorize the district those passed overwhelmingly. There has been at least on the ballot when this issue has been presented to voters there has been strong support. He is a very cautious cheerleader on this project. The very first City Council meeting he ever attended here in Montpelier 16 years ago in January they talked about this project so it's not an overnight thing. It has been worked on for a long time, and if it isn't going to fly with an $8 million federal grant it's never going to fly. The time is now to run this to the end and see where it goes. He isn't going to recommend it to the Council if he doesn't think it flies, and neither is Gwen. Neither is the state; they aren't going to do it, either. They have the same pressures that the city does. They have had some moments with the state over how these arrangements go but they don't want a bad year either. We could be embarking on a 50 or 100 year relationship here so they get it. He feels like it's now or never. If we don't take it to the end to see what it looks like then we aren't serving our citizens and aren't serving the environment either.

Mr. Etnier said this could be the beginning of a wonderful friendship. The Montpelier Energy Advisory Committee is very interested in this project and thinks it has strong potential for the city. They would like to find a way to make it succeed and they haven't seen any version of it they can stand behind at this point. They are very interested in what happens with these negotiations with the state. He is very impressed by the number of moving parts we have

here with the Department of Energy and its oversight of the grant and the Renewable Energy Laboratory and the advice they provide to us and the federal building possibly getting connected, and the Legislature, Buildings and General Services, City Council and the private property owners who may or may not hook on. He is impressed with the number of moving parts and the complications of coordinating them. He is impressed with the steadfastness of the staff and their inventiveness in coming to grips with obstacles. Will it result in something that the Energy Advisory Committee will recommend that the city invest in? He doesn't know. They are skeptics, too.

Planning & Development Director Halllsmith said one last word on the other kinds of encouragement needed with respect to the environmental impacts of the plant, Harold as a former air regulator is familiar with these impacts of the existing plant and the projected impacts of the technology they have been looking at for the proposed plant. What he has calculated is that even with a rough doubling of the plant's capacity we will be reducing the net emissions by 11 tons a year. That is pretty huge. Think about the 11 tons in the air that we are breathing. The increased efficiency that we gain with the plant combined with the reduced reliance that the entire service area will have on fossil fuels is a huge environmental benefit. The other one is that right now we have all of these propane and oil tanks scattered throughout the city in a floodplain. If we can get rid of those tanks and those fuel sources and concentrate them in a flood proofed central plant that's another big benefit because we will flood again despite all of our best efforts. As long as we have all of the petroleum products getting into the water when that happens it's a big environmental impact. There are a number of very beneficial impacts of this plant if we can get it built.

Council Member Golonka said he shares a lot of Sarah's concerns and has heard a lot of the same things in the community. He is trying to understand where they are putting these pipes. It used to be behind the buildings and then you were talking about State Street. What would be the impact to the downtown community of this project and how will that play out? We looked at the construction project on River Street and it was devastating to the community. He understands long term benefits but it also has to work in the short term for businesses here in downtown. If we are planning on ripping up State Street completely, which is what he understands they are switching to, that really concerns him. The second issue he would have is they haven't had much success with the utility business. Our water plant is facing a $500,000 deficit. Our experiment with wireless failed miserably. How is this going to be different? How do you convince people in the community that this is going to be different? If you are going to get private partners in this you have to convince them that we aren't going down this path that is going to be similar to the water problems we are having right now or similar to the wireless on a grander scale. He is really concerned that those issues have to be addressed. Tonight hearing they are relying more on private partners that really scares him because all along we have been saying we aren't going t rely on private partners and makes this run on its own and now suddenly private partners are coming into the mix. Those are big concerns of his. He wants to voice them now because he doesn't want her coming to the Council saying this is their grand plan.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said she shares all of their concerns. The first one is about the pipes in the street and coming down State Street and staying on Main Street. Speaking for her they have not finally decided on the pipe routing and they are looking hard at alternatives that are less disruptive to the downtown. The reason they went with the route in the bidding process was because that was going to be the most expensive way to go and they wanted conservative assumptions in the material they were addressing. The other reason is because they are in the middle of completing their environmental assessment to use the federal dollars. Once that is complete they can still amend it, but to get it completed quickly we needed to use routes that we already owned the rights-of-way in or they would be stuck in right-of-way struggles before they could complete the environmental assessment. This is a time constrained project. They are absolutely still open to alternative routes. In fact, some of what they learned in the bidding process because the bidders themselves proposed alternative routes were similarly good ideas for how to address that problem. They are not interested at all in being asked to be disruptive going right now Main and State Streets. It seemed like a logical way to at least construct the base bids for the project was that it is an enabling route. The businesses are all very close on Main and State. The route that Veolia had proposed going down the railroad tracks would be a long distance to hook up any of the downtown and that would add to the cost of hooking up which would provide an additional financial disincentive for people to join them if they didn't join right away. Since then they have been thinking about having feeder routes that are actually publicly constructed go through back areas instead of down the main streets. They won't get to those final decisions for awhile.

Mayor Hooper said drawing an analogy between what this could be and what was experienced recently with other construction projects she would ask folks to remember extremely construction projects in the downtown where we installed new sidewalks on both sides of State Street and did it also on Langdon Street as a separate project. They worked extremely closely with the property owners, maintained access and were very successful in making that work for the community. It was a good project. We have some very nice successes and we can make it work.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said on the second point about the city's success in the utility business, when she is talking about how it is important for us to really look hard at planning the capacity of the plant is because we want to avoid an over capacity situation when they are overbuilding something and paying for it because we haven't picked up the slack. In Burlington Telecom's case that was part of the problem, the capacity planning. In our water plant's case it was regulatory capacity that we were required to have. There is nothing analogous in the heating business so that is why they are sharpening their pencils and looking really closely at what capacity they need to build to because that really is the biggest nut to crack in this. We aren't saying we are doing to depend on unknown private building hookups. We want to know they are wanting to hook up and get a firm commitment.

City Manager Fraser said what he thinks they are really talking about here is the two federal buildings and maybe one more building owner who comes to the city and requests to be hooked up. They aren't talking about 10 buildings. They talk about this, worry about this every single day and have exactly the same concerns as Council members do. One other key difference with the water plant is that first of all there has been a district heating system for 50 or

60 years with the state and the largest user of the system will still continue to be the existing user. The main capacity of the plant is still for the state.

Council Member Golonka said they don't have any hard numbers in front of them right now about the scale of the project.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith replied it really hasn't scaled down. It has been split up a little.

Council Member Jarvis said first they were talking about cogeneration, now we are just talking about heat and not owning the plant, so it has been scaled down.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said the structure might have changed but the plant's projections are still the same size. She thinks the jury is still out on this. We haven't actually rejected it.

City Manager Fraser said there was a discussion about going to all hot water and that would have eliminated the electricity. We're going to do steam and steam allows for electricity. Because it is in the state's plant they have said that is up to them. The structure has been driven by their desire. At one point they said they would consider turning it over to a private entity and now they are not. They own it.

Council Member Jarvis said there is something about this that feels like we are just trying to make something work so we can use this money. Maybe that isn't a legitimate characterization but there is a little bit of that feeling she has.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said they are just trying to make something work so the city will have a reliable and low cost renewable energy source as we get off fossil fuel. And she wants to use that money to do it, but the goal is to have a reliable local renewable energy source that heats the downtown because we are going to need that next year. The oil prices are not going to come down a lot in our near future, at least if you can believe what you read in the projections right now. That is why she is so excited about it and not just because of the money, although she doesn't want to lose the money.

Council Member Jarvis said she thinks it is important for the Council and for the community to hear that because people keep seeing us try to do something and not expressing the overall goals.

Council Member Weiss said the discussion has been excellent and the next meeting of the Energy Committee is February 15th and he requested a transcript of just this portion of the discussion so the committee could focus on it.

Mayor Hooper said it has been an excellent discussion and she feels they ought to continue having more discussions and updates. We need to keep the community aware of this as well.

The Council took a short break at 9:00 P.M.

11-046. Consultant Selection

a) Staff requested proposals for Consultant Services/Management Analysis, seeking an outside review/assessment of its organizational/supervisory structure, management systems, financial practices, staffing levels and staff capacity.

b) The Committee is conducting interviews with four firms selected as finalists:

1) Municipal Resources, Inc. Meredith, New Hampshire	$29,300
2) Novak Consulting Group, Cincinnati, Ohio	$23,500
3) Matrix Consulting Group, Andover, Massachusetts	$34,500
4) Eaton Peabody Consulting Group, Augusta, Maine	$25,000

c) Copies of the full proposals from these firms are posted on the City's website.

d) Recommendation: It is the intent of the Committee to provide a recommendation at this evening's Council meeting; discussion; selection of a consultant.

The Consultant Committee is comprised of Council Members Jarvis, Hooper and Weiss along with the City Manager have met for many long hours and have done a lot of work.

Council Member Jarvis said the committee recommended to the Council that the city engage in a management analysis and the city hire an outside consultant to do this with the goal of enhanced departmental effectiveness and efficiency. The Council endorsed the idea and an RFP was drafted and they received 13 responses to the RFP and were happy to have such a wide range of proposals. The proposals ranged in price from $14,000 to $114,000. The RFP was to conduct an outside review for an assessment of the city's organizational supervisory structure/management systems/financial practices and staffing levels and staff capacity. The committee reviewed the 13 proposals and narrowed it down to 4 and conducted interviews on Monday and Tuesday of this week. All four of the proposals they decided to interview were very strong and had very good interviews. Based on the proposal and the interviews they have narrowed it down to one that they suggest the Council endorse and allow us to enter into a contract with, and that is the Matrix Consulting Group who are an entity based in Massachusetts and also have an office in California. They were the entity that was the best on paper and in person. Their proposal was very strong and thorough as was their presentation.

They collectively offer many years of experience consulting with other municipalities, many in New England and several in Vermont and many of the communities they work with are also similar in size to Montpelier, and that was important to the committee. They were impressed with their breadth and depth of experience. They offer area experts in some of our different departments and could offer us some real knowledge and experience.

The written proposal was very responsive to what they asked for in the RFP. They are offering a real comprehensive look at our operations and organizational management functions of Montpelier. They are interested in how they will be able to help us for future planning, for how we position ourselves looking toward staffing changes we will have in the future or how they might change things when opportunities do arise such as how we might consolidate, divide and consider doing things differently than we do now. They really appreciated the recognition that this entity shows of the fact that we really have a lot of strength and experience in our own city staff right now. Part of what these folks will do will draw on some of those experiences and ideas that the people working in these jobs have.

They were struggling as a group with the fact that what they are asking for is an internal focus of our operations and management but they want to be careful to keep the process open to the public and it is clear this is something that we are engaged in as a community. These folks said the city is the client; it's not the Council or the Manager.

They would recommend that the Council allow the Committee to enter into a contract with the Matrix Consulting Group for $34,500. It is expected we would have a report from them by June. She would make that a motion. Council Member Hooper seconded the motion.

Council Member Hooper said of the four they looked at this group stood out for all of the committee at the end of the interview process. They all weighed that as them being more expensive than the other groups and for each of them was the case they seemed to be worth the extra money.

Council Member Jarvis said it is a four-person team that would be working with them.

Council Member Golonka thanked the committee for taking this on because it is valuable. How does the process work?

Council Member Jarvis said they will be communicating with the City Manager. There is a lot of information they want to gather in terms of our Annual Report, Master Plan, staffing levels, etc. They want to meet with a large number of our employees and all of our department heads.

Council Member Weiss said they clearly understand that they will not evaluate any person's performance.

City Manager Fraser said they have a significant client list. This group had the most consulting experience. He called references on four of them in Brattleboro, Portsmouth and Keene, New Hampshire and Augusta, Maine and they all spoke very highly of their experience working with this group.

Council Member Sheridan said he is willing to accept the committee's recommendation on this. He would like the future Council to think about this. The value is not going to be in the report but in the courage the Council uses to implement what is in the report and to actually carry some things out. He thinks it needs to be done but he hopes it doesn't end up being a fancy report on a shelf.

Council Member Jarvis said their implementation rates are very high.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-047. Council Reports:

Council Member Hooper reported he attended an EC Fiber meeting. They will start streaming fiber for their first little pilot project. It is becoming a much more gradual process particularly with the City of Burlington's default. The options for large scale financing are gone. They are trying to work with state politics. Karen Marshall, Governor Shumlin's new broadband appointee, met with them last night.

Council Member Sheridan said this is his last public meeting with Bill Fraser. He has been the only City Manager he has worked with these 12 years and not only is he a good City Manager but even more important a good person. His life has been enriched by these 12 years by knowing him. He wishes him the best going forward. A City Council cannot look good without the staff that is employed under it making things happen. He thinks Sarah Jarvis is a great person, too, and he has enjoyed working with her.

Council Member Weiss said the four town emergency committee met last Thursday and Mr. Golonka did another brilliant job being prepared with a financial analysis of related budget expenses and revenues for each of the towns as related to fire, police, dispatch and ambulance. There was almost two full hours of discussion and suggestions made by representatives and Mr. Golonka is going to rewrite the report. It has been exceptionally helpful in getting the group to focus.

Council Member Jarvis thanked Jim Sheridan for his kind words and she has appreciated being under his tutelage and mentorship. She wishes him the best of luck and hopes he stays involved. The Senior Services Coordinating Committee continues to meet very diligently trying to get some recommendations to the Council. They are looking at the end date of Lucinda McCloud's retiring and what they want to have happen before that date.

11-048. Mayor's Report:

Mayor Hooper said she was invited to go up to Westview Meadows to meet with some folks and there were about 25 people who attended. She talked to them about the ballot, the budget, etc. She told them about the proposal for the bus and she was interested in how many people said they were very interested in that. They have a van that serves them and it is very limited in scope and people have felt unable to get around.

Washington County Mental Health has put in another application on behalf of the Central Vermont Community to bring in mental health workers to support a crisis intervention team to support our Police Department in Montpelier. The Barre and Montpelier Police Departments have worked together to try to get that and she is real hopeful that this next go at it with Washington County Mental Health will be there. There are some really interesting ideas out there about how to help our emergency responders manage some of the crisis situations they are seeing and Washington County Mental Health can partner in that.

She reminded the Council that the Teen Center is having an open house on February 11th from 4:00 to 6:00. They are doing an art display of their talents. The League of Cities and Towns has their local government day at the State House on February 16th which begins at 9:00 A.M. It is a nice gathering of local officials who understand the partnership between local and state.

The City Council met at 6:00 P.M. in Executive Session to do part of the City Manager's review and they need to talk about whether they are scheduling another time to sit down and have a conversation with City Manager Fraser.

Sandy Pitonyak sent her a note and said we need to think about the end of the month in terms of Council meetings.

Mayor Hooper told Jim Sheridan has given his passion and enthusiasm and excitement and love to this community for 12 years. He is very proud of the fact that he has showed up for every single meeting for 12 years. But it's not just showing up here and every single day he has cared about this community. He has taken phone calls from people and talked on the street with people and brought that love and passion to helping them solve their problems and getting the service they deserve and being the best representative possible for this community. They are all a great deal richer for him having served in that way and deeply thank him. The Council presented him a clock saying thank you for his 12 years on the City Council from March 1999 to March 2011.

11-049. Report by the City Clerk-Treasurer

City Clerk-Treasurer Hoyt said the property taxes are due on Tuesday, February 15th. They have the ballots for the Annual City Meeting so anybody who wants to vote early or is going to be away can vote. February 23rd is the last day to register to vote for the Annual City Meeting.

11-050. Status Reports by the City Manager:

They are doing their first preliminary meeting with the Police Union February 17th and they still do not have a Council representative. That meeting is set for 10:00 A.M. and scheduled to set the ground rules and schedule. They meet every two weeks to bargain.

Now that they have received the official retirement notice from Fire Chief Schneider it is time to do a search for a new Chief. They will probably restrict the search to New England this time. That will include him, the Police Chief, Director of Public Works, Fire Union and a citizen representative. He has found it useful to ask a former Council Member to serve. That has worked well in years past to give that perspective. He plans to have the new Chief named before Chief Schneider retires on May 1st. Hopefully in mid April they will identify the new Chief.

11-051. Agenda Reports by the City Manager

a) Consideration of the City Manager's ***21st Century Project***, including a ***Paperless Council Policy Recommendation***.

1) The City Manager has provided memos to City Council Members outlining his proposal, as well as information from the ***Sunshine Review*** website; this website summarizes what makes an effective municipal website for its citizens.

b) Recommendation: The City Manager is requesting that the Council (1) formally endorse the overall project and its stated goals; (2) specifically approve the paperless meeting policy including the related equipment funding; (3) acknowledge and approve the change in minutes preparation; and (4) offer any concerns, comments or suggestions to staff.

City Manager Fraser said he attended the ICMA Conference last fall in San Jose and this year's theme it was about technology. He heard a lot of suggestions about how things can be done. Number one, we need to ramp up our public information. We have been ramping up our web site. You hear the Governor talk about transparency and it is a big issue in the press and we have taken a lot of steps to be more open than we have in the past. One of the things he heard about in San Jose was the Sunshine Review who ranks municipal and state web sites and gives guidelines. He tasked the staff to get this done. Our survey showed us a direct curve between the ways people get information. The younger you are the more it is based on technology and the older you are the more it is based on the newspaper so we are in this age where we have to do both. He has been giving out weekly memos now with information about our departments now. It is important they get focused on the Carr Lot projects and the District Energy projects which are important, but it is important to remember that really 90 percent of what the city does is those services they deliver daily and that is really our responsibility all of the time. The public needs to read these reports on line to be reminded of that as well.

As of last Friday we have a City of Montpelier Facebook page. The web site is now linked and there are 51 people who liked us today. The city also has a twitter account. Going to the city's web site or going to look in the paper for ads is a request to see what the city is doing. People who are looking at Facebook are looking to see what people are doing and what is going on in their life. They will experiment with regular updates.

City Treasurer Hoyt is looking at different ways to use technology in accepting payment. They have set a target to have debit/credit card payments by the end of the year but hopefully by July 1. There are a lot of people who want to pay parking tickets or taxes with them because not many people carry cash or checkbooks any more. They are trying to look at ways to download zoning permits. We still have to have meetings but we realize that people work.

In line with the video Charlotte is ready to look at how we do the minutes. Maybe now is the time to scale down the minutes to something more of a synopsis and less of a transcript.

The last piece is that starting after Town Meeting Day that we no longer will have all of these paper packets and do everything on line. They are already posting the packet information on line. Technology exists where it makes it easy to read and they think the time is now to do that and get rid of all photocopying and keep paper copies for the Clerk's records. He provided the Council a memo about a proposal for doing this. If the Council approves that tonight their goal would be to have it ready to begin.

Council Members Jarvis and Golonka said it would be great to get rid of all of the paper.

Council Member Sherman moved the Council approve the ***21st Century Project*** and move ahead to paperless, more open, more efficient and more transparency. Council Member Sheridan seconded the motion.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion. The vote was 5-0, with Council Member Weiss abstaining.

Mayor Hooper told the Council that one of the things they had talked about was going back into Executive Session but she is going to ask for the meeting to adjourn and look for a time next week when we can get together.

Council Member Weiss said he would like to go back to the first part of the Manager's presentation regarding the schedule he set up for the process to retain the services of a new Fire Chief. He respects the fact that in many documents, a contract and in the City Charter the Manager has the right to employ but the Council as a matter of policy has the right to ask as we move

into the 21st Century whether or not they ought to look at whether or not there are other patterns for hiring Fire Chiefs, Police Chiefs and whether there is one person responsible for all of it. He would like to have that discussion before the Manager's Committee gets too far in the process.

Mayor Hooper said they would include it as an agenda item as a policy question.

Adjournment:

Motion was made by Council Member Jarvis, seconded by Council Member Sherman to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

Transcribed by: Joan Clack

Attest: ________________________________

Charlotte L. Hoyt, City Clerk

On Wednesday evening, January 5, 2011, the City Council Members met in the Council Chamber.

Present: Mayor Hooper; Council Members Golonka, Jarvis, Hooper, Sherman, Sheridan and Weiss; also City Manager Fraser.

11-001. Call to Order by the Mayor.

Mayor Hooper called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

11-002. General Business and Appearances.

Calvin Smith, a resident at 215 Barre Street, River Station Condominiums said he came before the Council last summer when they were considering following through on Turntable Park to deliver a letter of support from all of the residents of River Station Condominiums. The Council did follow through on the park and he wanted to thank the Council. Last summer he said that River Station Condominium owners consider themselves a partner with the city to help improve that area of town and they are continuing with efforts as a homeowner's association to improve their little corner of Montpelier.

11-003. Consideration of the Consent Agenda:

a) Consideration of approving a VT Agency of Transportation (VTrans) grant reimbursement form (TA-65) certifying that work supported by a VTrans grant known as "Town Highway Structures Program" and awarded to the City through its Public Works Department has been completed in accordance with the terms of the agreement. The grant assisted project completed this summer was the construction of a retaining wall located on North Street with a final cost of $184,784.5. Of this total, $161,100 is eligible for reimbursement at a rate of 90%. At this time, we may only seek partial reimbursement in the amount of $84,408.88 as indicated on the TA-65 form. This amount is the original approved grant funding based on the preliminary construction cost estimate prepared in 2008. The balance of the funds ($60,581.12) will be requested in the next State fiscal year as part of a grant amendment request submitted prior to beginning the project and approved by Agency officials. The amendment will be processed and funds committed in June 2011. With the amendment, the revised total grant award will be $144,900.00 equaling the maximum of 90% of the eligible project cost. City Council members are asked to acknowledge their approval by signing the attached form.

b) Consideration of approving, by ratification, a land transfer between Duane Wells and the City of Montpelier's Police Department regarding property located no Pitkin Court. A land transfer, with associated maintenance and parking agreements, was agreed upon as part of the development plans for the new Police Department with negotiations beginning in 1998 and finalized in 2000. The site plan and property line adjustments were approved by the Planning Commission in 2000 as part of site plan review. The land exchange effectively realigned the boundary line located between the parcels. However, recent research conducted in response to questions regarding the assignment of winter maintenance responsibilities caused staff to discover that the proper deeds were never recorded in the Montpelier land records (see memorandum to City Manager prepared by Tom McArdle, Public Works Department). Compensation for the land exchange was provided and the respective parties have conducted all affairs since the construction of the Police Department with the full understanding that the deeds had been properly executed and recorded.

   Recommendation: Approval of the warranty deed from the City to Duane Wells; acceptance of the warranty deed from Duane Wells to the City; and assignment of the City Manager to sign the documents on behalf of the City Council as the City's duly authorized agent.

c) Consideration of becoming the Liquor Control Commission for the purpose of acting on the following:

   Request for a catering permit for Hyzer Industries, Inc. d/b/a Three Penny Taproom to cater a Legislative Reception at the office of Kimbell, Sherman & Ellis at 26 State Street on Thursday, January 13, 2011 from 4:30 to 7:30 P.M.

d) Approval of Payroll and Bills.
   Payroll warrant dated December 23, 2010, in the amount of $30,327.34 and $112,949.37.
   General Fund Warrant dated December 29, 2010, in the amount of $292,383.36 and $4,413.03.

Motion was made by Council Member Hooper, seconded by Council Member Sherman to approve the consent agenda with the added catering permit. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-004. Convene the Second Public Hearing to consider amendments to the Montpelier Zoning and Subdivision Regulations.

a) The proposed amendment relates to floodplain development and is required by the National Floodplain Insurance Program (NFIP) because the City of Montpelier participates in the program.

b) The proposed bylaw amendment allows the City of Montpelier to continue meeting the minimum requirements of the NFIP.

c) City Council conducted the First Public Hearing on December 15th; the specific changes, as well as any further amendments made on December 15th, are outlined in the Notice of Public Hearing (attached). A copy is also available and can be downloaded from the front page of the City of Montpelier's website: http://www.montpelier-vt.org.

Mayor Hooper opened the Public Hearing at 7:07 P.M.

Clancy DeSmet, Zoning Administrator, provided the Council with some additional information along with several maps. The current floodplain on Barre Street goes all the way into the playground at 58 Barre Street, which the new floodplain doesn't. It barely covers Barre Street any longer. Blanchard Court is a new floodplain. It is all based on new data. The old data was hand drawn and done by engineers. The new information was done with lidar so they flew over the city of Montpelier and estimated in a different way. Right now we are in the 180 day period of the appeal period. The city won an appeal previously but there has to be another public process because they are county wide maps. Any development along Barre Street changes because it doesn't have to meet certain standards of the floodplain regulations. It is a big change and it has been almost four years since the new maps came out.

Council Member Weiss asked if the entire county was in the 180 day appeal period.

Zoning Administrator DeSmet replied yes.

Council Member Weiss asked if one portion of the county is rejected what would be the impact on Montpelier?

Zoning Administrator DeSmet said it would start the clock again. The Agency of Natural Resources is confident the maps will become effective this summer.

Council Member Sherman asked Clancy what the impact was on the Carr Lot area.

Zoning Administrator DeSmet said the Carr Lot is still within the 100 year floodplain. The only difference is the appeal they prevailed on changed the floodway. They don't allow building within the floodway unless you can demonstrate there will be no impacts downstream or upstream which is a very difficult standard to meet.

Mayor Hooper closed the Public Hearing at 7:13 P.M.

Motion was made by Council Member Hooper, seconded by Council Member Weiss that the City Council adopt the proposed amendments to the Montpelier Zoning and Subdivision Regulation relating to floodplain development. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-005. District Heat Update.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said she and Harold Garabedian wanted update and clarify some of the things that happened at the last. Their initial reviews of the bids they have received to date on the project were high, and there were some reasons for that. It didn't make the project undoable. It just meant they needed to look at some more information about how to rescope it and reprice it. After the last meeting they asked the bidders to submit some more information using hot water instead of steam. This has convinced them that the project is actually economically viable but with a bigger size and bigger scope it started to look borderline. They are moving forward making a proposal to the State of Vermont. They are drafting the proposal now outlining the conditions they would like to have between the state and the city and plan to have a discussion with the state next Friday. They are hoping over the next week their analysts and engineers will have a chance to look at what they are proposing and make sure it is acceptable.

The state has been undergoing a parallel process with the city and hiring economists and engineers to study how this works for them and have come up with some very promising answers. One of the answers they have found is that by accelerating their improvement plan for the plant they could save themselves close to $2 million over the next 20 years because of the reduced costs for energy achieved by the efficiency and the lower cost of fuel that the new plant would provide.

They are shooting to make this plant absolutely affordable for the city and the state. That means they are looking at the current costs of fuel that the city is spending on energy, current cost of capital and operating the city is spending on energy, and the state has been doing the same thing. So far the numbers we have based on the bids and the analysis shows the prices for energy that we will be paying once the plant is built are no more than the prices we are currently paying and the state is currently paying. That is largely due to the grant they received. If they didn't have the grant putting that much capital in place would be quite expensive. There will be more information for the next Council meeting on January 20th when they expect to have a recommendation.

Council Member Golonka said Gwen is talking about meeting with the state on January 14th and getting her recommendation to the Council on the 20th. Will there be information on the 14th in their packets?

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith replied absolutely and they will be giving the Council their proposal once it is drafted, and they will probably have it this week.

City Manager Fraser said their plan is to lay out how they see it working for both the city and the state including a partner soon. What they will be able to get to the Council on January 14th is the state's reactions to that proposal. He thinks it is important for people to understand what we are pushing towards because there are a lot of concerns about the cost of the project, and understandably because it is a huge project with big numbers. When people hear about these multi million of dollars they think the city is assuming those costs on top of our budgets. What they have defined affordable for the city is what is our current projected cost of fuel and capital replacement of boilers. The state is doing the same thing. If we are thinking the city, including the schools, are spending $300,000 a year that is what they are trying to stay within – money they are already spending and not new add on. Another thing he wants to be clear about is that it is their goal to try to come up with a project that does not rely on the private customers to make it work. We don't want another Burlington Telecom. The plan is to make these numbers work with the city, state and public infrastructure. If they can get private customers and bring the costs for everybody down, great, but they are not trying to do that.

Council Member Weiss said up until tonight the anticipation has been that until the Legislature comes close to adjourning in May or June and the capital budget is derived, we really wouldn't know how firm the commitment is. On January 14th Gwen will be going back with a slightly different variation. Does she have a sense as to whether or not that is going to impede the state's final decision and the budgetary action?

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said that is what they are trying to influence. In the state study of this project they have now come to determine that through an accelerated improvement schedule – they had planned originally to replace the plant in 2021 so the question their consultants have been asked is if we move that up to 2011, 10 years, what's its effect on the state's budget? What they found is by accelerating the improvement schedule and putting that in this year's capital budget instead of waiting until 2021 they will save close to \$2 million. That is because of the improved efficiency of the new plant and the lower fuel cost that the new plant allows them to purchase. We hope with the proposal we have for them they will make that policy decision and move their improvement schedule up so we can take advantage together of the savings derived from that. That is why we are in such a hurry because we need to get it into the state's capital budget. It is not there now moving into Inauguration week so that is why we are trying to get an analysis and a proposal to them.

City Manager Fraser said the next hurdle is to get the administration to propose it and then there is still the legislative process approval.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said in the course of all of that we will discover how much the city needs to put into the mix and how much the state is going to put into the mix. Is there additional grant funding that might help the state with some of their goals with steam versus hot water?

City Manager Fraser said the other key question is what price of oil you are measuring in comparison. We are trying to do it at current prices.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said the numbers the state economists have used to determine the payback in the net present value of the improvements are very conservative. There are scenarios that even current economic projections predict oil prices are going to be back at the same levels they were at the end of 2008 by the end of next year. As soon as oil prices go over \$3 per gallon for No. 2 heating oil this plant looks really smart. It is when it is still around \$2.50 that it is border line in terms of how much it cost versus how much we are paying, and they don't anticipate it will stay there for a long time. Of course, the price of wood escalates as well with the price of oil. The trajectory over time is pretty consistent that oil will increase at a higher rate than wood will, plus wood is a locally grown source of fuel.

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said on January 20th they will be here with a recommendation to the Council on the direction they should move.

11-006. Finalize the City Council's Proposed FY 2011-2012 Budget.

Mayor Hooper said they have systematically gone through each department, asked questions and flagging items in which they were interested in having more of a conversation around with the intention of having that conversation this evening. They have also received some larger thoughts from a couple of Council Members. Council Member Weiss presented them with a memo a couple of weeks ago proposing some reductions. She assumes from some information they received from Sandy Gallup this evening that Council Member Sheridan has asked some questions. Finance Director Sandy Gallup has provided the Council answers to a lot of the questions. In addition to the Council discussion they are having this evening there will be the opportunity for two public hearings on the budget to make comment.

Finance Director Gallup said there were some items that had finance related questions. The first one is the Community Justice Center – how much is allocated versus actual costs? This is because they allocate based on the full time equivalent of employees so therefore some of the costs wouldn't go away if they eliminated those employees. About $12,000 in their budget is allocations which would not go away. This brings the actual Community Justice net tax costs to about $20,000.

Council Member Weiss said he appreciates what she is doing. This program now has two budgets and those budgets are in the $200,000 total range. The overwhelming number of dollars in those two budgets goes to salary. This program does not contribute to its space in this building so he thinks the allocation is greater than $12,000.

Finance Director Gallup said she answered a simple question about the benefits costs.

City Manager Fraser said he would add they don't charge Planning, Finance, Manager or the Clerk or anybody else a space allocation, either. They are all city programs as this one is. There is a budget for the City Hall maintenance and operation. It could be allocated out by department, but right now it isn't.

Finance Director Gallup said under outstanding parking ticket revenue was a question she didn't have an answer for at the last meeting. As of June 30th, the end of last fiscal year, the tickets receivable was about $209,000. In accounting there is an allowance for uncollectable tickets of $181,000. That is an asset of $28,000.

Mayor Hooper asked why $181,000 is uncollectable.

Finance Director Gallup said it is because it is so old.

Mayor Hooper said at some point they need to write it off.

Finance Director Gallup said it goes back beyond 2006. People get tickets every day and never come back to town.

Finance Director Gallup said she was asked to break out personnel costs by FTE by department. There is a sheet that says proposed positions budget FY'12 which is without Council salaries and without fire calls. She did it by program and fund. There are 110.9 FTE (full time equivalents) and the average with the salaries and benefits together is $77,000.

Mayor Hooper inquired if this included overtime salaries and total salaries.

Finance Director Gallup replied yes, and it includes all benefits. Even the pension liability is put in there; it is everything.

Council Member Weiss said he asked that the audit be put on this discussion agenda. To him it is absolutely wrong to be here on the 5th day of January, 6 months and 5 days after the fiscal year closed, and he hasn't seen an audit report. He is asking for the budget year which we are working towards that there be some kind of a penalty clause put into the contract because if the city can't have an audit before they finalize their budget deliberations for next year we don't have a firm basis on which to work. That is his concerns.

City Manager Fraser said that is fair enough. They have certainly had this issue for the last couple of years with getting audits. In this particular year we have had an unusual situation with the changes we made in the Finance Office with having some of the financial statement work contracted out and now being brought in-house and the auditors can't complete their work until they get all of the financial statements from the firm that was doing them and they are still completing that work. They are finishing their contract with the city. That is an unusual holdup. Next year we won't be doing that. We will be doing the financial statements ourselves.

Finance Director Gallup said it is certainly their intent to have it by mid December. We do audit work in early October.

Council Member Weiss said what he is describing is an internal management problem and it does not help us to get the audit, and that is what we have to have. He doesn't see how they can vote on a budget for another year without looking at that audit first.

Finance Director Gallup said it looks like they are going to have the audit by the final hearing for this budget.

Mayor Hooper said they understand the complexities of it but they really need the audit.

Finance Director Gallup said there is a bequeath called the Blanchard Bequeath and they had asked about the date when they could start using that money. Three quarters of it can be used, and you can start using it in 2038. Total debt obligations was another exercise that was well worth doing. She also had a cover memo with it just because a lot of things were becoming clear to her. Long term liabilities as of June 30, 2010 – government activities is the main category which is mostly the General Fund with the cemetery included as well and the business type activities which is the water fund, sewer fund and the parking fund with a total debt at the bottom. The year of issuance is the first column; the original part of the loan is the second column. The fiscal year of the final payment is the third and the payment in the budget is the FY'12 payment in the next column and the loan balance as of June 30, 2010 is the final column for government activities. It is $8.27 million. For the water fund debt it is $8.28 million and $9.1 million for the sewer and small parking debt which is just the pension liability for a total of $25.8 million. If you add the school debt of $4.83 million there is a total city debt of $30.68 million. The capital assets are about $50 million.

Mayor Hooper asked Sandy Gallup what this tells her.

Finance Director Gallup said the capital assets is net of depreciation. There are common measures of how much you should have in debt.

Council Member Golonka said he would challenge her to say what we would be willing to sell to lower that debt or lower those assets.

Finance Director Gallup said to be honest she doesn't really know how we value our land such as Hubbard Park. It has to be worth millions and it probably isn't that highly valued.

City Manager Fraser said it is about 3 percent of the grand list.

Council Member Weiss said he maintains they have about $50 million in capital debt. When he looks at the budget book on page 6 it is listed that the total capital debt is $26 million. On page 7 the water fund is listed at $17 million and the sewer fund long term debt is listed on page 8. He can't reconcile what he think he found on those sheets.

City Manager Fraser replied those are total project costs for all sorts of projects. Those aren't debt. Those are paid out for projects now and in the future they might be considering. Those aren't debt numbers.

Council Member Weiss said he is going to maintain that this city owes $50 million until somebody can help him understand why there is a $20 million difference between Sandy's sheets and what he found in the budget book.

Finance Director Gallup said the easy answer is interest and there is principal only.

Council Member Golonka pointed out that is where the audit would be helpful.

Mayor Hooper said there is a concern that the city's debt is too high and it is a constraint on being able to do the projects they all want to do.

Council Member Weiss said if the Council in its wisdom was to reduce the operational budget for next year, reduce expenditures by a quarter million dollars we can't prepay or pay down all bonds. They could transfer that money into reducing a bond we could then start to save the interest on that money. That is what we need to do over an extended period of time, reduce down as many bonds as we are legally able to do. We could start doing that by lowering expenses.

Finance Director Gallup said anything that says Vermont Municipal Bond Bank or State Revolving SLRF she doesn't believe they can pay down early.

Council Member Golonka said they could create a sinking fund which would offset it so they could segregate assets.

Finance Director Gallup said Council Member Sheridan asked what a 1 percent cut by department is. It totals $83,946. It would be close to a penny on the tax.

Mayor Hooper said Council Member Weiss' memo suggests we do some across the board reductions.

Finance Director Gallup added the savings in the county tax is $15,938 which means the budget can be reduced by that amount.

Council Member Weiss outlined his memo to the Council. He said he is looking for a 3 cent budget cut which equals $240,000. All of this can be found on page 6 in the budget book. If you look at the City Council there would be $8,000 in that budget and he would reduce it by $4,000. For every other entry from the

Manager's Office to Fire and Ambulance is to take an amount by which to reduce it. On page 6 that reduction came from the increase between the current budget and the proposed budget for next year and there is still a balance left within that increase so it wasn't a complete elimination. That indicated with some 108 employees it should be certainly possible to eliminate 2 positions equal to about a total of $91,000. He thinks this is all reasonable and doable and he doesn't think any program or department is going to be substantially hurt because they are still getting an increase from the current budget to the present budget.

Council Member Jarvis posed a question about how the city is doing in terms of equity between personnel plan employees and paying union employees.

City Manager Fraser said they thought about holding the line at zero there. It's not an easy answer because the jobs are so different. The market is different for different groups of jobs. There is only one union signed for this coming budget year. Two are up for negotiations. The non union employees have not been gaining at the same rate as the union members. The total personnel costs include everything with benefits. There is 1% in for non union employees and nothing for the two unions except for the Fire Union who has signed at 3.5%. .

Mayor Hooper said effectively the conception of step increases a large portion of our workforce is proposed to be in at zero percent or a 1% increase. She asked the Council if they wanted to do across the board cuts and her sense is they want to go one by one at the flagged list.

Council Member Weiss said the only bargaining chip for him is a 3 cent reduction in the operating budget equaling $240,000.

Council Member Sherman said her target was zero increase and they are close to a minimal increase in the operating budget. Targets are different from requirements. She would like to make sure the Montpelier Circulator is included somewhere in the budget.

Council Member Golonka said if they can flag $240,000 and be comfortable with it that would be his goal.

Council Member Jarvis said there is no way they are going to find $240,000 and she wouldn't agree to most of these cuts.

Mayor Hooper said at the top of the list was a proposal to cut 10 percent out of the Planning Department.

Council Member Jarvis asked what service are we providing in the Planning Department do they think they shouldn't provide any longer.

Council Member Weiss said as a Council Member his role is limited to policy. A cut in the planning budget to him is a policy matter. If the Council approves that it is up to management to make a determination as to where they are going to get it.

City Manager Fraser said there would be some service reductions. Planning obviously has zoning enforcement which is required and then its other functions are involved in planning projects, whether it is the district energy plant or 58 Barre Street. The city as a matter of policy has embraced community development loan programs for creating affordable housing, etc. They could reduce the Planning Department by 2 people and take Eric with his GIS and put him in the IT Department and put Garth under the Manager as community development and cut the Planning Department to 3 people. The functions and services they are doing are the same services.

Council Member Jarvis said she would like to see us as a city spend more person hours on economic development issues and see the Planning Department work on those. Her thought is to get more out of that department and not less.

Mayor Hooper said there was also a question about the $20,000 that appeared in Planning for the VISTAs which was in the capital budget.

Council Member Golonka said that was the lion's share of the increase in planning.

Council Member Jarvis said it is the city's contribution towards the salaries of two full-time employees. At this point the VISTAs are doing the lion's share of the work for the zoning that is going on.

Council Member Sherman said the VISTA employees come from the Youth Services Bureau who has a multi faceted AmeriCorps and VISTA Program. You can host VISTAs if you pay part of their living allowance stipend. It's not called a wage which is in the realm of $12,000 so they live at a poverty level. That is the whole principle of VISTA – you do service, and this is a place where they do service because the city and the Planning Department are host sites. They are here for a year and have a number of responsibilities and performance measures they have to achieve that is in the grant that is held by the sponsoring nonprofit organization. They fulfill those duties here. She would say they get remarkable talented VISTAs here. It is partially because of the learning opportunity and the training they get from being here that they are willing to invest in themselves and take this kind of pay in order to be here because it works really well for them to put on their resumes that they worked for the Planning Department in the City of Montpelier. Look at the women we had last year and the year before. This is the first year we have had two men, but they are amazing people who leap at the opportunity to work here.

Mayor Hooper said one has a BA in Planning and the other has a Master's in Planning.

City Manager Fraser said more to the policy matter, they had included funds prior in the capital plan for the creation of the Master Plan feeling the Master Plan is a 5-year document and it was a longer term project with a completion date. Prior to Gwen's coming here they had always included some funds in years past for consultants to assist with the master planning, and that is where these VISTA matching funds have been included in the capital plan. The only reason he moved it this year was recognizing we had capital projects that were more traditional capital projects but now they are really spending the bulk of their work on the zoning and taking the results of the Master Plan and conducting community meetings to draft the rezoning. From his perspective the process of working on zoning and drafting zoning was an operating cost in the Planning Department. That is something that really isn't a capital project but a little more fluid that a Planning Department does. This was support costs, and a good bargain. There used to be an additional staff planner in that department. There was one more planning professional that has been reduced during his time here. If they didn't have them he can't imagine they would make the progress they need to make on the zoning.

Council Member Golonka said this seems to be a core function of any city government in terms of rewriting the zoning rules and we seem to be using it as an education tool for VISTA. Are we duplicating the work to some extent with our Planning Department overseeing this on such a major project? He understands the enVision plan because that seemed to be more interactive with the community. He is concerned this is a core function they are farming out to interns. He wants to make sure there is value involved.

City Manager Fraser explained their education come from going through the process and the work they are doing. They are handling and facilitating the community meetings that we would be paying a staff member to do.

Council Member Jarvis explained VISTA is also staffing the Senior Center's Coordinating Committee and Housing Task Force meetings.

Mayor Hooper said she thinks they bring tremendous value to the community and are extremely well qualified people we would probably consider hiring as full time Planning Department staff and we are getting them at a bargain price for great service.

Mayor Hooper said the tax status of 58 Barre Street housing units they received a memo from Garth. Regarding the DPW purchase of street lights they are having discussions with Honeywell and they may use Efficiency Vermont. They hope to buy the lights from Green Mountain Power and contract with them for the maintenance. The other savings is where you can move street lights.

City Manager Fraser reported they need to spend more on trash removal during the summer, especially for big events. They have budgeted for the same level of services as the prior years.

Mayor Hooper said it is a problem. There is overflowing trash in the summer time.

Council Member Golonka asked if they should raise the vendors' license fees to pay for that.

Director of Public Works Law said their number for trash and recycle barrels is $11,000 a year. That is 42 barrels picked up twice weekly during the summer months and additional times as necessary. The contractor the city has does make trips around the city. They are disposed of down at the DPW garage which is another $2,000 for the pick up. There are 17 barrels maintained during the winter and there is $1,100 for additional pickup during the summer months.

They talked about the water rates and agreed to put fluoridation on as an agenda item. Todd said he had received a call from the Department of Health in Burlington who are advocating for fluoridation and have heard from sources that the city is considering this. They would advocate for the use of fluoride.

They have a new bucket loader in the equipment fund in the budget. The bucket loader and sweeper have been included in the budget with funding over two years. The bucket loader is 15 years old and was scheduled to be replaced in 2008.

Mayor Hooper said there are several underlying policy questions regarding equipment purchases. Should there be an equipment fund that is managed as we do a capital fund? We haven't had the same sort of discipline with the equipment plan as they have had with the capital plan. Tonight's discussion is if they want to buy the bucket load and sweeper.

Council Member Weiss told the Council they need to think outside the box. They could set up a for profit corporation. Tom is saying we don't get any depreciation. If there was a for profit corporation or business that would work with them under the new federal tax law if you buy a piece of equipment this year you could get 100 percent depreciation allowance and we could save a fortune if we could buy under those conditions instead of a nonprofit municipality.

Public Works Director Law said they get a municipal discount when they purchase the equipment from a vendor.

Mayor Hooper said the question for tonight is whether they are going to spend $163,000 on equipment which covers the sweeper, bucket loader and the third payment on the grader. This is also proposing the beginning of the vactor purchase. Council Members agreed to this.

City Manager Fraser said the wastewater treatment position was just raised. They think they can reduce a position there. That would help the sewer fund.

In the capital budget the ADA improvement is $10,000. This is to try to maintain the city's effort to come into ADA compliance. There is some discussion about on street parking in the Library area. There are also other improvements in the buildings that aren't fully articulated yet, particularly for City Hall.

There is the question about the $10,000 for the downtown use. City Manager Fraser said they have typically allocated $10,000 for a downtown project in which they have allowed Montpelier Alive to have some input on how that is used. There is a notion floated by Montpelier Alive to do some work out back.

Council Member Golonka said he likes the idea of putting $10,000 aside each year for downtown development but it is similar to the Housing Trust Fund where it could build up and there is an application process.

Council Member Jarvis would like to see some of that money moved somewhere else or dedicated to City Hall signage. She went on to say that it is not just aesthetics but an accessibility issue and communication with the public.

Mayor Hooper said they are leaving $10,000 in and there will be direction on how it is going to be used.

Council Member Weiss said he is withdrawing all of the examples and is asking the City Manager as a policy matter to identify alternatives as to how he can reduce the operating budget by $240,000 but include an opportunity for economic development.

Mayor Hooper asked if the Council wanted the City Manager to find an additional $240,000 out of the capital and operating budgets or do they want to continue down to the bottom of the memo. We are only half way through the cuts.

Mayor Hooper said there is a proposal for December 15th for Montpelier Alive for a 20 percent reduction of funding for other parts of town.

City Manager said in order to maintain the downtown designation the city has to do certain services and maintain certain activities. He doesn't know if they are prohibited by law from doing other things.

Mayor Hooper suggested it is totally appropriate to look at how they support the commercial activities of the River Street area. It is an area they have neglected and failed to pay proper support of. This community at the direction of the City Council went through a two year planning process to consider what the proper steps and what the proper context was for providing support for the downtown. It was a very thoughtful and engaging of the downtown community process and came up with a good plan. She believes they need to do the same sort of thoughtful support and build the context for doing that sort of work rather than saying here is $4,000 and go do something. In the case of the downtown organization there is a nonprofit organization which is tasked with carrying out that sort of economic and community development efforts. What is the plan? How are they sure it is going to multiply and become something else?

Council Member Weiss said this budget doesn't go into effect until July 1st and it lasts for 12 months. There are 18 or 19 months to do what she is suggesting. He is just asking that some money be set aside so they can have this discussion with a result.

Council Member Jarvis said she wouldn't change the allocation but give some strong direction and support. It is the Montpelier Business Association's and Montpelier Alive supports that entity. We can provide some leadership and support in efforts of engaging the entire business community in Montpelier in trying to figure out what needs are in different areas. It's as much about the Council doing some leg work and providing leadership as it is about them.

The arts grant program was discussed and no changes were made.

The Community Justice Center, how much is allocation versus actual cost. Discussion followed on fees for service from court assigned cases.

Council Member Golonka said the suggestion the last time about the Community Justice Center's fees and the talk was to tack on an extra $250 or whatever the cost to the City of Montpelier was for that service for court appointed type activities. He would be in favor of adding it as a revenue item and working up a fee schedule before July 1st.

Community Justice Center Director Byrd said the negotiation over what kind of fees they might be able to charge are in the negotiation stage. It is way premature to say we could put that as revenue because the city has no control over it. They can't charge for their reparative cases. These are the cases allowed because of the new legislation passed where judges can refer cases to reparative services without probation. It hasn't happened yet in Washington County but they are doing it in a couple of other counties.

Council Member Golonka said we should set some type of rate so when they do come to us that is what we charge or we don't do it. It doesn't seem fair to subsidize the state.

Mayor Hooper said the underlying problem is this is a judicial system and the City of Montpelier does not set rates for the judiciary. We could say we aren't participating and let's get rid of the Community Justice Center; that is something the city can do. The reason she is a strong support of the community justice center system is that it is a way to significantly diverting costs to the people of Montpelier as well as the people of the state so we need to make sure the people of Montpelier aren't picking up the rest of the costs for the people of the state. That is the policy issue we are struggling with here. It is significant issues in terms of the burdens that is being shifted, but let's do it in a way that is productive and really accomplishes the end result we want.

Emergency management has a very limited staffing position that we don't see in the budget this time. Are we under staffing our emergency management needs? This is the question she has about pushing back on all of the departments.

City Manager Fraser said emergency management is a high priority for the city. They find themselves in a quandary where there is a demand to find a sum of money to reduce but continue to do everything that is important. With the resources they have budgeted for the Fire Department they can accommodate this function. They have looked at some different ways of aligning the part time positions and doing things a little differently. They believe they can allocate the kind of time they were using to maintain that particular function which is keeping the lists updated and the data, etc. They are comfortable they can maintain that work.

Mayor Hooper said the larger policy question is how far they are stretching all of their departments to provide all of the services we are expecting and as a result she worries about the city's ability to do work and to meet the expectations of the community if we keep pushing back and asking them to do more with less. That is already in the budget.

Council pay – Council Member Weiss had suggested reducing and Council Member Sheridan suggested increasing it.

Council Member Sheridan proposed they put it on the ballot that Council and Mayoral pay be increased by $2,000 each to be voted on by the people. If it goes down then the $1,000 is still in the budget, and if it passes they would receive $3,000.

City Manager Fraser said he didn't believe it was a charter requirement. He thinks it is on the ballot because the Council felt uncomfortable setting their own pay. The school board commission salary is handled the same way.

Mayor Hooper asked if that wasn't like what they were doing for the Library for the longest time where there was some in the budget and some on the ballot.

City Manager Fraser said in the charter it does say the Mayor and Council Members shall receive as compensation for their services such sum as shall be voted to them at the Annual City Meeting of each year.

Council Member Weiss said the night they spent with folks who testified regarding the proposed 1% increase one of the speakers make a great remark. What she said was that this would be a symbolic gesture on the part of the Council to reduce its compensation for one year, and he thinks she's right. Her point of reference was state government and others are tightening up and taking reductions. Maybe for this time the Council wants to reduce its worthy compensation.

Council Member Sheridan said his response to the person would be if they had gone 20 years without a raise. He highly doubts that anybody has gone 20 years without a raise.

Mayor Hooper said one of the underlying policy questions for her is the desire to attract a diverse group of people to the City Council and we certainly don't do it based on the pay. We are very fortunate in the array of backgrounds and experience and demographic on the City Council now. We are one of the few City Councils that in fact have young children. Her concern is that it is only a certain group of people who can afford to do this. If you were paying for babysitting some people would not be able to do this. It is much more important to have qualified representative people of the community and that means not asking them to pay to sit here by hiring babysitters and all of the other costs associated with being here.

Council Member Sheridan said for his 12 years he can guarantee he has been the only low income person that has ever sat on this Council, and that is one of the reasons you don't get low income people here. There aren't low income people sitting in the Legislature and certainly not in the federal government. The time the Council puts in and the grief they take deserves more than they are receiving. They haven't had a raise in over 20 years.

Mayor Hooper asked if the Council was interested in seeing an increase in the pay schedule for the Members of the Council, or do they want to see a reduction by half?

Council Member Golonka inquired if the League of Cities and Towns has a study of what other Councils around the state are receiving.

Council Member Jarvis said another option would be not to raise their salaries but to create some kind of fund that is available for someone who is paying for childcare or arrangements.

Council Member Sherman thanked Council Member Sheridan for his offer and said it shows great appreciation for the work they do, but this year and this economy they should stay where they are.

Mayor Hooper said they have the breakout of the personnel costs and audit costs.

City Manager Fraser said they had recommended a personal property reappraisal out of fund balance so it wouldn't affect the tax so they can either include it in the budget with revenue offset. It would be a follow up to get all of the property we are appraising equitable and current. In the end the revenue would go up. Hopefully the grand list would go up.

The Housing Trust Fund is in the budget for $41,000 and the question was whether to increase it. That is an increase from last year. It is still at a half cent. They received a request from the Housing Task Force to increase it to $82,000 which would be the full cent.

Council Member Jarvis reminded the Council of their very goal they stated about doing what we can to grow the grand list and doing what we can to encourage residential development and residential growth. She would encourage the Council to do the whole penny of $82,000. We aren't doing much else to encourage growth and this is a way to put our money where our mouth is. She would suggest they keep it inside the budget.

Council Member Sherman said they could put it back to $52,000 where it was. That would be a good jump for them.

Mayor Hooper said it certainly has been used successfully to leverage housing.

Council Member Golonka said he was comfortable keeping it where Bill had put it in. He doesn't know if he is ready to add to it this year. They are jumping up $15,000 so we are committing to increasing one more unit.

Council Member Sheridan said he would like to see half in the budget and half out for the voters.

Council Member Golonka said they did that with the Library and he doesn't want to get into the habit where we split things and don't make the decision. He has been part of the Housing Trust Fund Committee and is very pleased with what they have accomplished with it. When they have less money it tends to build up and then they get the good projects. They haven't had very good applicants for the smaller amounts. It is usually when they get a bigger piece. He doesn't want to raise it this year.

Mayor Hooper said she would very much like to go to $82,000 on this and would like to support the spending for the circulator bus. Those are both significant investments we should be making in the community. She would suggest they stay with the $41,000 because of the finances.

The next item on the list is the circulator route.

City Manager Fraser said his recommendation in the budget was that it goes on the ballot because it is a new and expanded service. The only thing in the budget is for the GMTA and the circulator route isn't included.

Council Member Weiss said he understands his logic. At a previous meeting they were talking about the guns the Police Department wants. The thought came up they could put in on the ballot as a special item and the Manager opposed that. Now he is saying they can put this on as a special item and he doesn't understand the distinction.

City Manager Fraser said one is for operating equipment for a department the city runs, administers, operates and sets the policies and has administrative control. It is a tool used to provide a service that we already provide. We don't run GMTA and don't provide the service. We aren't the direct providers of this service and it is talking about a whole new service level to the community that we are going to ask the citizens to pay for. You could include it in the budget but he was trying to present the Council with a budget that kept the city's core services intact without going too far afield on the tax list. If there is a desire and the citizens want to embrace this new service then let them decide that.

Council Member Sheridan voiced concern that he doesn't think the citizens will know what they are voting on. They are going to think this is going through the neighborhoods and there will be disappointment when they find out it is a District 2 circulator. They are going to think they are going to have buses go through the neighborhoods.

City Manager Fraser said he would presume they would publish what the route was going to be with the stops. The city and GMTA would have an obligation to say this is what you are getting for $41,000. This is the service you are purchasing.

Mayor Hooper said what concerns her about the discussion is they are not looking at the fundamental thing they are trying to accomplish with the bus service. Can you run a bus through neighborhoods? How do you change the way people get around our community? Is there an opportunity to deal with the large number of employees and students up on College Street and who are causing a considerable amount of congestion and concern in that neighborhood? Can you help them get downtown to their employment, etc.? This is about enabling some people to be able to live in their homes longer because they don't have to be relying on their ability to drive. In fact, they can use public transit and have more opportunities in their lives to be able to get around differently. There is a whole variety of societal goods we haven't talked about that could be accomplished with a Circulator Route. There was a presentation from the GMTA folks who were very excited because they were responding to something we had asked them to do. There are the economic development opportunities. We complain about the parking and congestion that is associated with it. This could potentially help with that. She is concerned about folks being able to stay in their homes and able to live independent lives longer. There are some interesting opportunities that are created for people who can't afford cars. They can get into the downtown and places of employment and play. Yes, it's a District 2 opportunity but in fact it is something for the whole community. There is Vermont College, NECI, all of the folks up there who are very much part of this community and need alternative ways of getting around. There are people across the river that if they could figure out how to get the bus over there it would begin to connect that neighborhood to the downtown.

Council Member Golonka said he doesn't think they can afford this service. It is all of these little things we add on every single year and looking to more than double our contribution to it. We did that with the Community Justice Center. We are doing it with the Library. It just creeps up and all of a sudden there are hundreds of thousands of dollars in these extra services without a strategic plan in terms of what is the best use of Montpelier's money. He doesn't think they have the unlimited resources that we profess to have and it suddenly creeps in. He can't support it at this time and he doesn't want it as a ballot item.

Council Member Sheridan said he couldn' t support it either.

Mayor Hooper said the point about the "creep" is well taken. She thinks there is a social good here and it could really serve Montpelier.

Council Member Hooper said he thinks this is one thing they could find a number of people who would rather not add this issue.

Council Member Weiss said if they want this he knows precisely where they can take the amount from another account and balance it off and pay for the bus for one year. That is a social policy question.

Council Member Sherman said if it is on as an item that residents vote on it is up to them. This is important and is good for the city. It is out of the box and it is new, but it is the way of the future. If we are talking about more efficiency, less gas pollution, services for people who need shared services, parking pressure, etc. the way to the future is public transportation and moving more people for less. We have had a totally dysfunctional circulator that supposedly served the Legislature and this would build on that. It would be a study and starter. She thinks the people at GMTA or CCTA know how to put these together and it is worth having an experimental year to see what happens. Yes, it is a major educational program to let people know what they are getting and how to use it, but it would also transport our kids to school and maybe there will be a savings with that.

Mayor Hooper said she didn't feel there was enough support to put it on the inside of the ballot. The question is whether they want to put it on the ballot so people can vote on it. She reminded the Council that GMTA in bringing the proposal to the Council said they had an opportunity to get federal and state money. If we don't take this it will be spent somewhere else and the money is gone. It is a three year grant.

Council Member Jarvis said the forum they had last May of community seniors identified nutrition and transportation as the two top needs of seniors in the community.

Council Member Sherman said this is certainly tied to the Senior Center. There are businesses willing to support it as well. National Life, the Co-op and other businesses so there could be other funding to lighten the city's burden.

Mayor Hooper asked if they wanted to put it on the ballot for people to vote on. Council Members Sheridan, Hooper and Weiss, and Golonka said no. There wasn't a majority to place in on the ballot.

The next item on the agenda is the cemetery. She is concerned they are not adequately investing in the infrastructure of the community. She is worried about the historic building they are not investing in.

Council Member Weiss agreed with the Mayor and hehad asked Superintendent Healy some specific questions about their rate chart. He was appalled at what the cemetery is giving away. You can buy a lot for $400 and endowment care for $240. He inquired if that was a total of $640 and Superintendent Healy said the $240 for endowment care is included in the $400. He called Norwich University and their fees are generally higher than the city's. His recommendation is the Council asks the Green Mount Cemetery Commission to provide the Council with a listing of comparable rates for cemeteries in the area and see whether the city is average or low. He suspects they are low. If they could raise more money through those revenues some of it could be committed to meeting their facility needs.

The last item on the agenda is the Council on Aging.

City Manager Fraser said that is supposed to be coming in by ballot.

Finance Director Gallup said it came in so it would mean she would pull it from the budget because they are asking for $5,000. The question in front of the Council is whether they are content with asking the staff to find us about $24,000, enough to come in at zero percent increase in operating expenses, or do they want to look for $240,000 additional reductions.

Council Member Jarvis said she would be comfortable asking staff to find the $20,000. Other members agreed. That would leave a two cent increase for equipment and infrastructure.

11-007. Council Reports.

Council Member Jarvis voiced major kudos for First Night. She was dismayed like a lot of other folks when she heard there were going to be no fireworks but the conclusion of the evening was amazing.

11-008. Mayor's Report.

None.

11-009. Report by City Clerk-Treasurer.

None.

11-010. Status Reports by the City Manager.

City Manager Fraser thanked the department heads for staying through the evening and the great job they did on the budget

Adjournment.

After proper motion made by Council Member Sheridan, seconded by Council Member Sherman the council meeting adjourned at 10:37 P.M.

Transcribed by: Joan Clack

Attest: ________________________________

Charlotte L. Hoyt, City Clerk

On Thursday evening, January 20, 2011, the City Council Members met in the Council Chamber.

Present: Mayor Hooper; Council Members Golonka, Hooper, Jarvis, Sheridan, Sherman and Weiss; also City Manager Fraser.

11-024. Call to Order by the Mayor:

Mayor Hooper called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

11-025. General Business and Appearances:

None.

11-026. Consideration of the Consent Agenda:

a) Consideration of leasing three updated digital imaging systems:

1) Due to incentives that are currently being offered by digital imaging system providers, the City has the opportunity to have newer digital imaging equipment with added functions and save money when compared to our current costs.

2) We recommend accepting OCE's proposal for a five-year lease for three digital servicing systems at the monthly cost of $1,150.00. This proposal includes consolidating and improving the printing, copying, scanning and faxing functions in the Finance, Planning and Clerk/Treasurer's Offices. (See memo from Finance Director dated January 14, 2011.)

b) Acting as the Liquor Control Commission, City Council Members may now consider the following permits:

1) Consideration for a Catering Permit from the New England Culinary Institute for a reception at the Vermont College of Fine Arts, T.W. Wood Art Gallery, on February 1, 2011 from 8:00 to 9:30 P.M.

2) Consideration for a Catering Permit from the New England Culinary Institute for a graduation dance for the VCFA at the Alumni Gym on February 4, 2011 from 9:00 P.M. to 1:00 A.M.

3) Consideration for a Catering Permit from the New England Culinary Institute for a graduation at the T.W. Wood Art Gallery on February 5, 2011 from 7:15 to 9:00 P.M.

4) Consideration for a Catering Permit from the New England Culinary Institute for a reception for the Vermont College of Fine Arts in Noble Lounge on February 7, 2011 from 5:00 to 7:00 P.M.

c) Approval of Payroll and Bills

Mayor Hooper said they had received a note from Finance Director Gallup that she would like the Council to remove from consideration the leasing of the digital imaging system.

Motion was made by Council Member Sheridan, seconded by Council Member Sherman to approve the consent agenda after removing the item on the digital imaging system. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-027. Appointments to Montpelier's Conservation Commission:

a) On January 22nd, two 2-year terms expire; on February 1eth three 3-year terms expire. Staff advertised and received the following responses:

1) Seeking reappointment for 2-year term: Christopher Hilke and Erik Esselstyn

2) Seeking reappointment for 3-year term: Roy Schiff, William Finnegan and Kris Hammer.

b) Also, the three Ex-Officio Youth Members' seats are only 1-year terms; staff advertised and Conservation Commission Chair Kris Hammer notified the students currently serving. To date, only one student, Caitlin Paterson, has responded and would like to be reappointed.

c) Recommendation: Appointments, including the Ex-Officio Youth Member.

Motion was made by Council Member Sherman, seconded by Council Member Weiss to move the reappointments, including the Ex-Officio Youth Member. The vote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-028 Continued Discussion on Taser Policy

a) This is a continuation of the discussion held at the Council's January 12th meeting.

b) Police Chief Facos will be in attendance to provide any further information and answer additional questions that Council Members and concerned citizens may have.

Mayor Hooper said last Wednesday was a very snowy night and there was a concern some folks weren't able to attend due to the bad weather. There were also a number of questions.

Police Chief Facos said he is going to run through some quick responses to questions that the Council has asked. He asked for tasers in 2007 and again with this current budget. What has changed? Why did he reintroduce such a controversial issue here in Montpelier?

Since he presented last he did find out new information. The Vermont State Police do in fact have the tasers and they are going to be rolling them out from lieutenant on down. They are trained and instructed right now at the Police Academy and it is anticipated they may be on line in March or April of this year. When he spoke last week they were temporarily on hold pending the new commissioner's review.

The policy he presented, which goes to Councilor Golonka's question about public input on policy development is the policy he is recommending if we choose to go with tasers here in Montpelier. That policy is based on law with wording from the 2nd Circuit, the 11th Circuit and Best Practices. That is why the wording is very specific.

Councilor Jarvis asked for clarification. They talked about active resistance as well as active aggression. What is the difference? Active and passive resistance have been defined by the federal appellate courts. Active aggression is not legally defined.

He did consult with a lawyer who is the primary author of the policies they will be potentially adopting. There are some jurisdictions and he gave him one that just had the active aggression level. What that basically means is when you are being assaulted. One of the benefits and plusses to wanting the taser as a fourth option is to hopefully bring something to deescalate a situation if need be by force if other methods are unsuccessful or inappropriate they will have that option available to them. That is why their policy has the active/passive threshold which goes back to the cornerstone of their policy which is a federal U.S. Supreme Court case on Gram v. Connor.

This is different up in Canada. If you look at the Brightwood Study, which was a commission done to look at taser use in Canada, they do have a different threshold, but even in that study they do say that the taser does have a place. They also cite good training, mental health and substance abuse; that training is critical if you are going to have these weapons in your police departments. This is something they have demonstrated they do have in Montpelier.

They aren't talking about a force continuum; they aren't talking about a lateral force. These are force options so they do the best they can to deescalate a situation and bring it hopefully under a safe resolution and conclusion. Active resistance is also defined in that policy.

Council Member Jarvis said he has defined aggression. She isn't sure he has answered the question about active resistance because her reading of it includes walking away.

Gram v. Connor is a three-prong Supreme Court decision and the three elements in that case that guide our current use of force across the country is what is the seriousness of the crime, what is the level of threat to the officer and individual, and what is the risk of flight? As the officer has to make those decisions it is not a bright line rule. For example, if somebody went into Rite-Aid and stole a can of Diet Coke and then ran from the officers. That would not be an appropriate use of that level of force to prevent flight. Let's say a juvenile is molested violently in a library and they get a call and as the officers are responding to that violent crime the librarian or complainant points out it is the person running that is a different level of force they would use to prevent that flight because of the potential further risk. It is a balance of those three aspects that are spelled on in Gram v. Connor.

In referring to their proposed policy active resistance is defined where a subject actively resists when you take affirmative action to defeat an officer's ability to take him into custody. That could be when you go hands on with them and they violently pull away from you. They do not present themselves and they are not complying with you or you can't get handcuffs on them without using additional force. It could be a stunning strike with a knee, an impact from their hands to get that compliance, or by policy could also in a stun mode if they had a taser. It is responding to whatever level of resistance when they are trying to take somebody into custody when they are making a definite movement or action to prevent that from occurring.

Council Member Jarvis said the three pronged test he mentions is not spelled out in the policy and that would be her concern. She believes that is the issue in Barre. People keep saying they reviewed this guy's actions and they decided it fit within the policy because the definition is so vague. You have active resistance where there is a felony crime or have these things really spelled out.

Police Chief Facos said when you take somebody into custody and they are resisting you physically and preventing you from taking them into custody, paraphrasing from <u>Gram v. Connor</u> was a tense, rapidly evolving dynamic situation. He can't even begin to count how many times he has personally been in a situation where he has tried to take somebody into custody and it goes south very quickly. One of the main reasons to have a device that can help immobilize the situation rapidly when it starts escalating is that you don't have to worry about the foot chase or throwing punches back and forth.

Mayor Hooper said she thinks they have identified an area in the policy that needs some clarity.

Police Chief Facos said they do train currently in their use of force training on <u>Gram v. Connor</u> specifically.

Mayor Hooper said she thinks there is going to be a lot of conversation about what the policy says and they need to be flagging where there needs to be clarity in the policy and not try to rewrite the policy right now.

Police Chief Facos said Councilor Weiss asked about what was the real cost. He put in the budget that the cost for the actual acquisition of 14 units would be around $11,400. There will also be training costs, and that includes purchasing training cartridges for deployment. The cost of those cartridges is roughly $19 to $20 per cartridge. He would envision at least two of those cartridges per officer for training session. They might be able to get tuition for a course which would be another $350.00. They might be able to find free training to get a certified taser instructor. He would advocate having an instructor in-house even though other departments with instructors have offered that if the decision is that we have the tasers they would provide the training for us. They found it more effective for their training environment here in Montpelier. It is nice having everything under one umbrella so they definitely want their own trainers on site. To some extent there will be overtime costs as is with any of their training, whether it is a legislative mandated 8-hour training for domestic violence. They estimate that would be around $3,000.00.

According to the manufacturer these units have very little to no maintenance within a 5-year period. They also utilize the same battery that they use in auto weapons, and according to Sergeant Cochran have a life of about 195 fires or approximately 4 years. Every time you start your shift there is a test fire that is done to make sure the device is operating correctly. The units would be downloaded once a month so they could see the data to make sure that every device, all 14 units, could tell us when they were test start or deployed how long was the deployments time dated and stamped and they can make sure that is consistent with use of force incidents. It is a unique accountability feature that no other weapon system can currently do.

The Vermont ACLU was very clear that they feel the taser is at the lethal force level. The taser is designed and by practice and statistics is a less lethal weapon system. Deadly force is something that has substantial risks of causing serious bodily injury, death, dismemberment or organ damage. This device does not have that track record. He is going back to the Bozeman Study that did qualify that because at one point he did some contract work with Taser International. However, it is the definitive medical study on taser, and that is the one that 1,201 subjects with an injury rate of less than .75 percent. That was mostly based on secondary injury.

City Manager Fraser asked Chief Facos to repeat that definition and say where it came from.

Police Chief Facos said it is the wording from the 11th Circuit about the deadly force that says substantial likelihood that it is going to cause death and/or serious bodily injury. That is the definition of lethal force.

Police Chief Facos said he wanted to touch briefly on force options. On OC Spray, which is basically pepper spray, and they have it in two forms, both in the aerosol spray that is on all of their duty belts as well as the pepper ball launchers. It looks like a paint ball and it has a powder version of the irritant. They have had a couple of deployments of OC Spray and one deployment late last year with a pepper ball launcher which was their first and only deployment where they actually engaged a subject with a pepper ball launcher. OC also has a lot of risk. This debate that is happening with the taser also occurred two years ago when they went from tear gas to the pepper spray. When he first started in Montpelier Police Department and they had the tear gas in their belts instead of the pepper spray product. Some people can be allergic to that and have very serious reactions to tear gas. One officer we had actually ended up with second degree burns. Especially when people have been fighting for awhile and they are getting exhausted they might be in a mentally altered state, a lot of times those people start to become hypoxic. He also spoke of an incident at a hospital with a combative subject and the inability to use OC spray in that environment.

Why do we need that here in Montpelier? What happens here? Last year they had 7 officers assaulted in the line of the duty and the year before it was seven. Things do happen here and our officers do a wonderful job in using whatever resources they do have as safely as they can to try to bring many of these incidents to a safe resolution.

He is going to run down some quick instances in the last two years here in Montpelier. A couple of years ago there was a restaurant called The Black Door. It was a medical call only. The subject needed medical assistance. Montpelier ambulance personnel responded. While there the subject became belligerent and combative and they called for the Police to assist them with that. The first officer that arrived on scene tried to assess the situation because additional backup was also arriving, was immediately assaulted by this individual. They were on the third floor of The Black Door in the office in very closed quarters. That officer ended up in a very rapid fist fight. His testicles were grabbed with full force as described in the affidavit. During all of that he was trying to kick one of the firefighters and one of the firefighters ended up with an injured hand. The sergeant arrived on the scene and another officer, and even when they handcuffed the individual he was still combative.

In another incident at The Three Penny Taproom their officer arrived because an individual had just put his head through the glass door. The officer rolls up to render assistance. Again, the officer is immediately attacked and didn't have a chance to grab any of the tools off his belt, ends up in a fist fight, gets pinned up against the car. They are throwing punches. Luckily these officers are very well skilled, but you can only go so far and anybody can have a bad day, and that bad day can have extreme consequences. Just because somebody has a mental disorder or some substance abuse problem at that time, or criminal intent to hurt, that is why it is called response to resistance. It is going to hurt just the same for the police and they need to respond appropriately to that.

These incidents are very frightening and challenging for the officer as well as for the person who watches this. That is why again he is very proud of the work done by the Act 80 Group and personally he thinks that should be mandatory training for law enforcement.

Police Chief Facos spoke about other incidents that had taken place on Wilder Street and Cummings Street.

Last week after hearing everyone speak he heard a lot of talk about the creep factor that they would use these things more and more, and yet that is not the evidentiary trend across the country. As a matter of fact, the Burlington Police Department has been very clear about how those cases are actually decreasing.

The use of force, for the most part, the 4th Amendment rules. This is the law that they are governed by. As far as the accountability it is in the current policy as well as the proposed policy how they investigate use of force, how they document use of force and how they review the use of force to make sure their officers are in compliance. Also, it identifies training needs that they need to address as well as the accountability. If something is really out of policy it is a crime potentially, and that is governed by Title 13 – Criminal Law

Today there were two other police officers killed in the line of duty down in Miami. So far that makes 10 police officers year to date killed. It doesn't count a sergeant from the Toronto Metropolitan Police Services that was murdered by an emotionally disturbed person when he saw a snow plow and pinned the sergeant against his cruiser killing him. Tim Derry, who is the Deputy Chief of Toronto Metro, is somebody he knows. He is a fellow colleague from the FBI National Academy. They spoke about a lot of these issues when he was here in 2009. There are roughly 900,000 police officers in this country. Statistics show in the last 10 years that a police officer is killed in the line of duty in approximately every 53 hours. Of those 900,000 police officers roughly 58,000 of those are assaulted every year. Of the 58,000 approximately 16,000 of those assault do result in injury.

Vermont is still the safest state in the country for police officers and he is going to do the best he can to keep Montpelier as safe as possible.

Mayor Hooper pointed out the rules for the hearing on tasers this evening. She would ask that everyone listen thoughtfully and courteously to all of the testimony we hear and not express a point of view.

Zachary Hughes, a resident from Prospect Street, said the jury is still out in his head about taser use but what the jury is back on is last night he watched e-mails coming in showing U-Tube videos but he wasn't laughing at the tasers. He was laughing at the fact that almost every tazed event on the U-Tube video showed the person quite disobedient to a point where the officer had no choice. How many of you have called the Police Department and how many would be lost without the police here? That is what we are talking about. He has heard people say that tasers are not good in anyone's hands, but he will ask this question as well – would you prefer to be shot with a gun and possibly killed or would you prefer tasing? Neither is an answer because the police officer does not have that option. If they had determined it is necessary, it is necessary. They are certified. If folks want to ask questions about why they are being asked to stop, that is what the courts are for. If the cops tell you to stop, you stop! How many people does it take to do this? He was told to stop once, and he stopped, and that wasn't even for use of force. He did it out of respect. On the U-Tube videos he sees people asking questions that are fightable in a courtroom. He asks people to consider the alternative of gun shot. He would also ask the Police Department to take the following concerns into play. The mental health population sometimes does not have the capacity to obey so there has to be a way. Montpelier Police has a reputation for doing what they can. It has been termed as patience but he is terming it as what should be done. If you can talk a subject down, that's great, but as Chief Facos said anything goes. How many of the audience are certified as a police officer? The use of tasers with children also should be closely checked. Thank you.

Thomas Weiss, a resident of Liberty Street, said it is his recollection is that when tasers were first introduced they were introduced as an alternative to the use of the firearm and were introduced not to be in situations where a firearm was not going to be used. If the city decides to acquire tasers and as they develop the policy they should keep that in mind.

Roger Ormiston a resident of the Lane Shops on Mechanic Street said he came to Vermont because it was much more peaceful than where he was in New York. Years ago he was a policeman and they were trained. They made mistakes but he learned quickly to work as a team, and sometimes they had to back off until they could reconsider the situation. He does believe in teamwork and rules. They had no tazers. There were situations when they would tell their sergeant they didn't want to do this but they said we were trained and that was our job. They had to apprehend people under many circumstances. Also what came in very handy for us was a police dog and they also learned how to separate people, even on a third floor. He is against tazers and the fact that the image of tasers themselves in this city is negative.

Vicki Lane of Berlin Street said her jury is still out on the tazer use. She firmly believes the man in Bennington or Brattleboro would still be alive if we had tasers. She thinks the city should try them.

Corinna Jordan, a resident of Barre, said she is living at Another Way this evening. Her partner and she have had domestic problems in Montpelier. She apologized to Chief Facos because he is one of the policemen who have come over to mediate. Relationships aren't easy for her and conflict isn't easy for her to deal with. There have been times when she has gotten really angry. She isn't a particularly violent person and isn't violent in public. She has a lot of empathy with people who are feeling imperiled by situations they are in. She went through a difficult time when she was 19 in Montpelier where she was held by the police in protective custody and was sent to the State Hospital and had to undergo an EE which was extremely frightening because the State Hospital didn't have a good reputation in 1995. Her experience in recent years has been that whenever she has asked for help the police have been kind. She hopes she never gets tased. Maybe tasers could be an alternative to guns. She doesn't believe this is something that police should use to prevent on the job injuries.

Donna Youngblood said she owes the police a great debt. She said she would like to actually experience a taser. Secondly, she would like to see a committee of people from all different professions to work with the police. These are very difficult times. The job of being a police officer is rough; it is a tough job. Our behavior right now isn't optimum because of the times. She would like to include a unique person, Nicholas Hecht, who often helps out in difficult situations. Sometimes a person can interrupt a sequence of events to prevent a difficult situation. Steven Morgan who runs Another Way would be good. Becca Clark and the Trinity Methodist Church starting in February is going to open their doors for people who don't have a place to go starting at nine o'clock going to four or five to be in a warm place in case you don't have any place to be, which is the case for a lot of people. She won't make a deliberate evaluation of tasers until she is tased. She thinks they need to help each other right now. She is a little afraid for people with pacemakers because this could kill them in certain circumstances. We do want to support the police. They are in a tough position.

Laura Ziegler from Plainfield said she has been involved with a committee. In response to the City Manager's statement that a clear policy for use of force, including tasers, has been prepared by the Chief using a model policy drafted in conjunction with the Vermont League of Cities and Towns and the Commission for Law Enforcement agencies, the draft response to a resistance policy put forward does not appear to have been drafted locally. It is copyrighted to the Legal and Liability Institute and the section on electronic control devices was taken almost word for word from the Legal and Liability Management Institute's policy on electronic control devices. While it is reasonable for the City of Montpelier to adopt policies that enable effective law enforcement and protect the city from liability, these are not the only public policy interests at stake. Setting the bar at the lowest point the law allows may be optimal for manage and liability but does it reflect the correct values of Montpelier residents? Were the interests of those residents effectively represented in the development of the draft? She asks that partly from her experience with the Act 80 Group when you have a collective process that includes different perspectives and they have a very different product. She did ask Chief Facos if any advocates had been involved in the development and her understanding is they had not. How clear is the draft policy? It prohibits using tasers on passive resisters. It says electronic control device development shall not be considered for use on passive resister subjects. Active resistance or active aggression shall be required. The entire definition of "active resistance" – a subject actively resists when they take affirmative action that to negate an officer's ability to take them into custody. That doesn't address people who are bystanders who can also get tasered. There is no definition of active aggression nor is there any definition of passive resistance. Last November the Second Circuit issued a decision in Crowell v. Kirkpatrick which characterized the immobile Brattleboro protestors "actively resisting their arrest." Far from distinguishing Montpelier from Brattleboro the VLCT draft policy could be read to endorse taser deployment in such situations. In the section on electronic control devices the Legal and Liability Management Institute on small policy language was subsequently modified in two places by adding language allowing tasers to be used on a handcuffed subject who poses a threat to an officer through physical conduct. In the original language it limited who are actively resistant and control cannot be otherwise accomplished, which effectively makes it a last resort, by omitting language including subjects who are very frail among those who would be more dramatically impacted by taser, and then by admitting the following language. "Additionally, officers shall consider the type of area where tasers can be deployed, i.e., railroad tracks, grass, etc. Some agencies have been criticized as well as sued for use on pregnant women, the very young and the elderly and where the method has been used photographs are extremely important due to the increased potential for this method to cause scarring. Her feeling is that this is a somewhat sanitized version only because language that is graphically presented as potential risky or scarring has been taken out. Otherwise it is unchanged from what came out of this national organization. It wasn't developed on the ground in Montpelier or in Vermont.

She has some material she acquired from the Vermont State Police through a public records request after two months or so of stonewalling that made it clear that four out of the six incidents that a taser was deployed on a mental health subject that one of those incidents was fatal. Both a tazer and a gun was deployed and the person died. That was Joseph Fortunati. It doesn't necessarily save anyone's life and sometimes it can cause death.

She would agree with the California Court which made it clear that there is a continuum of less lethal, that there is not a monolith and maybe we should tailor those folks that this is so expedient and safe but rather that it isn't as dangerous as a gun. It may not even be as dangerous as being hit on the head with a baton but it still poses some significant risks.

Maybe they aren't substantial but are significant. Also, the issue of excruciating pain and what that says about the role of law enforcement, especially toward people who are more disruptive than dangerous. She has material she wants to make available to the Council that she received from the State Police. She would hope they can rely on substance, and objective substance, rather than spin.

Diane Derby, a resident at 23 College Street, said she thinks they all want to trust local officials to deal with this. She would suggest that should the Council decide it wants to adopt a taser policy it might appoint a group of citizens to work with the Chief and maybe file reports every time a taser is used and maybe have a review committee at some point. Hopefully, if they are adopted they won't have to be used at all.

Mayor Hooper said she would like to thank everybody who came this evening as well as last week. Clearly, this is an issue that the community feels passionately about. She particularly would like to thank the City Manager and Police Chief Facos in trying to bring us information. There is a lot we don't know about our community when we are just going about our daily business and there is a lot more we are going to need to learn about how devices work and when these devices are appropriately used and how they should be used. Last week she had some suggestions and she repeated those in an e-mail to the Chief and Manager.

Clearly, we need to have solid robust community engagement. What we have had right now is a statement of positions and thoughts and opinions, but we need to have a good conversation in the community. She feels that way and finds it interesting that both the Vermont Attorney General and the Maryland Attorney General say that is one of the tests we should have. There should be a good robust community conversation about why are devices like this are necessary and when, where and how. We haven't had that. We need to have that and it needs to involve issues around training, policy and oversight, and it needs to be very public.

Council Member Jarvis was raising questions about assault and how that is understood. That needs to be abundantly evidence in the policy so that needs to be clarified. She is sure there are many other issues that other members will see and look at that need to be clarified.

Mayor Hooper said she would like to see standards for reporting and they have heard some suggestions for how that would be done. That should be in the policy. There should be a timeframe for recertification around training in order to make sure we have folks up to speed as much as possible. That should be in the policy. There should be standards for reporting requirements and she would include that when a taser is displayed. Generally, there should be general independent oversight and reporting requirements.

She doesn't know what that all looks like and they aren't going to write a policy this evening that does that. She comes back to the notion of having a community group that would help us through this sort of process. That would be her recommendation to the City Council for how to proceed. She believes there are instances where it would be appropriate to use tasers, and if we believe in our community that those instances happen then our police officers should have those tools. Let's get them. Let's have that sort of conversation so the appropriate tools are available to the appropriate people at the appropriate time, and she doesn't believe they are there yet. She would also say it should be separated from the budget.

Council Member Weiss said his pleasure is to support the position that the Mayor is stating. His position is that before any committee is formed, and he thinks we need one, that the so-called objectives of that committee be established and approved by the Council, and that the membership on this open group be structured in such a way as to be representative of all of the clientele within the city. He would move that as a motion.

Council Member Sherman seconded the motion.

Council Member Golonka said the one thing that wasn't included in the motion is what happens if it is implemented. If we do go down the road and implement a taser policy and get tasers you talk about oversight. Did you talk about penalties? Are we formalizing the process? He would like that to be considered as well. There are so many questions in his mind about it he isn't ready to keep it in the budget at this point. He would support having a committee and maybe report back to the Council in the summer.

Council Member Hooper said he thinks a committee is necessary if this is going to happen. He is curious as to whether the Chief had any thoughts he would like to add in before the Council moves forward with voting on creating a committee to help with the policy.

Police Chief Facos said it was his job as Chief of Police to look at how he runs the department and provide public safety. He made a recommendation based on the information he had. Certainly, it is the Council's decision to decide what they want to do, how they want to proceed. A lot of times when they have groups and different opinions they can resolve a lot of things. This is an important issue, and he does recognize that. He also made it very clear to the City Manager that although this was technically the appropriate time to raise this issue he was also deeply concerned because of a difficult budget process and was respectful of that. A lot of things that were just mentioned briefly are in the policy, such as the recertification. Just like any of our weapons that are currently in force are included. There is recertification every two years, and that is in the policy anyway. We'll make it work.

Mayor Hooper said one of the things she is grateful that was brought out much more strongly this evening is the conversation around our obligation as good leaders within our community to the personnel who work for use. She doesn't think there was really a clear discussion the last time they met around the threats that the folks who serve this community face on a daily basis and they are willing to go out and serve this community in that way.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion. Thevote was 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

11-029. Conduct Second Public Hearing on Proposed FY'12 Municipal Budget

a) The City Manager presented a recommended budget on December 8, 2010.

b) The Council conducted "budget workshops" as part of their meetings held on December 8th, December 15th, and December 22, 2010; and January 5, 2011.

c) The First Public Hearing was held on January 12, 2011.

d) The proposed budget requires a two cent increase in the municipal tax rate (one cent for Capital Improvements and one cent for Equipment Purchases).

e) Recommendation: Conduct Second Public Hearing; provide direction to staff as necessary.

Mayor Hooper thanked the Superintendent of Schools Mark Mason and Cindy Rossi, School Business Manager for being present.

Mark Mason, Superintendent of Schools, said he wanted to go through some highlights about both the financial aspects of their budget as well as the problematic aspects of their budget. They are present to answer any questions the Council may have. He wanted to call their attention to the last one under programs which is that the Montpelier Public Schools will maintain high quality programs to sustain and continue in their statewide prominence. The proposed

General Fund budget for FY'11 is $14,931,575. This is an increase of $216,000 or 1.47 percent increase over the FY'11 current fiscal budget of $14,715,484. The proposed General Fund budget is $46,086,775, representing a decrease of $395,000 which is a result primarily due to our funds which came from Washington to sunset on June 11 of this year. K-12 enrollment for Fiscal Year 2012 is projected to be relatively flat, which he thinks is good news for all of us in this industry. Total salaries for the district are down 2.66 percent.

With regards to programming, they will enhance the mathematics programming at the elementary school, increase professional development for both credentialed and non-credentialed staff. They are going to integrate language arts and social studies to improve literacy instruction at the Middle School. They have, unfortunately, had to reduce credentialed staff by 3.8 FTE and they have reduced 3.3 non-credentialed staff district wide. He said he would affirm to the Council that this budget will allow them to maintain serious and competitive programming in this region.

Today they learned through the U.S. News & World Report as well as Newsweek has identified our high school as one of the top achieving high schools in the country once again.

Council Member Weiss asked Superintendent Mason if the state had made a decision yet as to what it is going to do with the $19 million that came through the federal government that is supposed to go to the schools.

Superintendent Mason said in truth they have not. However, the recommendation seemed to be coming out that they will turn that money over to the municipalities and Montpelier is due to receive about $200,000. It might be wise to take that money, where they do have a budget in place providing it is approved, because they are anticipating a very lean year to put that into a savings account and use that funding for next year.

Council Member Golonka said last week they had brought up an issue last fall about Article 8 which talks about the unaudited fund balance that is carried over year to year in the school. It is the only item on our ballot that doesn't have a dollar amount. Could they give some detail in terms of what that amount is? What is it expected to be? What has it been in the past couple of years? Also what are other towns doing? It was stated that it is more common to see the proposition that it not exceed a certain amount so it would give a little more clarity to the voters. What amount is that?

Cindy Rossi said the audited fund balance for FY'10 was around $400,000. They are putting $267,000 towards the FY'12 budget so the difference is about

$135,000. City Attorney Giuliani wrote the language for the Article. The reason they have that Article is because of Act 68. They have to get voter approval for any fund balance to be reserved. Otherwise it all goes towards the next budget you are working on. The FY'10 audited fund balance would go towards FY'12. He wrote that language for them as well as Washington Central. They don't know the amount of next year's. They are voting through June 30, 2011 so they don't know the amount to be reserved. It gives the Board a way to put the amount towards the budget to reduce taxes or to reserve it for expenditures.

Council Member Golonka asked about any reserved fund left from the Recreation Department. That is totally separate. How do they handle their reserve funds? Does that roll over? That isn't covered by any Article. He said that would automatically come back to the city. How does that work?

School Business Manager Rossi said the Recreation Department doesn't fall under Act 68 so they don't have to have a vote, just like the city doesn't for their fund balance and you manage that as the Council.

Council Member Golonka said he is talking about them being in compliance with the Charter in regards to how they handle the money. What should they be voting on or putting on the ballot to authorize that in order to comply with the City Charter?

Superintendent Mason said a point for clarification is that the School Board has voted those Articles and he wonders if that would disrupt that program.

School Business Manager Rossi said the estimated tax rate for FY'11 the educational residential tax, which is the CLA, was $1.37; next year it is estimated to be $1.297 so it is a decrease of about 8 cents. The Common Level of Appraisal is going up to 98.2 percent which definitely helps in our Act 68 tax calculations. That is the result of the reappraisal.

Council Member Sherman said in support of clarity and not confusing the voters she thinks introducing this new information about a reserve, which has been there for years and years and has not been abused, to suddenly bring that up in a press release just before budget time does not help voters and it does not add clarity. She doesn't think the Council should do that to the school budget. She doesn't think the city needs to talk about the school's reserve.

Council Member Golonka said he thinks they should. The Charter does say that the City Council holds all reserve balances in the city.

Mayor Hooper said that both the City Manager and the Superintendent in our Annual Report comment on the budget. There will be that explanation in the Annual Report.

At this time Mayor Hooper called for a short break.

The meeting reconvened at 9:00 P.M.

City Manager Fraser did a visual presentation for the Council and members of the viewing public. A printed copy will be attached to the permanent minutes.

Mayor Hooper reminded folks the Council is conducting a public hearing on the proposed budget and inviting comments from the public.

Zachary Hughes, a resident at 3 Prospect Street, said he commended the Council for coming up with the budget and he hopes for the best.

Terry Sudol, a resident at 58 Liberty Street, said what prompted her to attend was last week she saw an article in the Times Argus about median family income declines. It says for the second consecutive year it has declined setting family income back to its 2001 level. She works for the State of Vermont and as a state employee they had their pay cut in July by 3%. Because of the reappraisal she pays over $200 more a quarter in property taxes and that is really difficult to swallow when you have taken a 3% cut in pay. She would hate to ask anyone else to take a pay cut. Even though she is really happy to have a job with good benefits it is still a struggle when you receive a pay cut. She feels that anyone who is now being funded by taxpayers should be sensitive to this and should not be getting pay increases at this point in time. It is hard for her to support any budget that does include pay increases for employees. It is hard because it doesn't feel fair to her.

Vicki Lane, a resident from Berlin Street, she said she feels similar to what Terry Sudol just said. She doesn't know where the Council stands on the 1 percent increase and the increase in the Councils' stipends. She wants to remind them that anybody that is dependent on Social Security in any form for their income the federal government has determined for two years in a row that the cost of living has not increased. She wants to remind those people who are considering giving cost of living increases to certain employees that the federal government has already determined that there has been no cost of living increase. Whether she agrees with that or not is beside the point. She is one of those people you saw who is a recipient of a prebate because she doesn't have much income but she did see her taxes increase. She saw even though there was no cost of living increase determined by the federal government she has seen her benefits go down because our prescription coverage goes up. There are a lot of people out there that aren't seeing any increase in their income for the second year in a row but have seen increases in their expenses regardless of what the federal government feels is cost of living or not.

Diane Derby, a resident of 22 College Street, said she has heard from a lot of neighbors and a lot of people in town with concerns that after the reappraisal was done that their values went up and like their values went up their taxes went up. In addition to their taxes going up there is a real concern about young people moving in and the inability of young people to buy homes because of not only the price of the home but sustaining the tax rate. The City Manager showed the tax rate going up incrementally in what looks to be small numbers but if you take all of those small numbers over time and many of us have seen their bills go up, and some say they have doubled. It is an impressive presentation at face value and she applauds the Council. They work very hard. She doesn't deny they are due the stipend increase they are asking for; it is a very small number. But it opens a broader discussion of how do we attract young people to Montpelier? How can we keep it sustainable for years to come? She doesn't know how we engage the community in that discussion.

Vicki Lane from Berlin Street said she just wants to plead with the Council that this year, for the first year as long as she can remember, the tax rate might go down because of the school. It will also be the first year that she will vote positively for the school.

Mayor Hooper said she isn't going to close the public hearing right now in case other folks would like to comment.

Council Member Jarvis asked about the petitions they received from the Center for Independent Living.

Mayor Hooper said there were a number of petitions being passed around and three groups have met the requisite 5 percent. The Clerk's Office counted and there were 320 plus names who were valid voters. One of the petitions is to see if the voters of the City of Montpelier will exempt from taxes for 10 years the property of the Central Vermont Memorial Civic Center located at Gallison Hill Road in Montpelier. Note if the city voters vote to exempt this the taxes are still paid but they are paid by the remaining voters in the city.

Council Member Jarvis said there is a loss of revenue and there is an increased payment.

City Manager Fraser said it's about $4,000 local tax and roughly $7,000 school tax.

Mayor Hooper said the next iitem is, Shall the City of Montpelier appropriate the sum of $40,000 for the creation of a year round bus route within the city of Montpelier. This $40,000 will match approximately $120,000 from GMTA to fully fund specific stops. Service will be determined jointly by the city and the Green Mountain Transit Authority with input from the public. The third petitioned article which successfully met the threshold of voters is, Shall the City of Montpelier vote to raise and appropriate and expend a sum of $5,000 for the support of the Vermont Center for Independent Living to provide services to the residents of Montpelier? There is also Article 10. There are four petitions that were put on and the first one is Article 10. Shall the voters appropriate the sum of $5,000 to be used by the Central Vermont Council on Aging for the next fiscal year.

City Manager Fraser said we do have currently $1,000 in the budget for that. They didn't know they were coming in with a petition so that is an article.

Mayor Hooper said the other items that are on the warning that the appropriation for the Mayor and the Council Members' salaries be increased. She thinks they put them up too much so she would request the Council reconsider that action.

Council Member Weiss said customarily according to Roberts Rules of Order you cannot reconsider something which has been adopted, so that is out. However, Roberts Rules allows you to rescind a motion that was originally made. In order to do that, because it has not been previously warned, if a motion is made to rescind the contents of Article 5 it would take a motion to second it and a unanimous vote. In that case there are no numbers left in Article 5. Then, another motion would be appropriate to insert a number. His reading is at this time you cannot adjust the numbers in it without rescinding it first.

Council Member Jarvis asked if a motion to rescind have to be made by someone.

Council Member Weiss replied it does not. It can be made by anybody who voted, whether they voted on the for or against side.

Council Member Sherman said she wasn't sure they voted on it.

Council Member Jarvis said they did because Alan and she voted against it.

Mayor Hooper said upon the advice of our parliamentarian and despite her plea to pay attention to the needs of people and to make some gesture towards compensation for the goal of good democracy and the benefit of the community, nevertheless, to rescind the vote to increase our pay by so much.

Council Member Weiss said they would have to vote yes to get it on the table and see if there is a second. He moved that the Council rescind Article 5 and 6. Council Member Jarvis seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was 4 to 2 with Council Members Golonka and Sheridan voting no. The vote has to be unanimous so the motion died. Council Member Golonka said he would vote yes, but Council Member Sheridan did not.

Mayor Hooper said she is concerned it will be voted down and then there will be no compensation.

Council Member Weiss said according to the budget book they had and some other materials he has been working with a different figure than appears in Article 2, which is $6,800,000. He has been working with a number that is in the $7 million range. He is wondering why between the big budget book they started with and what is on the warning is roughly a million dollars difference.

Finance Director Sandy Gallup said $7 million includes the Library.

Mayor Hooper said at the Council's last meeting Council Member Weiss indicated he would not vote in support of this budget. He has been consistently saying he has been looking for another $240,000 to be cut out of the budget. We also learned at the last meeting that Council Member Sheridan was not supporting this. He is looking for a 1% reduction.

Council Member Sheridan said he doesn't want any raise to anybody outside of the Council Members. He would like to see any member of the public come up and say they haven't had a raise in 28 years.

Mayor Hooper said the Council has resisted saying to him what would it take to reduce the budget. If we were to take another $100,000 out of the budget, what would it be? What is the amount that is represented in salary increases?

City Manager Fraser said the 1% total is $26,700 but in the General Fund it is $18,027. The rest is in the water and sewer fund.

Mayor Hooper said the budget that has been presented to the Council has been presented as a bare bones budget necessary to maintain the current service level and we haven't heard from anybody to reduce our service levels. In order to cut out of the budget we are either cutting core services or we are going to cut the funding for the outside agencies or community enhancements.

She would suggest it would be breaking a promise to look at the outside agencies because we committed to them a number of months ago to maintain them at the current service level if they didn't ask for more. Some have petitioned in because they want more but she would suggest it wouldn't be good to go after that when they have no opportunity to petition at this late date. The only place she can think to go to reduce the budget is to the community enhancements.

Council Member Golonka said for most years he wouldn't recommend this and he asked about the amount of the fund balance.

Finance Director Gallup said within the next week they hope to have a full audit draft so things are moving. She gave an $820,000 number but the accountants see that as the end of 2010 and with the reappraisal there was a $45,000 deficit. That is because they funded the $70,000 over three years but the reappraisal cost didn't follow that exactly. They took the $45,000 and said we needed to take it off our bottom line. If you take $45,000 off the $820,000 that is what the audit report will show for an unrestricted fund balance as of the end of June 30, 2010.

Council Member Golonka asked what has been the trend since June.

Finance Director Gallup said nothing too troublesome has happened except for the health insurance rates did go up 20 percent and they had budgeted a 13 percent increase. It's winter and it can go $200,000 either way with a couple of storms.

Council Member Golonka said he brought that up because he is willing to explore the reserve funds. In years where we have done very well we should reward the taxpayers in difficult times.

Zachary Hughes asked what we value as a city. What do we value because if you are looking for money you are going to have to take some values away, and that isn't an easy thing.

Council Member Weiss said according to the presentation that the City Manager made he believes he suggested that there will be a $.177 tax increase and that would be about $140,000. At a previous meeting of the Council it was suggested that we take a 1% across the board deduction for all of the departments. That 1% equals $83,946. To come back to the question, you asked the Manager if the Council were to approve keeping in the 1% for equipment and 1% for capital improvement and deduct 1%by taking out $83,946 he would support it.

Don Marsh from Liberty Street said it seems peculiar to him that there would be a process for which your parliamentary procedures prohibit the Council from having an action that would respond to the second half of the public hearing. If you are having a public hearing today and saying we can't affect what you did last week, then why have a public hearing? It doesn't make any sense. With Articles 5 and 6, apparently if you had 1,000 people in here that opposed those because you made a decision last time you couldn't do anything about it. His understanding with most parliamentary procedures would allow you to suspend the rules by two-thirds vote and then go back and revote the issue they did just a little while ago. You don't have to have a majority.

Council Member Jarvis said she had that discussion with Council Member Weiss because that can't be the case in the context of a budget hearing. When we have two public hearings on a budget where each hearing is basically starting from scratch and everything is on the table it can't be that you are bound by your first public hearing when you go into your second public hearing. It defies logic.

Mayor Hooper said she thought that the process was that a person who voted in the affirmative had to bring it up for reconsideration and then there would be no threshold that had to be met.

Council Member Sheridan said he would change the vote so it would be unanimous so they could discuss it.

Council Member Hooper moved to rescind Articles 5 and 6. Council Member Jarvis seconded the motion. The vote 6-0, motion carried unanimously.

Vicki Lane said she has a question for Council Member Sheridan. His comments about the low income people not being able to serve as Councilors because of the stipend not being very high she isn't sure she understands why. It has always been her sense, and she doesn't think she is unusual, in that when she serves on a committee for the city she isn't doing it for financial gain. She is doing it because that is what she was brought up to do and she wishes to serve the community she lives in. The City Council certainly isn't sitting here because of the massive pay they are getting. We all do it because we have a desire to give back to our society. She isn't sure she understands why a low income person wouldn't be able to serve. She is a low income person and she has served on committees.

Council Member Sheridan said first of all he didn't say that was the only reason. He said it was an impediment. He is a low income person and he has served for 12 years, but he made the point that he is the only low income person that has ever served on the Council in his 12 years.

Vicki Lane said he also said he would challenge anyone from the community to say they haven't gotten a raise in 28 years and she would said that in 28 years her income has gone down to half.

Council Member Sheridan said serving on a committee is way different than serving on the Council because serving on the Council is really a negative cash flow for you. He documented it in his two most busiest years and kept track of the hours. Not just serving on the Council but calls and people stopping him on the street it was 1,000 hours which is very close to a half time job. That is way different than a committee. He sits on a lot of committees and sitting on the Council is a negative hit to anybody who serves on the Council in a number of ways. It is way beyond serving on a committee. His point is they aren't getting people in the races. There are too many elections where there is only one person. Why is that? One of the reasons is that people don't want to do this much any more. He is looking for ways to get more people to want to serve and if there is a little more money in it they

might. People have to have babysitters sometimes. It's a losing proposition. Get on the Council and find out.

Mayor Hooper said she wants to spend an appropriate amount of time on big decisions as well as the small ones. They have rescinded Articles 5 and 6. She would like to know if there is a motion to provide alternatives for Articles 5 and 6.

Council Member Sherman said she would like to propose an alternative motion. She would propose that Council Members receive $1,200 each, which is $100 a month, and the Mayor get a slight increase to $3,600. Council Member Weiss said for discussion purposes he would second the motion.

Mayor Hooper said this is important in telling the community the value of the service, etc.

Council Member Sherman said it would be $300 a month for the Mayor and $100 a month for Council Members.

Mayor Hooper said she would like to suggest that it not be that large of an increase. Currently the Mayor is at $2,700 and she would put it at $3,000.

Council Member Golonka asked the City Manager if he had given them numbers that were the CPI adjustments from the 28 year period, and that would be more his suggestion as to a dollar amount.

City Manager Fraser said it went to $1,000 in 1989. There has been a 78.9 percent in inflation since then so that would be $4,830.

Council Member Golonka said he would make an alternate motion of $1,750 and $4,850 just to keep in line with the CPI. That is what he would think would be more reasonable.

Mayor Hooper said she isn't hearing people accepting that as an alternate motion. The motion on the table is $1,200 for each Council Member, which is $100 a month, and $3,000 for the Mayor.

The vote on the motion was 3-3, with Council Members Jarvis, Golonka, and Hooper voting against the motion. Mayor Hooper voted in favor of the motion to make the fourth vote. .

Council Member Golonka said he would like clarifying language in terms of the articles. Can we add clarifying language like they do for the Library? For example, for the Library in Article 9 we write this amount is requested by the Library Board as an addition to the $45,000 for the bond payment included in the City General Fund budget. He would like to add clarifying language to Article 11 that says this results in a $10,000 increase to the taxpayer expense. Article 12 this amount is requested by petitioners as an addition to the $29,371 for GMTA included in the City General Fund budget in Article 2. He thinks clarifying language is important on those two articles. They are misleading and they have always tried to be consistent in our approach.

Council Member Weiss asked Council Member Golonka if he also wanted to include the bus with a 3-year contract.

Council Member Golonka said the article says scheduled service and details will be determined by the city and GMTA. It doesn't bind the city for three years.

Mayor Hooper said the first question asked if they wanted to add clarifying language to Articles 11 and 12. They are both the same question. Is there agreement we should do that? Let's go to Article 11 and talk about what that language ought to be.

Council Member Golonka said this would vote in an approximate cost to the city of about $10,000 from the General Fund.

Don Marsh from Liberty Street and also as a Board Member and Treasurer of the Civic Center said he didn't think they could change a petition. The item is there and is before the voters. The voters signed a petition with specific language on it and he doesn't think they have the statutory authority to change it. He doesn't believe they have the statutory authority to do anything other than put a petition that has 5 percent of the voters on the ballot. In an explanatory item somewhere else or in the city report, wherever you can do that, but this is a petition and the statute is very clear that it goes on the ballot. In addition, it is not a loss of revenue. This is something that really is fulfilling a promise that your predecessors made that just until this year the Tax Assessor has changed the rules. When the Civic Center was constructed 13 years ago the city said if you build it here you will be tax free. That lasted until this year. To go further and try to amend it is inappropriate and you don't have the statutory authority to do it. The statute doesn't support changing a petition item.

Council Member Golonka said Paul Giuliani had told the Council in the past that we could have a Council recommendation on all ballot items, that they could say the Council supports this item or the Council does not support this item. We could go that route if they wanted to do it this way. He doesn't want to do it that way. He wants clarifying language in different areas, whether it is through Bill's report or whether it is through some type of recommendation from the Council. He thinks it is deceiving if they don't inform the public about the tax impact of any of these balloted items. Maybe we could get Paul Giuliani's opinion on how to do that. He is only asking that the voters understand the impact of voting yes on any of these items. He thinks that is only fair to the voters of Montpelier.

Finance Director Gallup said in the Annual Report she will have a page that has listed the articles and the dollar amount, estimated or real, and what it means to the taxpayers with different property values.

Council Member Weiss said the warning is a separate article on tonight's agenda and we were starting to discuss the budget. Can we please go back to the budget?

Mayor Hooper reminded folks they are conducting the public hearing on the city's proposed budget.

City Manager Fraser said the action the Council took on Articles 6 and 7 they reduced $9,200 and they took the $1,000 from VCIL so that will be $10,200 in reductions.

Council Member Golonka moved they take use $53,000 from the fund balance. Council Member Weiss seconded the motion.

Council Member Hooper said he is not going to vote on this. He believes in maintaining a healthy reserve fund and not using it for what will be ongoing expenses like a reasonable highway road maintenance budget and a reasonable equipment budget? On the other hand, as Tom and he have discussed, if we don't spend down our reserve some other Council will.

Council Member Golonka said they have spent a lot of money over the past four years on this flood mitigation and it has prevented us from doing the one-time things and it has prevented us from taking money from parking. Because of that he is willing to look at it.

Mayor Hooper said the motion is to take $53,000 from the fund balance. The vote was 4 to 2 with Council Members Jarvis and Hooper voting no.

Council Member Weiss moved that the Council adopt a budget with the following provisions: One percent for capital improvements be included; One percent for equipment be included; the $14,000 for tasers be removed; and One percent cut across the board for each of the departments. Council Member Sheridan seconded the motion.

Council Member Jarvis said the taser money is now money that is allocated for video equipment for the Police Department.

Council Member Golonka asked what 1% cut across the board would mean in dollars.

Council Member Weiss replied $83,946, and every department according to his calculation with a 1% cut would still get a little more money than it had in the current budget.

Mayor Hooper asked if his proposal was on top of taking the $53,000 from the fund balance.

Council Member Weiss replied yes.

Council Member Golonka asked if that would take us below zero to the taxpayers. Would that be a flat budget?

Council Member Sheridan said he had never seen the Council vote a negative budget.

Mayor Hooper said she would remind the Council that in all of the presentations we received that the budget which was presented to them was essentially bare bones before and there was no more room for reduction within those departments and the consequence of that is she doesn't think the staff found a way to find that additional money. If that is the goal of the Council we need to say what we want to cut out of the budget.

Council Member Jarvis said she thinks they are advocating our responsibility if we just say the departments cut 1 percent. It is the Council's job as policy leaders to say we need to cut the budget so let's get rid of this particular thing. She doesn't think they are doing anybody a service by saying 1 percent cut across the board. She would also point out that 1 percent affects different departments in very different ways.

Council Member Golonka said he has been part of this process for the past three months and he isn't willing to just delegate that. If you can come up with $83,000 in individual cuts we can talk about he would be interested in it, but he is more in favor of taking it out piece by piece.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion. The vote was 4-2, with Council Member Jarvis and Hooper voting against the motion.

Council Member Golonka moved to remove the taser money of $11,400 out of the budget. Council Member Weiss seconded the motion.

City Manager Fraser said he wanted to make an observation here. They had set a goal of raising the equipment plan by a certain amount of money and the tasers were included in the proposal. The proposal was either use the money on tasers or for the second half of the video system.

Council Member Golonka said his concern is that he wants to separate the budget from the taser discussion. Leaving the money in is a little disingenuous. He thinks they need an affirmative motion to take it out right now pending our decision and then we
are in a much better shape to defend the idea that it isn't included if they change their minds.

Council Member Hooper said he thinks it is fairly clear that we are not deciding tasers at this point. They have had a very good discussion and spoken about how it is going to go forward. For those who don't know that now they can be convinced that it is essential for the people of Montpelier that this budget is not including tasers. It is just taking it from the equipment fund.

Council Member Jarvis asked about a friendly amendment to transfer the $11,400 from the taser line to the digital video equipment for the Police Department equipment budget.

Mayor Hooper said they aren't reducing the equipment budget but just eliminating the line that deals with tasers. All those in favor of the motion that you decrease the equipment budget by the amount of the tasers. The vote was 4-2, motion carried.

Council Member Jarvis moved they transfer the $11,400 from the taser line for the police digital in car video line. Council Member Hooper seconded the motion. The vote on the motion was 5 to 1 with Council Member Weiss voting against the motion.

Council Member Jarvis moved the Council approve the budget as amended today. Council Member Sherman seconded the motion.

Brad Weeks who lives on Gould Hill called in and reminded the Council of the very limited incomes that some folks have, fuel prices are rising, and the Council should consider not taking an increase in their pay and we also need to look out for the lower income population.

Mayor Hooper said she would note in the past they have had City Councilors, regardless of what the ballot said chosen not to take pay. They have just done that very quietly.

There is a motion and a second to pass the budget. Are you ready for the question?

Council Member Weiss replied no. They are going to increase the budget by $90,000, which is about a penny and he went on to explain why.

Council Member Sheridan asked if the raise for city employees was still included in the budget.

Finance Director Gallup replied yes.

Council Member Sheridan said he won't vote for the budget then.

Council Member Jarvis said they have contracts.

Council Member Sheridan said he is talking about the raise for non-union employees.

Mayor Hooper called for a vote on the motion. The vote was 4-2, with Council Members Weiss and Sheridan voting against the motion.

Council Member Weiss explained why he had voted against the budget.

Mayor Hoper closed the public hearing on the budget at 10:10 P.M.

11-030. Conduct Second Public Hearing on Warning for the March 1, 2011 Annual City Meeting.

a) Council conducted the First Public Hearing on January 12, 2011; this hearing is the deadline for all petitioned ballot items.

b) Recommendation: Conduct the Public Hearing; provide direction to staff as necessary.

The Council has amended Articles 5 and 6 so that the compensation proposed for Mayor is $3,000 and the compensation proposed for Council Members is $1,200. There was a proposal to add additional language to some of the articles that came in by petition. There was also discussion about other ways to provide information to the voters with regard to the cost of those items.

City Manager Fraser said they also need to get the correct number for Article 2.

Mayor Hooper spoke about adding addition language to Article 11.

Don Marsh said he thinks they are uncomfortable with adding additional language. They absolutely agree with Council Member Golonka in terms of making sure that the voters know what the implications are. He doesn't think the warning item is the place to put it. They need to do it and the public needs to know. He doesn't think the Council has the ability to modify language in the warning.

Council Member Golonka said in Article 12 it is more important to add language because we have Green Mountain Transit in the budget already. It is very similar to the Library. The language they put in Article 9 for the Library is appropriate for Article 12.

Council Member Jarvis said if they are adding clarifying language they should for all articles. They are asking the School Board for a figure for their reserve fund. We want to be as clear as we possibly can so people know the impact of what they are voting on and a lot of people don't pay attention to the information that is out there until they get to the ballot box and vote. More information is better.

Mayor Hooper said they could consider alternative language. We could get legal advice. We aren't editing the petition language.

Council Member Sherman said if they add language of explanation in Article 12 that there is other money in the budget for other GMTA services so they don't think they are paying for the same thing twice. This money is requested by petition and is in addition to the $29,371 for other GMTA services in the General Fund budget included in Article 2.

City Manager Fraser said he believed they should get a legal opinion because people can draft a petition that is misleading or incorrect.

Mayor Hooper said she believes there is agreement on the bus. What they are talking about is contingently accepting the language on Article 12 with the additional of a parenthetical statement that says it is in addition to the $29,371 for other GMTA services included in the city's General Fund budget.

Council Member Jarvis said to look at the Secretary of State's web site, which is an interpretation of the statute. They are looking at 17 V.S.A. §66 regarding improper influence. "Neither the warning, the official voter information cards nor the ballot itself shall include any opinion or comment by any town body or officer, or other person, in any matter to be voted on." The Vermont League of Cities and Towns says that doesn't apply to petitions though. This is their interpretation of the state statute so they need to reply on the opinion of the city's legal counsel. For Article 11 it should say this will result in a net increase in the city budget.

City Manager Fraser said the issue is we would be forgiving municipal taxes on some amount and we would actually be assuming paying the state a certain amount. This will cost the city x amount of dollars.

Finance Director Gallup said they could say what we estimate their tax bill to be next year.

Mr. Marsh said the complicated thing is that heretofore there has been no state tax charged to anybody, city or otherwise, because up until three years ago they were exempt. There was a lawsuit and three civic centers similar to this around the state were determined to be taxable. The Legislature has waived that on a year by year basis. What is confusing here is if the Legislature were to act by then, which is unlikely, and waive it then this makes it very misleading. If the

Legislature doesn't waive it the city has to pay it then it is more accurate. The city tax figure of $3,400 is pretty clear.

Mayor Hooper said if the Legislature fails to act then we know what the value of the exemption would be. If they do act it doesn't matter because it doesn't exist. If the Legislature continues to exempt the Civic Center it doesn't matter because we aren't subsidizing it.

Mr. Marsh said just the implication to the voter is if you are talking about $3,400 or $10,000. The current law is an exemption so they aren't paying property taxes.

City Manager said they are asking the city attorney if they can add any parenthetical comments at all, including by petition, in addition to some other amount included in the budget and how to handle the tax exemption question.

Mayor Hooper said they aren't going to try to find some specific language to the Civic Center as they did with Article 12.

Finance Director Gallup said they are going to have to sign the warning so you will need a special meeting.

City Manager Fraser suggested they get the legal opinion and circulate the wording and there could be a special meeting to sign the warning.

Mayor Hooper asked if they figured out the language for Article 2.

Finance Director Gallup said they are balancing back to a penny so instead of the $6,899,500 it is $6,759,570; that is $64,425 down this is $10,000 for the Council reduction and $53,000 from the fund balance.

Mayor Hooper said they are not going to set the warning for this evening but pick a date for a special meeting. The Council has accepted Article 1, 2, 3, 4 and changed Articles 5 and 6. They have accepted Articles 7 and 8 and 9 and 10 and looking for revised language on Articles 11 and 12; they have accepted Article 13.

Discussion followed on setting a date for a Special Council Meeting to finalize the warning. The date of Monday, January 24, 2011 at 8:30 A.M. was chosen.

11-031. Update on District Heat Project

Planning & Development Director Hallsmith said they are still meeting with the state and there is no recommendation yet.

11-032. Council Reports.

None.

11-033. Mayor's Report.

Mayor Hooper said she has a note from Harris Webster about getting information about who to contact when there are issues about sidewalks. We were going to put a contact number on the web site. That is Public Works Department.

She met with the Central Vermont Economic Development Corporation this morning and asked them to think about local options taxes. She also said she wanted to talk with other organizations about it.

The Rail Council is meeting sometime next week and she has asked to be on their agenda because she thought there was some misinformation about Montpelier's attitude towards the proposed train and she wanted them to hear what the city's concerns were.

11-034. Report by the City Clerk-Treasurer.

City Clerk-Treasurer Charlotte Hoyt said she would remind people that today are the first day they can file a petition if they are running as a candidate for office and the last day was January 31st.

11-035. Status Reports by the City Manager.

City Manager Fraser said the Rail Council is meeting Wednesday, January 26th at 1:00 P.M. He is meeting with Secretary Stowell tomorrow morning to talk about rail issues.

There is a phone conference call on district energy tomorrow afternoon and another meeting with the Commissioner of Buildings and General Services staff on Monday at noon. In the Council's e-mail inboxes there were 13 proposals from consultants and they are all waiting to hear how we are going to proceed in evaluating the process and timing. They want to know when the Council is going to authorize them to start.

Adjournment:

After motion was duly made and seconded by Council Member Sheridan and Hooper, the council meeting adjourned at 10:38 P.M.

Transcribed by: Joan Clack

Attest: ________________________________

Charlotte L. Hoyt, City Clerk

City of Montpelier, Vermont

"The Smallest Capital City in the United States"

DATE: March 3, 2011

TO: Mayor and City Council Members

FROM: Sandra Gallup, Finance Director

SUBJECT: SUMMARY BUDGET REPORT BY DEPARMENT FOR GENERAL FUND AND DETAILED BUDGET STATUS REPORTS FOR GENERAL FUND, WATER FUND, SEWER FUND, CEMETERY FUND, PARKS FUND, PARKING FUND AND SENIOR CENTER FUND FOR A SEVEN MONTH PERIOD BEGINNING JULY 1, 2010 AND ENDING JANUARY 31, 2011

Enclosed please find budget reports for the above reference funds. **For the General Fund, please note that 96% of revenues budgeted have been received (compared to 97.5% last fiscal year) and 65% of expenditures budgeted have been expensed for this time period (compared to 69% last year). This represents 58% of the budget year completed.**

GENERAL FUND NOTES:

Revenue:

This year's property tax revenue is $20,976 lower than budgeted. Board of Civil Authority Appeal decisions lowered tax revenue by $38,000. As was reported in December, other revenue is coming in as budgeted except for State Pilot which is $144,000 higher than the budget. 58 Barre Street rental income will be $25,000 less than budget but expenditures will be down as well. Ambulance revenue remains high for the first seven months of this year.

Expenditures:

After a very snowy February, our General Fund Budget may be looking at some financial challenges. During the next few weeks the financial impact of this winter's weather will be determined. Some inter-fund adjustments need to be made because Water and Sewer Fund employees have helped out with DPW Street snow removal duties. This will increase expenditures in the General Fund.

WATER FUND: 75% of revenues budgeted have been received (compared to 73% last fiscal year) and 50% of expenditures budgeted have been expensed for this time period (compared to 47% last year). Water Use Revenue is following budget projections (76% after three quarters of billings).

SEWER FUND: 78% of revenues budgeted have been received (compared to 78% last fiscal year) and 48% of expenditures budgeted have been expensed for this time period (compared to 48% last year). Both the Water and Sewer Fund expenditures will be reduced when adjustments are made for employees who provided services to DPW Streets during the winter months.

PARKING FUND: 54% of revenues budgeted have been received (compared to 56.5% last fiscal year) and 61% of expenditures budgeted have been expensed for this time period (compared to 58% last year). Equipment difficulties with parking lot meters continue and two new parking lot meters will be installed within the next month. After a slow start, parking ticket revenue is now $10,000 higher than the same time last year.

The Budget Reports are scheduled for the City Council Consent Agenda for March 9, 2011.

City of Montpelier, Vermont

- The Smallest Capital City in the United States -

Mayor Mary S. Hooper

City Council:

Tom Golonka
Andy Hooper
Sarah Jarvis
Nancy Sherman
Angela Timpone
Alan Weiss

William Fraser,
City Manager
wfraser@montpelier-vt.org

Beverlee Pembroke Hill
Assistant City Manager
bhill@montpelier-vt.org

MEMORANDUM

To: Mayor Hooper & City Council Members
From: William Fraser, City Manager
Re: District Heat Project Status
Date: March 8, 2011

We remain in discussions with the State of Vermont – primarily through the Department of Buildings and General Services (BGS) – about the proposed District Energy project. I will try to provide a complete overview of the project and the financial challenges. Some of the following project information is taken from a draft memo being prepared by Lawrence Kopp who is the state's lead consultant on this project. That memo is not finalized but much of the descriptive information is useful and not likely to change.

Project Summary

The State of Vermont through the Department of Buildings and General Services and the City of Montpelier, Department of Planning and Community Development with the support of the U.S. Department of Energy propose to develop a biomass fueled district heating facility that will provide a source of heat to state and city office buildings and eventually businesses and residences in the downtown area of Montpelier. The overriding goal is to reduce reliance on fossil fuels, support local economic activity and reduce the cost of space heating in the Capital Complex and in the City of Montpelier downtown.

The proposal calls for the accelerated replacement of the State of Vermont Capital Complex district heating boiler plant and the expansion of system capacity to accommodate both the State of Vermont's and the City of Montpelier's own heating requirements and a small margin. The State of Vermont will be primarily responsible for the development, construction and operation of the expanded boiler plant. The City of Montpelier will be primarily responsible for the construction of the downtown distribution system and the operation of that distribution system as a thermal utility or some such entity. A long-term thermal energy supply, purchase and operation contract between the State of Vermont and the City of Montpelier will establish the terms of the provision of capacity and energy by the State to the City so that the City may advance its municipal utilityto include downtown commercial and residential properties.

The State and the City will share in the Department of Energy clean energy stimulus grant and each will separately bond for the balance of the initial capital cost. The facilities constructed should have an economic life exceeding 30 years with proper maintenance and repair.

Project Details

The proposed expanded boiler plant will be constructed on the site of the existing plant behind 120 State Street on the Capital Complex. The current chimney and foundation will be utilized. The footprint will be increased to accommodate the additional heating capacity required. A similar façade will be constructed to preserve the historic character of the existing building. The foundation will be vaulted and raised to a height above the floodplain. #2 heating oil will be primarily used for start up or backup operation in the event that wood fuel is unavailable. The upgraded plant will be sized to cover the anticipated combined heating load of the system with a reserve of approximately 8 percent. This is adequate until such time that the State adds significant additional space to the capital complex or the City adds more than 33 percent additional load.

The distribution system will follow the most economic and efficient route (yet to be determined). It will directly serve Montpelier City Hall and Fire Station, the Police Station, Union Elementary School and Montpelier High School. It is also anticipated that the federal government buildings on State Street and School Street will be connected but they have not been included in the financial estimates. Private property owners will also be able to connect to the system.

Summary Background

The current plant consists of three boilers. The boilers were converted from coal fuel to #2 heating oil in the 1960s. In the 1970's they were converted from #2 heating oil to #6 heating oil. One of these converted boilers was subsequently reconfigured to burn hardwood chip in 1981. One of the remaining oil boilers underwent significant repair and maintenance in 2005. The total capacity of the boiler plant is approximately 750 BHP, which provides redundant capability in the event of loss of one of the boilers. The boilers have been continuously maintained, are safe and capable of operating for an indefinite number of years. Improved instrumentation and the addition of heat recovery equipment have been scheduled for the upcoming off season. However, a conversion of the majority of plant heating capacity to burn wood chips, which are a lower cost fuel based on a BTU equivalent basis, will save money through improved efficiency and lower cost fuel.

The boiler plant building and chimney were constructed in 1946 and have experienced several modifications over the 60 plus years since they were first constructed. The existing plant is in the floodplain of the Winooski River, which is problematic as the boilers would be badly damaged if cold water were to enter the boiler house while the boilers were heated. The Capital Complex heat distribution system is a steam based system operating at approximately 90 to 100 pounds of pressure. The distribution system underwent major repairs in 2005 and is capable of functioning efficiently and safely for the indefinite future.

In a typical year the State's heating plant requires 186,000 gallons of #6 oil and 2,600 tons of hardwood chips to provide the required heat to the capital complex. In 2009 the total fuel cost was $503,000. The City in 2009 purchased 96,000 gallons of #2 heating oil at a total cost of

$182,000. The total heated space of the Capital Complex is approximately 560,000 square feet. The total heated space of the City and school system buildings is approximately 208,000 square feet.

Project Management

In order to accomplish the required tasks of engineering, final design, bid solicitation, construction oversight and system initiation and operation on the schedule required by the DOE grant, it is presently envisioned that project responsibilities will be divided between the City and State teams. Overall project coordination will be maintained through regular project meetings and joint engineering teams where design coordination is required to ensure compatible systems. The State team will be responsible for the final design, engineering, bid preparation and oversight and construction oversight of the boiler plant. The State will assume primary responsibility for the operation, maintenance and oversight of the boiler plant after acceptance from the contractor. The City will be responsible for the engineering, final design, bid solicitation, construction oversight, system acceptance and operation and maintenance after system acceptance from the contractor(s). The City will assume primary responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the distribution system and its components after final acceptance. The City may choose to operate its distribution system as a municipal utility at some future time.

Construction at the boiler plant is expected to include demolition of the existing building with the exception of the foundation and chimney structures. A new boiler house will be constructed on the existing foundation at an elevation above the floodplain. The new boiler house will be approximately 20 percent larger on a square foot basis than the existing structure. The preliminary plant design has taken into account the view of the state capital building from Memorial Drive and it will not obstruct this view. The foundation will be vaulted to prevent flooding. The below grade foundation space will be used to house the newer of the existing oil boilers following reconditioning to burn #2 heating oil. The remainder of the below grade space will be used as a shop and supply storage space. Fuel handling and automatic truck unloading will be added along the south and west side of the existing footprint such that trucks can enter the western entrance off State Street and exit from the eastern entrance. Fuel deliveries will be schedule to coincide with work schedule and low traffic periods. Onsite storage will be approximately 72 hours of wood chip on an average winter heating day.

Structure of the Relationship

A project memorandum of understanding will set forth the project development responsibilities of the parties. A long-term thermal energy supply, purchase and operation agreement will establish the mutual obligations of the State of Vermont to supply and the City of Montpelier to purchase thermal energy from the expanded boiler plant.

The agreement will establish performance obligations between the State of Vermont and the City of Montpelier. It is anticipated that an agreement will obligate the State of Vermont to construct, operate and maintain the boiler plant for the term of the agreement with sufficient capacity to supply the City of Montpelier's distribution station. The State of Vermont accepts the responsibility to construct, operate and maintain the boiler plant consistent with good engineering standards and operating protocols for similar facilities. A portion of the capacity charges will fund a maintenance reserve. The State will maintain the reserve fund to provide necessary capital maintenance and comprehensive and business interruption insurance to insure against loss.

It is also anticipated that the agreement will obligate the City to purchase thermal energy from the State plant and to pay for that energy based on the metered amount delivered to the City's distribution point during each accounting period. The State of Vermont will budget and account for the operating and maintenance cost of the plant including the cost of personnel, insurance, utilities, supplies and incidentals required for the operation of the boiler plant and all of its systems. The City will pay for a prorated share of all operating and capacity expenses through an agreed upon formula or through the energy rate. The agreement will also address operations, expansion, liabilities, problem resolution, distribution of revenues and formulation of rates.

Financial Analysis

The total project cost is presently estimated at $22 million. The city's (including the two school buildings) present annual fuel costs and projected capital needs can support a $2 to $2.4 million 20 year bond payment (and/or CEDF loan) in addition to the annual costs for the district heat. This stays within the present value of our current payment stream which keeps the commitment made to you and the public. Obviously there are many variables used in calculating this payment stream with the most important of those being the cost of oil and wood over the life time of the project. You have the spreadsheet which was generated to analyze these numbers.

Under that scenario, the city (including the schools) might save $500,000 to $750,000 over the 20 year period or an average of $25,000 to $37,500 per year. This does not include reliance on any private customers being involved which was our other commitment to you and the public. We have not yet analyzed the relative merits of financing part of this through a school bond.

With the $8 million grant and $2 million city capital contribution, the remaining $12 million would need to be paid by the state, other funding sources or project cost reductions. The state identified about $1.5 million in operating and in kind expenses leaving a capital need of $10.5 million. The state's consultant indicates that, at $10.5 million the state would save about $2 million in present value money over the life of the project or about $100,000 per year. Even with district customers, the state would remain the largest user in the system.

The major challenge is that the state administration says that the most they can fit into their capital bill is $7 million. Like the city, the state has a cap on capital funds which has to include all projects throughout the entire state. Although the state will see operations savings, they would be paying upfront with capital dollars.

With $7 million in state capital money, $2 million from the city, the $8 million DOE grant and the $1.5 million operating/in kind money from the state we are left with a funding gap of approximately $3.5 - $4 million. We are working with the Governor and BGS to seek additional assistance through our Congressional delegation and/or DOE. Some of this gap may be able to be closed by cost reduction in either the heat plant upgrade or in the distribution system or both. We are pursuing some other funding possibilities such as a capital contribution from the federal General Services Administration (GSA) for the two federal buildings and also trying to ascertain whether it's possible to convert a portion of the state's projected annual savings into upfront money without compromising their capital bill requirements.

One potential source of funds is the Clean Energy Development Fund (CEDF). There are three possibilities there:

<u>State CEDF Grant Program.</u> These are state based dollars. All funds have been awarded, however there are a number of projects are not moving forward and some funds could be

available for re-allocation. This project is assigned at $400,000. There may be another $600,000 of projects potentially available for re-allocation if "called". It may take a senior administration directive to 'call' these projects.

ARRA CEDF Grant Program. These are ARRA funds that are distributed by the CEDF. This money comes with federal ARRA requirements. We are not clear whether there may be funding available here or how much it might represent. The schedule we are working under has construction of the distribution system beginning this fall and being completed next fall, with construction suspended over the winter season. Additional follow up is necessary to understanding the potential funding eligibility here.

Low Interest/No Interest Loan Program. A revolving loan fund is operated by CEDF. Under this program potentially up to a $1M might be available. The Board can issues loans from 0% to 2%, and they can defer the start of repayment to a point when the project would go cash positive. We have incorporated this possibility into the spreadsheet.

Schedule

City and State officials are slated to appear before the House Institutions and Corrections Committee this Friday afternoon.

The plan is to provide a general outline similar to this one and seek their support for inclusion of $7 million in the capital bill. While the City does not need to make any formal commitment right now, we should be able to comment on our reaction to the general project outline and to articulate our limits of possible local share funding.

The House is expected to complete its work on the capital bill by the 22nd or so which means the bill would be in the Senate by March 30th. By mid to late April we would be getting a sense of how things are proceeding and will likely be called upon to take a more specific position on the proposal and funding such as committing to a bond vote for a certain number if everything passes through the legislature.

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
10.20 PROPERTY TAX REVENUE				
10.2000.00.00.4 PROPERTY TAX GF	$6,520,363.00	$6,499,386.57	($20,976.43)	99.68 %
10.2005.00.00.4 PROPERTY TAX LIBRARY	$293,975.00	$293,975.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2006.00.00.4 PROPERTY TAX AGENCIES OUT	$30,500.00	$30,500.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2007.00.00.4 PROPERTY TAX CEMETERY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2008.00.00.4 HOUSING TRUST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2009.00.00.4 PROPERTY TAX SENIOR CENTER	$125,707.00	$125,707.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUE	**$6,970,545.00**	**$6,949,568.57**	**($20,976.43)**	**99.70%**
10.21 STATE/LOCAL PILOT				
10.2100.00.00.4 STATE PILOT	$589,020.00	$733,733.00	$144,713.00	124.57 %
10.2100.00.01.4 LOCAL PILOT	$22,000.00	$17,122.54	($4,877.46)	77.83 %
10.2100.00.02.4 CURRENT USE	$8,600.00	$10,630.00	$2,030.00	123.60 %
10.2101.00.00.4 PENALTY DELINQUENT TAXES	$52,000.00	$28,632.71	($23,367.29)	55.06 %
10.2102.00.00.4 INTEREST DELINQUENT TAXES	$20,000.00	$10,738.79	($9,261.21)	53.69 %
10.2103.00.00.4 STATE ADMIN ALLOWANCE	$20,000.00	$0.00	($20,000.00)	0.00 %
TOTAL STATE/LOCAL PILOT	**$711,620.00**	**$800,857.04**	**$89,237.04**	**112.54%**
10.22 PERMITS AND LICENSE REV				
10.2201.00.00.4 BUSINESS PERMITS/LICENSES	$10,500.00	$1,371.50	($9,128.50)	13.06 %
10.2202.00.00.4 DOG LICENSES	$3,000.00	$208.25	($2,791.75)	6.94 %
10.2203.00.00.4 BUILDING PERMITS/CODE SVC	$70,000.00	$19,164.29	($50,835.71)	27.38 %
10.2204.00.00.4 STATE CONTRACT:PLANS & PE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2205.00.00.4 IMPACT FEES - PARK	$0.00	$3,500.00	$3,500.00	0.00 %
10.2206.00.00.4 INSPECTION FEES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL PERMITS AND LICENSE REV	**$83,500.00**	**$24,244.04**	**($59,255.96)**	**29.03%**
10.23 INTERGOVERNMENTAL REV				
10.2301.00.00.4 GRANTS-POLICE HOMELAND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.2301.00.01.4 GRANTS-POLICE FEDERAL	$0.00	$24,171.75	$24,171.75	0.00 %
10.2301.00.02.4 FEDERAL COPS GRANT	$69,857.00	$17,464.25	($52,392.75)	25.00 %
10.2302.00.00.4 FEDERAL EMERGENCY MGT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2303.00.00.4 STATE HIGHWAY AID	$195,022.00	$161,117.89	($33,904.11)	82.62 %
10.2304.00.00.4 STATE STATUTORY PAYMENT	$184,000.00	$0.00	($184,000.00)	0.00 %
10.2305.00.00.4 CAPITAL FIRE MUTUAL AID	$144,693.00	$70,788.99	($73,904.01)	48.92 %
10.2307.00.00.4 START PROJ GRANT REVENUE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2309.00.00.4 ST/TOWN HWY GRANT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2310.00.00.4 ACT 60 REAPPRAISAL-STATE	$28,500.00	$412.58	($28,087.42)	1.45 %
10.2313.00.00.4 SCHOOLS-RESOURCE OFFICER	$42,078.00	$20,642.50	($21,435.50)	49.06 %
10.2314.00.00.4 STATE GRANTS COM JUSTICE CTR	$82,500.00	$135,549.50	$53,049.50	164.30 %
10.2315.00.00.4 FED/ST GRANTS- FIRE/EMERG	$0.00	$59,193.54	$59,193.54	0.00 %
10.2316.00.00.4 PLANNING GRANT REVENUE	$0.00	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	0.00 %
10.2316.00.04.4 ST GRANT CJC RE-ENTRY PRG	$0.00	$53,049.50	$53,049.50	0.00 %
10.2317.00.00.4 CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS-FED	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2318.00.00.4 STATE GRANTS - PLANNING	$0.00	$3,447.00	$3,447.00	0.00 %
TOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL REV	**$746,650.00**	**$551,837.50**	**($194,812.50)**	**73.91%**
10.24 FEES & CHARGES FOR SERVICES				
10.2401.00.00.4 RECORDING DOCUMENTS	$75,000.00	$41,825.00	($33,175.00)	55.77 %
10.2402.00.00.4 CLERK/TREASURER DEPT FEES	$15,500.00	$8,852.92	($6,647.08)	57.12 %
10.2404.00.00.4 RECORDS RESTORATION FEE	$0.00	$4,628.00	$4,628.00	0.00 %
10.2406.00.00.4 PLANNING DEPARTMENT FEES	$15,000.00	$4,494.52	($10,505.48)	29.96 %
10.2409.00.00.4 SALE OF GIS MATERIALS	$250.00	$0.00	($250.00)	0.00 %
10.2411.00.00.4 PHOTOCOPIER MACHINE	$500.00	$230.58	($269.42)	46.12 %
10.2413.00.00.4 AMBULANCE CALL CHARGES	$325,000.00	$231,613.56	($93,386.44)	71.27 %
10.2415.00.00.4 AMBULANCE CONTRACTS	$84,766.00	$84,775.00	$9.00	100.01 %
10.2416.00.00.4 POLICE - STATE	$8,600.00	$5,168.55	($3,431.45)	60.10 %
10.2417.00.00.4 OUTSIDE PAY POLICE & FIRE	$8,000.00	$2,996.22	($5,003.78)	37.45 %
10.2417.00.02.4 OUTSIDE PAY POL-HOMELAND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2417.00.03.4 OUTSIDE PAY FIRE-HOMELAND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2418.00.00.4 FIRE DEPT - MISC FEES	$200.00	$10.00	($190.00)	5.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.2419.00.00.4 POLICE DEPT - MISC FEES	$7,300.00	$3,945.07	($3,354.93)	54.04 %
10.2420.00.00.4 STUMP DUMP	$1,500.00	$1,019.50	($480.50)	67.97 %
10.2420.10.00.4 TREE STUMPAGE REVENUE	$0.00	$730.00	$730.00	0.00 %
10.2421.00.00.4 PUBLIC WORKS DEPT FEES	$10,000.00	$12,402.02	$2,402.02	124.02 %
10.2422.00.00.4 CPR COURSE FEES	$4,000.00	$845.00	($3,155.00)	21.13 %
10.2423.00.01.4 TREE MGMT WOOD SALES	$3,000.00	$0.00	($3,000.00)	0.00 %
10.2424.00.00.4 SUPPORT SERVICES-MDCA	$2,000.00	$25.00	($1,975.00)	1.25 %
10.2425.00.00.4 COM JUSTICE CTR FEES	$1,500.00	$2,850.00	$1,350.00	190.00 %
10.2425.00.01.4 CJC CONTRACT SVC RE-ENTRY	$22,301.00	$0.00	($22,301.00)	0.00 %
10.2425.00.02.4 COM JUSTICE REIMB OF EXP	$0.00	$260.00	$260.00	0.00 %
10.2425.00.03.4 CJC DONATIONS	$0.00	$500.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.2425.00.04.4 RE-ENTRY PROGRAM REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL FEES & CHARGES FOR SERVICES	**$584,417.00**	**$407,170.94**	**($177,246.06)**	**69.67%**
10.25 RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES				
10.2501.00.00.4 POLICE ALARM RENTALS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2502.00.00.4 MEMORIAL ROOM RENTAL	$600.00	$500.00	($100.00)	83.33 %
10.2504.00.00.4 58 BARRE ST RENT	$52,500.00	$27,500.00	($25,000.00)	52.38 %
TOTAL RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES	**$53,100.00**	**$28,000.00**	**($25,100.00)**	**52.73%**
10.260 FINES & FORFEITURES				
10.2601.00.00.4 POLICE FINES & FORFEITURE	$36,000.00	$16,698.10	($19,301.90)	46.38 %
10.2602.00.00.4 DRUG SEIZURE-FOR RESERVE	$0.00	$4,700.51	$4,700.51	0.00 %
10.2605.00.00.4 BUILDING/ZONING FINES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL FINES & FORFEITURES	**$36,000.00**	**$21,398.61**	**($14,601.39)**	**59.44%**
10.261 EQUIPMENT/LAND REVENUE				
10.2610.00.00.4 WATER FUND EQUIPMENT XFER	$103,008.00	$103,008.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2611.00.00.4 SEWER FUND EQUIPMENT XFER	$136,545.00	$136,545.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2612.00.00.4 PARKING FUND EQUIP XFER	$12,603.00	$12,603.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2613.00.00.4 FUEL SALES	$56,375.00	$39,002.09	($17,372.91)	69.18 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.2614.00.00.4 SALE OF EQUIPMENT	$0.00	$500.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.2614.00.10.4 PROCEEDS LEASE/NOTES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2614.00.11.4 SALE OF LAND	$0.00	$13,000.00	$13,000.00	0.00 %
10.2615.00.00.4 RENTAL OF EQUIPMENT	$16,000.00	$0.00	($16,000.00)	0.00 %
10.2616.00.00.4 MISC. REVENUE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2617.00.00.4 MISC REIMB (FLEET REPAIR)	$16,500.00	$10,021.23	($6,478.77)	60.73 %
10.2618.00.00.4 VACTOR USE FEE SEWER FUND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2619.00.00.4 USE OF EQUIPMENT FUND RES	$10,200.00	$10,255.00	$55.00	100.54 %
TOTAL EQUIPMENT/LAND REVENUE	**$351,231.00**	**$324,934.32**	**($26,296.68)**	**92.51%**
10.27 INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE				
10.2700.00.00.4 INTEREST INCOME	$50,000.00	$4,406.82	($45,593.18)	8.81 %
10.2715.00.00.4 PENSION DIVIDENDS & DISTR	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE	**$50,000.00**	**$4,406.82**	**($45,593.18)**	**8.81%**
10.28 MISC REVENUE				
10.2801.00.00.4 MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	$2,500.00	$857.54	($1,642.46)	34.30 %
10.2802.00.00.4 MISCELLANEOUS REIMB	$4,000.00	$5,434.25	$1,434.25	135.86 %
10.2802.00.01.4 INS. REIMB - OTHER DEPTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2802.00.02.4 INS. REIMB - DPW	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2802.00.03.4 INS. REIMB - POLICE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2802.00.04.4 INS. REIMB. - FIRE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2803.00.00.4 POLICE CANINE -OTHER REVENUES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2804.00.00.4 DONATIONS - AMBULANCE	$0.00	$15.00	$15.00	0.00 %
10.2804.00.01.4 DONATIONS- POLICE K-9	$0.00	$1,479.45	$1,479.45	0.00 %
10.2805.00.00.4 WELCOME MONTPELIER SIGNS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2806.00.00.4 GRNT DRAWDWNS -TREE BOARD	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2807.00.00.4 W.C./S.T.D. WAGE REIMBURS	$0.00	$16,628.14	$16,628.14	0.00 %
10.2807.00.01.4 WC /STD REIMB - DPW	$0.00	$10,850.73	$10,850.73	0.00 %
10.2807.00.02.4 WC /STD REIMB - POLICE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2807.00.03.4 WC / STD REIMB FIRE	$0.00	$10,834.04	$10,834.04	0.00 %
10.2809.00.00.4 TREE BOARD DONATIONS	$0.00	$589.00	$589.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.2811.00.00.4 ENERGY SAVINGS INCENTIVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2813.00.00.4 RESERVE FIRE REVENUE	$0.00	$2,774.68	$2,774.68	0.00 %
10.2814.00.00.4 PROCEEDS FROM L.T. DEBT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2816.00.00.4 CONNOR-INTEREST ON NOTE	$5,032.00	$2,219.31	($2,812.69)	44.10 %
10.2816.00.10.4 MISC GRANT REV-PLANNING	$0.00	$100.00	$100.00	0.00 %
10.2816.00.20.4 MISC REVENUE-HEALTH/BLD	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2817.00.00.4 USE OF CONNOR RESERVE	$29,635.00	$12,225.14	($17,409.86)	41.25 %
10.2820.00.00.4 EMPLOYEE WELLNESS (RESERV	$0.00	$8,381.00	$8,381.00	0.00 %
TOTAL MISC REVENUE	**$41,167.00**	**$72,388.28**	**$31,221.28**	**175.84%**
10.29 OPERATING TRANSFERS				
10.2901.00.00.4 ADMIN TRANSFER - WATER	$263,164.00	$263,164.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2902.00.00.4 ADMIN TRANSFER SEWER	$362,168.00	$362,168.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2903.00.00.4 ADMIN TRANSFER - PARKING	$39,027.00	$39,027.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2903.00.10.4 XFER FROM PARKING RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2904.00.00.4 XFER FROM PARKS-TREE WARD	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2905.00.00.4 XFER FROM SENIOR CENTER	$14,400.00	$14,400.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2906.00.00.4 XFER FRM DEBT SVC RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2907.00.00.4 XFER FROM FIRE RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2909.00.00.4 TRANSFER FROM CDA	$30,000.00	$0.00	($30,000.00)	0.00 %
10.2909.00.01.4 REACH GRANT ADMIN	$7,500.00	$0.00	($7,500.00)	0.00 %
10.2909.00.02.4 XFER FROM REACH	$0.00	$38,757.81	$38,757.81	0.00 %
10.2909.00.03.4 XFER FROM DISTRICT ENERGY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2913.00.00.4 XFER FROM WELLNESS RESERV	$5,000.00	$5,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2914.00.00.4 USE OF RECORDS RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2916.00.00.4 USE OF GEN FUND BALANCE	$24,400.00	$24,400.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.2920.00.00.4 BOND PROCEEDS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2930.00.00.4 LEASE/PURCHASE PROCEEDS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2932.44.00.4 REACH GRANT OTHER GRANTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.2932.44.01.4 REACH GRANT OTHER GRANTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL OPERATING TRANSFERS	**$748,659.00**	**$749,916.81**	**$1,257.81**	**100.17%**

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES	**$10,376,889.00**	**$9,934,722.93**	**($442,166.07)**	**95.74%**
EXPENDITURES				
10.3000 CITY COUNCIL				
10.3000.10.00.5 CITY COUNCIL SALARY & WAGES	$8,700.00	$5,074.86	$3,625.14	58.33 %
10.3000.15.02.5 CITY COUNCIL FICA/MEDICARE	$666.00	$388.43	$277.57	58.32 %
10.3000.15.03.5 CITY COUNCIL HEALTH INS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3000.20.00.5 CITY COUNCIL OFFICE SUPPLIES	$625.00	$317.05	$307.95	50.73 %
10.3000.20.01.5 CITY COUNCIL POSTAGE	$1,350.00	$0.00	$1,350.00	0.00 %
10.3000.30.00.5 CITY COUNCIL ADVERTISING	$5,160.00	$3,583.00	$1,577.00	69.44 %
10.3000.40.00.5 CITY COUNCIL DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$2,330.00	$186.00	$2,144.00	7.98 %
10.3000.56.00.5 CITY COUNCIL OTR PUR SRVC	$770.00	$716.37	$53.63	93.04 %
10.3000.56.01.5 CITY COUNCIL MONTP TELECOM	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3000.62.00.5 CITY COUNCIL PRINT & BINDING	$7,951.00	$0.00	$7,951.00	0.00 %
10.3000.74.00.5 CITY COUNCIL TRAVEL/TRANS	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
10.3000.79.00.5 CITY COUNCIL MISC	$950.00	$2,682.50	($1,732.50)	282.37 %
10.3000.83.00.5 CITY COUNCIL MACH & EQUIP	$150.00	$29.98	$120.02	19.99 %
TOTAL CITY COUNCIL	**$28,702.00**	**$12,978.19**	**$15,723.81**	**45.22%**
10.3210 CITY MANAGER				
10.3210.10.00.5 CITY MGR SALARY & WAGES	$176,642.00	$98,344.79	$78,297.21	55.67 %
10.3210.11.00.5 CITY MGR OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3210.15.01.5 CITY MGR DENTAL INS	$1,156.00	$579.25	$576.75	50.11 %
10.3210.15.02.5 CITY MGR FICA/MEDICARE	$12,895.00	$7,068.47	$5,826.53	54.82 %
10.3210.15.03.5 CITY MGR HEALTH INS	$21,954.00	$12,887.56	$9,066.44	58.70 %
10.3210.15.04.5 CITY MGR IRS SECTION 125	$310.00	$169.23	$140.77	54.59 %
10.3210.15.05.5 CITY MGR LT CARE INS	$134.00	$401.31	($267.31)	299.49 %
10.3210.15.07.5 CITY MGR CITY RETIREMENT	$10,599.00	$6,392.34	$4,206.66	60.31 %
10.3210.15.08.5 CITY MGR LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$1,839.00	$1,071.48	$767.52	58.26 %
10.3210.15.09.5 CITY MGR UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$313.00	$381.33	($68.33)	121.83 %
10.3210.15.10.5 CITY MGR WORKERS' COMP	$551.00	$397.99	$153.01	72.23 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3210.15.12.5 CITY MGR PARKING FEE	$1,560.00	$1,560.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.3210.15.13.5 CITY MGR DEF COMP 401(A)	$2,021.00	$1,100.40	$920.60	54.45 %
10.3210.20.00.5 CITY MGR OFFICE SUPPLIES	$805.00	$434.16	$370.84	53.93 %
10.3210.20.01.5 CITY MGR POSTAGE	$500.00	$7.00	$493.00	1.40 %
10.3210.30.00.5 CITY MGR ADVERTISING	$8,405.00	$8,186.50	$218.50	97.40 %
10.3210.34.00.5 CITY MGR COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$242.21	($242.21)	0.00 %
10.3210.34.02.5 CITY MGR INTERNET WAN SVC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3210.34.03.5 CITY MGR TELE CELL & PAGER	$1,900.00	$1,498.46	$401.54	78.87 %
10.3210.40.00.5 CITY MGR DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$5,175.00	$3,695.86	$1,479.14	71.42 %
10.3210.48.00.5 CITY MGR PROPERTY & LIAB INS	$3,460.00	$2,310.98	$1,149.02	66.79 %
10.3210.56.00.5 CITY MGR OTR PUR SRVC	$0.00	$250.62	($250.62)	0.00 %
10.3210.58.00.5 CITY MGR VIDEO ARCHIVE SYS	$0.00	$3,643.22	($3,643.22)	0.00 %
10.3210.61.00.5 CITY MGR LEGAL SERVICES	$40,000.00	$27,935.86	$12,064.14	69.84 %
10.3210.62.00.5 CITY MGR PRINT & BINDING	$100.00	$0.00	$100.00	0.00 %
10.3210.66.00.5 CITY MGR OTHER RENTALS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3210.68.00.5 CITY MGR EQUIP REPAIR & MNT	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
10.3210.68.01.5 CITY MGR INTERNAL FLEET REP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3210.70.00.5 CITY MGR COPIER	$345.00	$114.04	$230.96	33.06 %
10.3210.70.01.5 CITY MGR COPIER PAPER	$92.00	$79.11	$12.89	85.99 %
10.3210.74.00.5 CITY MGR TRAVEL/TRANS	$1,500.00	$594.45	$905.55	39.63 %
10.3210.74.01.5 CITY MGR TRANS-FUEL	$175.00	$0.00	$175.00	0.00 %
10.3210.75.00.5 CITY MGR CAR LEASE/STIPEND	$2,500.00	$0.00	$2,500.00	0.00 %
10.3210.79.00.5 CITY MGR MISC	$800.00	$29.00	$771.00	3.63 %
10.3210.83.00.5 CITY MGR MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3210.95.01.5 CITY MGR PENSION INT EXP	$5,363.00	$2,681.45	$2,681.55	50.00 %
TOTAL CITY MANAGER	**$301,294.00**	**$182,057.07**	**$119,236.93**	**60.43%**
10.3400 CLERK-TREASURER				
10.3400.10.00.5 CLERK TREAS SALARY & WAGES	$131,664.00	$71,893.84	$59,770.16	54.60 %
10.3400.11.00.5 CLERK TREAS OVERTIME	$1,000.00	$0.00	$1,000.00	0.00 %
10.3400.15.01.5 CLERK TREAS DENTAL INS	$1,203.00	$664.81	$538.19	55.26 %
10.3400.15.02.5 CLERK TREAS FICA/MEDICARE	$9,611.00	$4,960.70	$4,650.30	51.61 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3400.15.03.5 CLERK TREAS HEALTH INS	$22,833.00	$12,880.17	$9,952.83	56.41 %
10.3400.15.04.5 CLERK TREAS IRS SECTION 125	$322.00	$176.00	$146.00	54.66 %
10.3400.15.05.5 CLERK TREAS LT CARE INS	$139.00	$318.80	($179.80)	229.35 %
10.3400.15.07.5 CLERK TREAS CITY RETIREMENT	$7,900.00	$3,587.95	$4,312.05	45.42 %
10.3400.15.08.5 CLERK TREAS LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$1,912.00	$1,114.34	$797.66	58.28 %
10.3400.15.09.5 CLERK TREAS UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$325.00	$396.59	($71.59)	122.03 %
10.3400.15.10.5 CLERK TREAS WORKERS' COMP	$413.00	$297.05	$115.95	71.92 %
10.3400.15.12.5 CLERK TREAS PARKING FEE	$2,400.00	$2,160.00	$240.00	90.00 %
10.3400.20.00.5 CLERK TREAS OFFICE SUPPLIES	$8,000.00	$3,809.92	$4,190.08	47.62 %
10.3400.20.01.5 CLERK TREAS POSTAGE	$7,000.00	$204.90	$6,795.10	2.93 %
10.3400.23.00.5 CLERK TREAS SMALL TOOLS&EQP	$1,000.00	$0.00	$1,000.00	0.00 %
10.3400.30.00.5 CLERK TREAS ADVERTISING	$3,500.00	$640.50	$2,859.50	18.30 %
10.3400.40.00.5 CLERK TREAS DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$700.00	$163.81	$536.19	23.40 %
10.3400.48.00.5 CLERK TREAS PROP & LIAB INS	$3,599.00	$2,406.54	$1,192.46	66.87 %
10.3400.51.00.5 CLERK TREAS REC RESTORATION	$0.00	$15,233.00	($15,233.00)	0.00 %
10.3400.60.00.5 CLERK TREAS PROF SVCS	$17,000.00	$6,507.01	$10,492.99	38.28 %
10.3400.68.00.5 CLERK TREAS EQUIP REP&MAINT	$17.00	$0.00	$17.00	0.00 %
10.3400.70.00.5 CLERK TREAS COPIER	$358.00	$118.63	$239.37	33.14 %
10.3400.70.01.5 CLERK TREAS COPIER PAPER	$96.00	$82.27	$13.73	85.70 %
10.3400.74.00.5 CLERK TREAS TRAVEL/TRANSP	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
10.3400.83.00.5 CLERK TREAS MACH AND EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3400.95.01.5 CLERK TREAS PENSION INT EXP	$5,577.00	$2,788.71	$2,788.29	50.00 %
TOTAL CLERK-TREASURER	**$226,869.00**	**$130,405.54**	**$96,463.46**	**57.48%**
10.3420 FINANCE				
10.3420.10.00.5 FINANCE SALARIES & WAGES	$135,907.00	$110,931.91	$24,975.09	81.62 %
10.3420.11.00.5 FINANCE OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3420.15.01.5 FINANCE DENTAL INSURANCE	$1,203.00	$791.93	$411.07	65.83 %
10.3420.15.02.5 FINANCE FICA/MEDICARE	$9,921.00	$8,040.78	$1,880.22	81.05 %
10.3420.15.03.5 FINANCE HEALTH INSURANCE	$22,833.00	$11,501.61	$11,331.39	50.37 %
10.3420.15.04.5 FINANCE IRS SECTION 125	$322.00	$181.94	$140.06	56.50 %
10.3420.15.05.5 FINANCE LONG TERM CARE INS	$139.00	$375.35	($236.35)	270.04 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3420.15.07.5 FINANCE CITY RETIREMENT	$8,154.00	$6,248.49	$1,905.51	76.63 %
10.3420.15.08.5 FINANCE LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$1,912.00	$1,114.34	$797.66	58.28 %
10.3420.15.09.5 FINANCE UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$325.00	$285.69	$39.31	87.90 %
10.3420.15.10.5 FINANCE WORKERS' COMP	$424.00	$305.70	$118.30	72.10 %
10.3420.15.12.5 FINANCE PARKING FEE	$1,560.00	$1,800.00	($240.00)	115.38 %
10.3420.20.00.5 FINANCE OFFICE SUPPLIES	$5,500.00	$1,938.58	$3,561.42	35.25 %
10.3420.20.01.5 FINANCE POSTAGE	$3,000.00	$12.50	$2,987.50	0.42 %
10.3420.30.00.5 FINANCE ADVERTISING	$0.00	$282.65	($282.65)	0.00 %
10.3420.34.00.5 FINANCE COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3420.40.00.5 FINANCE DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$750.00	$12.50	$737.50	1.67 %
10.3420.41.00.5 FINANCE PROF DEV/TRAINING	$750.00	$220.00	$530.00	29.33 %
10.3420.48.00.5 FINANCE PROPERTY & LIAB INS	$3,599.00	$2,406.54	$1,192.46	66.87 %
10.3420.60.00.5 FINANCE PROF SVCS AUDIT/FS	$30,900.00	$22,710.00	$8,190.00	73.50 %
10.3420.60.01.5 FINANCE ACCNTING SFTWRE	$8,740.00	$11,305.50	($2,565.50)	129.35 %
10.3420.60.02.5 FINANCE PROF SVCS ACCOUNT	$58,620.00	$22,963.32	$35,656.68	39.17 %
10.3420.60.03.5 FINANCE FIN STMTS & FIXED ASSETS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3420.62.00.5 FINANCE PRINTING & BINDING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3420.68.00.5 FINANCE EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$600.00	$0.00	$600.00	0.00 %
10.3420.70.00.5 FINANCE COPIER	$358.00	$118.63	$239.37	33.14 %
10.3420.70.01.5 FINANCE COPIER PAPER	$96.00	$82.27	$13.73	85.70 %
10.3420.74.00.5 FINANCE TRAVEL/TRANSP	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
10.3420.79.00.5 FINANCE MISC	$0.00	($172.41)	$172.41	0.00 %
10.3420.83.00.5 FINANCE MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3420.95.01.5 FINANCE PENSION INT EXP	$5,577.00	$2,788.71	$2,788.29	50.00 %
TOTAL FINANCE	**$301,490.00**	**$206,246.53**	**$95,243.47**	**68.41%**
10.3423 TECHNOLOGY SERVICES				
10.3423.10.00.5 TECHNOLOGY SALARIES & WAGES	$86,856.00	$49,237.84	$37,618.16	56.69 %
10.3423.11.00.5 TECHNOLOGY OVERTIME	$785.00	$0.00	$785.00	0.00 %
10.3423.15.01.5 TECHNOLOGY DENTAL INS	$925.00	$463.40	$461.60	50.10 %
10.3423.15.02.5 TECHNOLOGY FICA/MEDICARE	$6,398.00	$3,515.03	$2,882.97	54.94 %
10.3423.15.03.5 TECHNOLOGY HEALTH INS	$17,564.00	$9,884.61	$7,679.39	56.28 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3423.15.04.5 TECHNOLOGY IRS SECTION 125	$248.00	$135.39	$112.61	54.59 %
10.3423.15.05.5 TECHNOLOGY LT CARE INS	$107.00	$282.26	($175.26)	263.79 %
10.3423.15.07.5 TECHNOLOGY CITY RETIREMENT	$5,258.00	$2,901.99	$2,356.01	55.19 %
10.3423.15.08.5 TECHNOLOGY LIFE,STD,LTD INS	$1,472.00	$857.19	$614.81	58.23 %
10.3423.15.09.5 TECHNOLOGY UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$250.00	$305.08	($55.08)	122.03 %
10.3423.15.10.5 TECHNOLOGY WORKERS' COMP	$273.00	$196.11	$76.89	71.84 %
10.3423.15.12.5 TECHNOLOGY PARKING FEE	$1,200.00	$1,200.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.3423.20.00.5 TECHNOLOGY OFFICE SUPPLIES	$500.00	($39.48)	$539.48	(7.90)%
10.3423.20.01.5 TECHNOLOGY POSTAGE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.23.00.5 TECHNOLOGY SMALL TOOLS&EQUIP	$3,300.00	$1,897.84	$1,402.16	57.51 %
10.3423.30.00.5 TECHNOLOGY ADVERTISING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.34.00.5 TECHNOLOGY TELE BASIC SERVICE	$9,804.00	$5,643.55	$4,160.45	57.56 %
10.3423.34.01.5 TECHNOLOGY TELE LONG DIST	$2,105.00	$1,459.99	$645.01	69.36 %
10.3423.34.02.5 TECHNOLOGY INTERNET WAN SVC	$16,477.00	$7,576.94	$8,900.06	45.98 %
10.3423.34.03.5 TECHNOLOGY TELE CELL & PAGER	$1,356.00	$711.24	$644.76	52.45 %
10.3423.40.00.5 TECHNOLOGY DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.48.00.5 TECHNOLOGY PROPERTY&LIAB INS	$2,768.00	$1,851.18	$916.82	66.88 %
10.3423.56.00.5 TECHNOLOGY OTR PUR SRVC	$12,600.00	$2,897.34	$9,702.66	22.99 %
10.3423.60.00.5 TECHNOLOGY PROFESSIONAL SVC	$14,850.00	$7,326.23	$7,523.77	49.33 %
10.3423.65.00.5 TECHNOLOGY RENTAL OF EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.68.00.5 TECHNOLOGY EQUIP REP & MAINT	$5,250.00	$5,595.98	($345.98)	106.59 %
10.3423.70.00.5 TECHNOLOGY COPIER	$276.00	$91.24	$184.76	33.06 %
10.3423.70.01.5 TECHNOLOGY COPIER PAPER	$74.00	$63.28	$10.72	85.51 %
10.3423.74.00.5 TECHNOLOGY TRAVEL/TRANS	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
10.3423.83.00.5 TECHNOLOGY MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.83.01.5 TECHNOLOGY COMP EQUIP ALLOC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.88.01.5 TECHNOLOGY COMPUTER RESVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.88.02.5 TECHNOLOGY TELE RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3423.95.01.5 TECHNOLOGY PENSION INTEXP	$4,290.00	$2,145.16	$2,144.84	50.00 %
TOTAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	**$195,186.00**	**$106,199.39**	**$88,986.61**	**54.41%**

10.3430 PROPERTY ASSESSOR

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3430.10.00.5 ASSESSOR SALARIES & WAGES	$47,042.00	$26,533.37	$20,508.63	56.40 %
10.3430.11.00.5 ASSESSOR OVERTIME	$845.00	$0.00	$845.00	0.00 %
10.3430.15.01.5 ASSESSOR DENTAL INS	$463.00	$231.70	$231.30	50.04 %
10.3430.15.02.5 ASSESSOR FICA/MEDICARE	$3,496.00	$1,942.29	$1,553.71	55.56 %
10.3430.15.03.5 ASSESSOR HEALTH INS	$8,782.00	$1,150.55	$7,631.45	13.10 %
10.3430.15.04.5 ASSESSOR IRS SECTION 125	$124.00	$67.69	$56.31	54.59 %
10.3430.15.05.5 ASSESSOR LT CARE INS	$54.00	$126.20	($72.20)	233.70 %
10.3430.15.07.5 ASSESSOR CITY RETIREMENT	$2,823.00	$1,326.73	$1,496.27	47.00 %
10.3430.15.08.5 ASSESSOR LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$736.00	$428.58	$307.42	58.23 %
10.3430.15.09.5 ASSESSOR UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$125.00	$263.43	($138.43)	210.74 %
10.3430.15.10.5 ASSESSOR WORKERS' COMP	$148.00	$106.71	$41.29	72.10 %
10.3430.15.12.5 ASSESSOR PARKING FEE	$600.00	$900.00	($300.00)	150.00 %
10.3430.20.00.5 ASSESSOR OFFICE SUPPLIES	$1,600.00	$755.08	$844.92	47.19 %
10.3430.20.01.5 ASSESSOR POSTAGE	$650.00	$13.00	$637.00	2.00 %
10.3430.30.00.5 ASSESSOR ADVERTISING	$250.00	$0.00	$250.00	0.00 %
10.3430.34.00.5 ASSESSOR COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3430.40.00.5 ASSESSOR DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$2,950.00	$1,199.67	$1,750.33	40.67 %
10.3430.48.00.5 ASSESSOR PROPERTY &LIAB INS	$1,384.00	$925.60	$458.40	66.88 %
10.3430.56.00.5 ASSESSOR OTR PUR SRVC	$4,500.00	$4,370.00	$130.00	97.11 %
10.3430.60.00.5 ASSESSOR PROFESSIONAL SVC	$47,904.00	$46,940.00	$964.00	97.99 %
10.3430.60.01.5 ASSESSOR REAPPRAISAL SVCS	$70,000.00	$22,000.00	$48,000.00	31.43 %
10.3430.60.02.5 ASSESSOR REAPPRAISAL RESVE EXP	$17,325.00	$4,877.48	$12,447.52	28.15 %
10.3430.62.00.5 ASSESSOR PRINTING & BINDING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3430.68.00.5 ASSESSOR EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
10.3430.70.00.5 ASSESSOR COPIER	$138.00	$45.64	$92.36	33.07 %
10.3430.70.01.5 ASSESSOR COPIER PAPER	$40.00	$31.64	$8.36	79.10 %
10.3430.74.00.5 ASSESSOR TRAVEL/TRANS	$100.00	$0.00	$100.00	0.00 %
10.3430.83.00.5 ASSESSOR MACHINERY & EQUIP	$525.00	$0.00	$525.00	0.00 %
10.3430.95.01.5 ASSESSOR PENSION INT EXP	$2,145.00	$1,072.58	$1,072.42	50.00 %
TOTAL PROPERTY ASSESSOR	**$214,799.00**	**$115,307.94**	**$99,491.06**	**53.68%**

10.3600 PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3600.10.00.5 PLANNING SALARIES & WAGES	$238,836.00	$127,202.79	$111,633.21	53.26 %
10.3600.10.01.5 PLANNING MINUTES SALARIES	$0.00	$3,160.14	($3,160.14)	0.00 %
10.3600.11.00.5 PLANNING OVERTIME	$1,108.00	$0.00	$1,108.00	0.00 %
10.3600.11.01.5 PLANNING OVERTIME MINUTES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.15.01.5 PLANNING DENTAL INS	$2,174.00	$1,134.68	$1,039.32	52.19 %
10.3600.15.02.5 PLANNING FICA/MEDICARE	$17,516.00	$9,158.24	$8,357.76	52.28 %
10.3600.15.03.5 PLANNING HEALTH INS	$41,257.00	$19,819.27	$21,437.73	48.04 %
10.3600.15.04.5 PLANNING IRS SECTION 125	$583.00	$318.01	$264.99	54.55 %
10.3600.15.05.5 PLANNING LT CARE INS	$251.00	$431.84	($180.84)	172.05 %
10.3600.15.07.5 PLANNING CITY RETIREMENT	$14,397.00	$7,648.17	$6,748.83	53.12 %
10.3600.15.08.5 PLANNING LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$3,458.00	$2,013.52	$1,444.48	58.23 %
10.3600.15.09.5 PLANNING UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$588.00	$716.60	($128.60)	121.87 %
10.3600.15.10.5 PLANNING WORKERS' COMP	$747.00	$539.31	$207.69	72.20 %
10.3600.15.12.5 PLANNING PARKING FEE	$3,300.00	$3,300.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.3600.20.00.5 PLANNING OFFICE SUPPLIES	$1,800.00	$304.09	$1,495.91	16.89 %
10.3600.20.01.5 PLANNING POSTAGE	$2,790.00	$22.61	$2,767.39	0.81 %
10.3600.21.00.5 PLANNING OPERATING SUPPLIES	$500.00	$397.67	$102.33	79.53 %
10.3600.23.00.5 PLANNING SMALL TOOLS/EQUIP	$500.00	$576.01	($76.01)	115.20 %
10.3600.30.00.5 PLANNING ADVERTISING	$5,000.00	$1,729.80	$3,270.20	34.60 %
10.3600.40.00.5 PLANNING DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$1,200.00	$728.77	$471.23	60.73 %
10.3600.41.00.5 PLANNING PROFESSIONAL DEV	$4,500.00	$1,097.52	$3,402.48	24.39 %
10.3600.48.00.5 PLANNING PROPERTY &LIAB INS	$6,503.00	$4,348.43	$2,154.57	66.87 %
10.3600.56.00.5 PLANNING OTR PUR SRVC	$3,000.00	$0.00	$3,000.00	0.00 %
10.3600.57.00.5 PLANNING PROGRAM EXPENSES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.58.00.5 PLANNING WEB SITE MAINT	$4,000.00	$851.20	$3,148.80	21.28 %
10.3600.60.00.5 PLANNING PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$2,500.00	$1,595.00	$905.00	63.80 %
10.3600.60.01.5 PLANNING CONTRACT SVS BLDG INSPEC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.60.02.5 PLANNING RE-ZONING CONTRACT SVS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.61.00.5 PLANNING OTHER LEGAL SVCS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.62.00.5 PLANNING PRINTING & BINDING	$100.00	$30.06	$69.94	30.06 %
10.3600.63.00.5 PLANNING MASTER PLAN UPDATE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.68.00.5 PLANNING EQUIP REPAIR&MAINT	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3600.70.00.5 PLANNING COPIER	$648.00	$214.32	$433.68	33.07 %
10.3600.70.01.5 PLANNING COPIER PAPER	$173.00	$162.28	$10.72	93.80 %
10.3600.74.00.5 PLANNING TRAVEL & TRANS	$625.00	$234.79	$390.21	37.57 %
10.3600.75.00.5 PLANNING CENTRAL VT ECONOMIC DEV	$3,000.00	$0.00	$3,000.00	0.00 %
10.3600.79.00.5 PLANNING MISC	$300.00	$435.55	($135.55)	145.18 %
10.3600.83.00.5 PLANNING MACHINERY & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3600.85.00.5 PLANNING RE-ZONING GRANT EXP	$0.00	$2,320.00	($2,320.00)	0.00 %
10.3600.95.01.5 PLANNING PENSION INT EXP	$10,082.00	$5,041.13	$5,040.87	50.00 %
TOTAL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	**$371,936.00**	**$195,531.80**	**$176,404.20**	**52.57%**
10.3710 CITY HALL MAINT				
10.3710.10.00.5 CITY HALL SALARIES & WAGES	$46,063.00	$20,600.53	$25,462.47	44.72 %
10.3710.11.00.5 CITY HALL OVERTIME	$2,478.00	$325.71	$2,152.29	13.14 %
10.3710.15.01.5 CITY HALL DENTAL INS	$509.00	$214.66	$294.34	42.17 %
10.3710.15.02.5 CITY HALL FICA/MEDICARE	$3,543.00	$1,499.62	$2,043.38	42.33 %
10.3710.15.03.5 CITY HALL HEALTH INS	$10,538.00	$3,977.57	$6,560.43	37.75 %
10.3710.15.04.5 CITY HALL IRS SECTION 125	$136.00	$81.23	$54.77	59.73 %
10.3710.15.05.5 CITY HALL LT CARE INS	$59.00	$103.78	($44.78)	175.90 %
10.3710.15.07.5 CITY HALL CITY RETIREMENT	$2,912.00	$1,280.94	$1,631.06	43.99 %
10.3710.15.08.5 CITY HALL LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$810.00	$514.30	$295.70	63.49 %
10.3710.15.09.5 CITY HALL UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$138.00	$183.03	($45.03)	132.63 %
10.3710.15.10.5 CITY HALL WORKERS' COMP	$2,507.00	$1,814.22	$692.78	72.37 %
10.3710.15.12.5 CITY HALL PARKING FEE	$660.00	$660.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.3710.18.00.5 CITY HALL UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$500.00	$280.17	$219.83	56.03 %
10.3710.20.00.5 CITY HALL OFFICE SUPPLIES	$100.00	$60.67	$39.33	60.67 %
10.3710.21.00.5 CITY HALL OPERATING SUPPLY	$7,000.00	$5,915.95	$1,084.05	84.51 %
10.3710.21.01.5 CITY HALL SPRING/FALL PLANT	$1,000.00	$0.00	$1,000.00	0.00 %
10.3710.23.00.5 CITY HALL SMALL TOOLS&EQUIP	$1,000.00	$300.73	$699.27	30.07 %
10.3710.34.00.5 CITY HALL COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3710.34.03.5 CITY HALL TELE CELL & PAGER	$600.00	$492.40	$107.60	82.07 %
10.3710.34.04.5 CITY HALL TELEPHONE PUBLIC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3710.40.00.5 CITY HALL DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$50.00	$25.80	$24.20	51.60 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3710.48.00.5 CITY HALL PROP & LIAB INS	$1,661.00	$1,110.71	$550.29	66.87 %
10.3710.48.01.5 CITY HALL XFER FRM POLICE ST	($10,300.00)	($10,300.00)	$0.00	100.00 %
10.3710.56.00.5 CITY HALL OTR PUR SRVC	$5,000.00	$4,589.10	$410.90	91.78 %
10.3710.60.00.5 CITY HALL PROFESSIONAL SVC	$500.00	$168.50	$331.50	33.70 %
10.3710.68.00.5 CITY HALL EQUIP REPAIR&MAINT	$1,000.00	$0.00	$1,000.00	0.00 %
10.3710.69.00.5 CITY HALL BLDG REPAIR/MAINT	$18,300.00	$11,315.58	$6,984.42	61.83 %
10.3710.70.00.5 CITY HALL COPIER	$152.00	$54.73	$97.27	36.01 %
10.3710.70.01.5 CITY HALL COPIER PAPER	$40.00	$36.17	$3.83	90.43 %
10.3710.74.00.5 CITY HALL TRAVEL/TRANS	$100.00	$56.95	$43.05	56.95 %
10.3710.76.01.5 CITY HALL ELECTRIC	$30,000.00	$15,425.69	$14,574.31	51.42 %
10.3710.76.02.5 CITY HALL HEATING FUEL	$45,000.00	$28,031.28	$16,968.72	62.29 %
10.3710.76.03.5 CITY HALL TRASH REMOVAL	$9,600.00	$1,974.00	$7,626.00	20.56 %
10.3710.76.04.5 CITY HALL IN HOUSE UTILITIES	$3,000.00	$605.38	$2,394.62	20.18 %
10.3710.82.00.5 CITY HALL CAPITAL IMPROV	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.3710.83.00.5 CITY HALL MACH & EQUIP	$1,000.00	$663.90	$336.10	66.39 %
10.3710.95.01.5 CITY HALL PENSION INT EXP	$2,360.00	$1,179.84	$1,180.16	49.99 %
TOTAL CITY HALL MAINT	**$188,016.00**	**$93,243.14**	**$94,772.86**	**49.59%**
10.3810 58 BARRE ST BLDG MAINT				
10.3810.10.00.5 58 BARRE ST SALARY & WAGES	$5,902.00	$3,219.68	$2,682.32	54.55 %
10.3810.11.00.5 58 BARRE ST OVERTIME	$38.00	$36.75	$1.25	96.71 %
10.3810.15.01.5 58 BARRE ST DENTAL INS	$0.00	$21.47	($21.47)	0.00 %
10.3810.15.02.5 58 BARRE ST FICA/MEDICARE	$434.00	$245.16	$188.84	56.49 %
10.3810.15.03.5 58 BARRE ST HEALTH IN	$878.00	$237.34	$640.66	27.03 %
10.3810.15.04.5 58 BARRE ST IRS SECTION 125	$0.00	$6.77	($6.77)	0.00 %
10.3810.15.05.5 58 BARRE ST BLDG MAINT	$0.00	$12.67	($12.67)	0.00 %
10.3810.15.07.5 58 BARRE ST CITY RETIREMENT	$356.00	$193.55	$162.45	54.37 %
10.3810.15.08.5 58 BARRE ST LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$0.00	$42.86	($42.86)	0.00 %
10.3810.15.09.5 58 BARRE ST UNEMPLOY INS	$0.00	$15.27	($15.27)	0.00 %
10.3810.15.10.5 58 BARRE ST WORKERS' COMP	$18.00	$10.37	$7.63	57.61 %
10.3810.21.00.5 58 BARRE ST OPERATING SUPPLY	$1,300.00	$27.51	$1,272.49	2.12 %
10.3810.23.00.5 58 BARRE ST SMALL TOOLS	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.3810.34.03.5 58 BARRE ST COMMUNICATIONS	$600.00	$0.00	$600.00	0.00 %
10.3810.48.00.5 58 BARRE ST PROPERTY & LIAB INS	$0.00	$92.56	($92.56)	0.00 %
10.3810.56.00.5 58 BARRE ST OTR PUR SRVC	$9,500.00	$0.00	$9,500.00	0.00 %
10.3810.60.00.5 58 BARRE ST PROFESSIONAL SVC	$2,500.00	$0.00	$2,500.00	0.00 %
10.3810.68.00.5 58 BARRE ST EQUIP REP & MAINT	$1,000.00	$0.00	$1,000.00	0.00 %
10.3810.69.00.5 58 BARRE ST BLDG MAINT	$9,400.00	$60.50	$9,339.50	0.64 %
10.3810.70.00.5 58 BARRE ST COPIER	$0.00	$4.54	($4.54)	0.00 %
10.3810.70.01.5 58 BARRE ST COPY PAPER	$0.00	$1.36	($1.36)	0.00 %
10.3810.76.01.5 58 BARRE ST ELECTRIC	$36,000.00	$1,851.38	$34,148.62	5.14 %
10.3810.76.02.5 58 BARRE ST HEAT	$35,000.00	$0.00	$35,000.00	0.00 %
10.3810.76.03.5 58 BARRE ST TRASH REMOVAL	$1,200.00	$449.00	$751.00	37.42 %
10.3810.76.04.5 58 BARRE ST IN HOUSE UTILITY	$2,500.00	$701.26	$1,798.74	28.05 %
10.3810.96.00.5 58 BARRE ST XFER TO CEM FD-PLOWING	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
TOTAL 58 BARRE ST BLDG MAINT	**$108,626.00**	**$7,230.00**	**$101,396.00**	**6.66%**
10.4100 POLICE OPERATIONS				
10.4100.10.00.5 POLICE SALARY & WAGES	$841,776.00	$451,233.52	$390,542.48	53.60 %
10.4100.11.00.5 POLICE OVERTIME	$94,050.00	$70,932.23	$23,117.77	75.42 %
10.4100.15.01.5 POLICE DENTAL INS	$7,335.00	$3,315.64	$4,019.36	45.20 %
10.4100.15.02.5 POLICE FICA/MEDICARE	$68,315.00	$38,255.68	$30,059.32	56.00 %
10.4100.15.03.5 POLICE HEALTH INS	$149,279.00	$68,027.72	$81,251.28	45.57 %
10.4100.15.04.5 POLICE IRS SECTION 125	$1,843.00	$1,073.55	$769.45	58.25 %
10.4100.15.05.5 POLICE LT CARE INS	$795.00	$1,262.71	($467.71)	158.83 %
10.4100.15.07.5 POLICE CITY RETIREMENT	$58,991.00	$33,146.79	$25,844.21	56.19 %
10.4100.15.08.5 POLICE LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$10,940.00	$5,846.61	$5,093.39	53.44 %
10.4100.15.09.5 POLICE UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$1,984.00	$2,419.17	($435.17)	121.93 %
10.4100.15.10.5 POLICE WORKERS' COMP	$27,428.00	$19,775.59	$7,652.41	72.10 %
10.4100.15.12.5 POLICE PARKING FEE	$2,652.00	$2,652.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.4100.18.00.5 POLICE UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTH	$9,400.00	$6,209.18	$3,190.82	66.06 %
10.4100.19.00.5 POLICE TUITION REIMB/FIT TEST	$3,000.00	$660.00	$2,340.00	22.00 %
10.4100.20.00.5 POLICE OFFICE SUPPLIES	$2,020.00	$888.31	$1,131.69	43.98 %
10.4100.20.01.5 POLICE POSTAGE	$1,500.00	$638.41	$861.59	42.56 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4100.21.00.5 POLICE OPERATING SUPPLIES	$10,460.00	$12,270.57	($1,810.57)	117.31 %
10.4100.21.01.5 POLICE INTERNAL FLEET FUEL	$21,730.00	$11,702.28	$10,027.72	53.85 %
10.4100.30.00.5 POLICE ADVERTISING	$800.00	$2,299.30	($1,499.30)	287.41 %
10.4100.40.00.5 POLICE DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$942.00	$990.50	($48.50)	105.15 %
10.4100.41.00.5 POLICE TRAINING	$7,600.00	$3,863.49	$3,736.51	50.84 %
10.4100.48.00.5 POLICE PROPERTY & LIABI INS	$21,966.00	$14,768.89	$7,197.11	67.24 %
10.4100.56.00.5 POLICE OTR PUR SRVC	$5,977.00	$847.10	$5,129.90	14.17 %
10.4100.56.01.5 POLICE XFER TO CITY HALL CLEANING	$10,300.00	$10,300.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.4100.60.00.5 POLICE PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$9,325.00	$3,802.15	$5,522.85	40.77 %
10.4100.62.00.5 POLICE PRINTING & BINDING	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
10.4100.68.00.5 POLICE EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$29,050.00	$15,506.26	$13,543.74	53.38 %
10.4100.68.01.5 POLICE INTERNAL FLEET REP	$16,000.00	$4,951.69	$11,048.31	30.95 %
10.4100.69.00.5 POLICE BLDGS/GROUNDS MAIN	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4100.70.00.5 POLICE COPIER	$2,187.00	$723.56	$1,463.44	33.08 %
10.4100.70.01.5 POLICE COPIER PAPER	$583.00	$483.94	$99.06	83.01 %
10.4100.72.00.5 POLICE TAXES/LICENSE/REG	$205.00	$0.00	$205.00	0.00 %
10.4100.74.00.5 POLICE TRAVEL/TRANS	$3,100.00	$409.78	$2,690.22	13.22 %
10.4100.75.00.5 POLICE LEASE/PURCHASE INSTL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4100.76.00.5 POLICE UTILITIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4100.76.01.5 POLICE ELECTRIC	$15,082.00	$8,085.53	$6,996.47	53.61 %
10.4100.76.02.5 POLICE HEATING OIL	$7,800.00	$2,591.05	$5,208.95	33.22 %
10.4100.76.04.5 POLICE IN HOUSE UTILITIES	$915.00	$509.87	$405.13	55.72 %
10.4100.79.00.5 POLICE CHILD SAFETY SEATS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4100.83.00.5 POLICE MACHINERY & EQUIP	$0.00	$1,797.00	($1,797.00)	0.00 %
10.4100.83.01.5 POLICE EQUIP -DRUG SEIZURE RES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4100.85.00.5 POLICE GRANT EXPENSE	$0.00	$5,509.23	($5,509.23)	0.00 %
10.4100.89.00.5 POLICE INT EXPNS ON LEASES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4100.95.01.5 POLICE PENSION INTEREST EXP	$34,022.00	$17,011.13	$17,010.87	50.00 %
TOTAL POLICE OPERATIONS	**$1,479,652.00**	**$824,760.43**	**$654,891.57**	**55.74%**
10.4105 POLICE COMMUNICATIONS				
10.4105.10.00.5 POLICE COM SALARY & WAGES	$257,783.00	$152,433.27	$105,349.73	59.13 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4105.11.00.5 POLICE COM OVERTIME	$55,000.00	$32,552.63	$22,447.37	59.19 %
10.4105.15.01.5 POLICE COM DENTAL INS	$2,521.00	$1,341.60	$1,179.40	53.22 %
10.4105.15.02.5 POLICE COM FICA/MEDICARE	$22,833.00	$13,377.44	$9,455.56	58.59 %
10.4105.15.03.5 POLICE COM HEALTH INS	$55,361.00	$27,944.49	$27,416.51	50.48 %
10.4105.15.04.5 POLICE COM IRS SECTION 125	$675.00	$368.92	$306.08	54.65 %
10.4105.15.05.5 POLICE COM LT CARE INS	$292.00	$428.48	($136.48)	146.74 %
10.4105.15.07.5 POLICE COM CITY RETIREMENT	$18,767.00	$12,004.08	$6,762.92	63.96 %
10.4105.15.08.5 POLICE COM LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$4,010.00	$2,335.82	$1,674.18	58.25 %
10.4105.15.09.5 POLICE COM UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$682.00	$831.31	($149.31)	121.89 %
10.4105.15.10.5 POLICE COM WORKERS' COMP	$5,090.00	$3,671.33	$1,418.67	72.13 %
10.4105.15.11.5 POLICE COM TUITION REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4105.15.12.5 POLICE COM PARKING FEE	$750.00	$750.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.4105.18.00.5 POLICE COM UNIFRMS/PROT CLOTH	$1,800.00	$124.90	$1,675.10	6.94 %
10.4105.19.00.5 POLICE COM TUITION REIMB/FIT TEST	$3,000.00	$485.00	$2,515.00	16.17 %
10.4105.20.00.5 POLICE COM OFFICE SUPPLIES	$1,380.00	$460.53	$919.47	33.37 %
10.4105.20.01.5 POLICE COM POSTAGE	$0.00	$18.75	($18.75)	0.00 %
10.4105.21.00.5 POLICE COM OPERATING SUPPLY	$100.00	$54.60	$45.40	54.60 %
10.4105.30.00.5 POLICE COM ADVERTISING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4105.34.00.5 POLICE COM COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4105.34.03.5 POLICE COM TELE CELL &PAGER	$3,360.00	$2,185.05	$1,174.95	65.03 %
10.4105.34.04.5 POLICE COMM TELE VLETS	$4,230.00	$2,050.50	$2,179.50	48.48 %
10.4105.40.00.5 POLICE COM DUES/SUB/MTGS	$90.00	$92.00	($2.00)	102.22 %
10.4105.41.00.5 POLICE COM TRAINING	$1,625.00	$117.54	$1,507.46	7.23 %
10.4105.48.00.5 POLICE COM PROP & LIABI INS	$7,544.00	$5,044.48	$2,499.52	66.87 %
10.4105.56.00.5 POLICE COM OTR PUR SRVC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4105.62.00.5 POLICE COM PRINT & BINDING	$100.00	$0.00	$100.00	0.00 %
10.4105.68.00.5 POLICE COM EQUIP REP &MAINT	$9,438.00	$2,820.50	$6,617.50	29.88 %
10.4105.70.00.5 POLICE COM COPIER	$751.00	$248.64	$502.36	33.11 %
10.4105.70.01.5 POLICE COM COPIER PAPER	$200.00	$172.44	$27.56	86.22 %
10.4105.74.00.5 POLICE COM TRAVEL/TRANS	$400.00	$36.00	$364.00	9.00 %
10.4105.83.00.5 POLICE COM MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4105.85.00.5 POLICE COM FED/ST GRANT EXP	$11,691.00	$0.00	$11,691.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4105.95.01.5 POLICE COM PENSION INT EXP	$0.00	$5,845.56	($5,845.56)	0.00 %
TOTAL POLICE COMMUNICATIONS	**$469,473.00**	**$267,795.86**	**$201,677.14**	**57.04%**
10.4150 OUTSIDE PAY POLICE				
10.4150.10.00.5 OUTSIDE PAY SALARY & WAGES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4150.11.00.5 OUTSIDE PAY OVERTIME	$0.00	$383.88	($383.88)	0.00 %
10.4150.15.02.5 OUTSIDE PAY FICA/MEDICARE	$0.00	$28.83	($28.83)	0.00 %
10.4150.15.03.5 OUTSIDE PAY POLICE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4150.15.07.5 OUTSIDE PAY CITY RETIREMENT	$0.00	$22.50	($22.50)	0.00 %
TOTAL OUTSIDE PAY POLICE	**$0.00**	**$435.21**	**($435.21)**	**0.00%**
10.4161 POLICE CANINE UNIT				
10.4161.21.00.5 CANINE OP SUPPLIES	$0.00	$583.21	($583.21)	0.00 %
TOTAL POLICE CANINE UNIT	**$0.00**	**$583.21**	**($583.21)**	**0.00%**
10.4190 POLICE SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER				
10.4190.10.00.5 SCHOOL RES SALARY & WAGES	$56,918.00	$35,162.64	$21,755.36	61.78 %
10.4190.11.00.5 SCHOOL RES OVERTIME	$1,000.00	$832.29	$167.71	83.23 %
10.4190.15.01.5 SCHOOL RES DENTAL INS	$462.00	$229.53	$232.47	49.68 %
10.4190.15.02.5 SCHOOL RES FICA/MEDICARE	$4,228.00	$2,753.78	$1,474.22	65.13 %
10.4190.15.03.5 SCHOOL RES HEALTH INS	$8,782.00	$1,150.55	$7,631.45	13.10 %
10.4190.15.04.5 SCHOOL RES IRS SECT 125	$124.00	$67.69	$56.31	54.59 %
10.4190.15.05.5 SCHOOL RES LT CARE INS	$53.00	$77.90	($24.90)	146.98 %
10.4190.15.07.5 SCHOOL RES CITY RETIREMENT	$3,475.00	$2,339.68	$1,135.32	67.33 %
10.4190.15.08.5 SCHOOL RES LIFE,STD,LTD INS	$736.00	$428.58	$307.42	58.23 %
10.4190.15.09.5 SCHOOL RES UNEMPLOY INS	$125.00	$152.53	($27.53)	122.02 %
10.4190.15.10.5 SCHOOL RES WORKERS' COMP	$2,178.00	$1,571.78	$606.22	72.17 %
10.4190.15.11.5 SCHOOL RES TUITION REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.18.00.5 SCHOOL RES UNIF/PROTECT CLOTH	$550.00	$0.00	$550.00	0.00 %
10.4190.20.00.5 SCHOOL RES OFFICE SUPPLY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.20.01.5 SCHOOL RES POSTAGE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4190.21.00.5 SCHOOL RES OPER SUPPLY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.40.00.5 SCHOOL RES DUES/SUB/MTGS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.48.00.5 SCHOOL RES PROP & LIAB INS	$1,384.00	$925.60	$458.40	66.88 %
10.4190.62.00.5 SCHOOL RES PRINT & BINDING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.70.00.5 SCHOOL RES COPIER	$138.00	$45.64	$92.36	33.07 %
10.4190.70.01.5 SCHOOL RES COPIER PAPER	$37.00	$31.64	$5.36	85.51 %
10.4190.74.00.5 SCHOOL RES TRAVEL/TRANS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.79.00.5 SCHOOL RES MISC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4190.95.01.5 SCHOOL RES PENSION INT EXP	$2,145.00	$1,072.58	$1,072.42	50.00 %
TOTAL POLICE SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER	**$82,335.00**	**$46,842.41**	**$35,492.59**	**56.89%**
10.4200 COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER				
10.4200.10.00.5 JUSTICE CTR SALARY & WAGES	$87,355.00	$41,559.42	$45,795.58	47.58 %
10.4200.11.00.5 JUSTICE CTR OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4200.15.01.5 JUSTICE CTR DENTAL INS	$870.00	$359.30	$510.70	41.30 %
10.4200.15.02.5 JUSTICE CTR FICA/MEDICARE	$6,377.00	$3,128.83	$3,248.17	49.06 %
10.4200.15.03.5 JUSTICE CTR HEALTH INS	$16,466.00	$3,860.12	$12,605.88	23.44 %
10.4200.15.04.5 JUSTICE CTR IRS SECT 125	$233.00	$126.92	$106.08	54.47 %
10.4200.15.05.5 JUSTICE CTR LT CARE INS	$100.00	$146.07	($46.07)	146.07 %
10.4200.15.07.5 JUSTICE CTR CITY RETIREMENT	$5,241.00	$2,371.57	$2,869.43	45.25 %
10.4200.15.08.5 JUSTICE CTR LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$1,383.00	$803.61	$579.39	58.11 %
10.4200.15.09.5 JUSTICE CTR UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$235.00	$285.99	($50.99)	121.70 %
10.4200.15.10.5 JUSTICE CTR WORKERS' COMP	$305.00	$846.82	($541.82)	277.65 %
10.4200.15.12.5 JUSTICE CTR PARKING FEE	$1,125.00	$1,128.00	($3.00)	100.27 %
10.4200.20.00.5 JUSTICE CTR OFFICE SUPPLY	$2,900.00	$191.04	$2,708.96	6.59 %
10.4200.20.01.5 JUSTICE CTR POSTAGE	$400.00	$0.00	$400.00	0.00 %
10.4200.21.00.5 JUSTICE CTR OPERATING SUPPLY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4200.30.00.5 JUSTICE CTR ADVERTISING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4200.40.00.5 JUSTICE CTR DUES/SUB/MTGS	$2,000.00	$3,222.20	($1,222.20)	161.11 %
10.4200.41.00.5 JUSTICE CTR PROFESSIONAL DEV	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
10.4200.48.00.5 JUSTICE CTR PROP & LIAB INS	$2,596.00	$1,735.48	$860.52	66.85 %
10.4200.56.00.5 JUSTICE CTR OTR PUR SRVC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4200.56.01.5 JUSTICE CTR REENTRY PROGRAM	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4200.56.02.5 JUSTICE CTR MEDIATION SVC	$0.00	$395.50	($395.50)	0.00 %
10.4200.60.00.5 JUSTICE CTR PROFESSIONAL SVC	$500.00	$112.50	$387.50	22.50 %
10.4200.62.00.5 JUSTICE CTR PRINT & BINDING	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
10.4200.68.00.5 JUSTICE CTR EQUIP REP & MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4200.70.00.5 JUSTICE CTR COPIER	$259.00	$85.56	$173.44	33.03 %
10.4200.70.01.5 JUSTICE CTR COPIER PAPER	$69.00	$59.41	$9.59	86.10 %
10.4200.74.00.5 JUSTICE CTR TRAVEL & TRANS	$3,300.00	$122.14	$3,177.86	3.70 %
10.4200.79.00.5 JUSTICE CTR MISC. COUNCIL ADJ	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4200.95.01.5 JUSTICE CTR PENSION INT EXP	$4,033.00	$2,016.45	$2,016.55	50.00 %
TOTAL COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER	**$137,547.00**	**$62,556.93**	**$74,990.07**	**45.48%**
10.4205 RE-ENTRY PROGRAM				
10.4205.10.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG SALARY & WAGES	$0.00	$23,409.80	($23,409.80)	0.00 %
10.4205.11.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.15.01.5 RE-ENTRY PROG DENTAL INS	$0.00	$227.78	($227.78)	0.00 %
10.4205.15.02.5 RE-ENTRY PROG FICA/MEDICARE	$0.00	$1,740.82	($1,740.82)	0.00 %
10.4205.15.03.5 RE-ENTRY PROG HEALTH INS	$0.00	$1,203.15	($1,203.15)	0.00 %
10.4205.15.04.5 RE-ENTRY PROG IRS SECT 125	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.15.05.5 RE-ENTRY PROG LT CARE INS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.15.07.5 RE-ENTRY PROG CITY RETIREMENT	$0.00	$1,361.94	($1,361.94)	0.00 %
10.4205.15.08.5 RE-ENTRY PROG LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.15.09.5 RE-ENTRY PROG UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.15.10.5 RE-ENTRY PROG WORKERS' COMP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.15.12.5 RE-ENTRY PROG PARKING FEE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.20.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG OFFICE SUPPLY	$0.00	$104.78	($104.78)	0.00 %
10.4205.20.01.5 RE-ENTRY PROG POSTAGE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.34.03.5 RE-ENTRY PROG TELE,CELL &PAGER	$0.00	$654.45	($654.45)	0.00 %
10.4205.40.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG DUES, SUB/MGT	$0.00	$368.29	($368.29)	0.00 %
10.4205.41.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG PROFESSIONAL DEV	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.48.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG PROP & LIAB INS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.56.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG OTR PUR SRVC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4205.57.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG OTHER CLIENT NEEDS	$0.00	$373.13	($373.13)	0.00 %
10.4205.60.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG PROF SVC	$0.00	$112.50	($112.50)	0.00 %
10.4205.66.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG CLIENT HOUSING	$0.00	$7,786.00	($7,786.00)	0.00 %
10.4205.70.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG COPIER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4205.74.00.5 RE-ENTRY PROG TRAVEL & TRANS	$0.00	$1,286.36	($1,286.36)	0.00 %
10.4205.95.01.5 RE-ENTRY PROG PENSION INT EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL RE-ENTRY PROGRAM	**$0.00**	**$38,629.00**	**($38,629.00)**	**0.00%**
10.4500 FIRE AND E.M.S				
10.4500.10.00.5 FIRE EMS SALARY & WAGES	$901,268.00	$481,056.57	$420,211.43	53.38 %
10.4500.10.01.5 FIRE EMS CALL FORCE	$12,000.00	$4,315.78	$7,684.22	35.96 %
10.4500.11.00.5 FIRE EMS OVERTIME	$148,876.00	$131,899.43	$16,976.57	88.60 %
10.4500.15.01.5 FIRE EMS DENTAL INS	$9,019.00	$4,618.54	$4,400.46	51.21 %
10.4500.15.02.5 FIRE EMS FICA/MEDICARE	$77,537.00	$45,098.07	$32,438.93	58.16 %
10.4500.15.03.5 FIRE EMS HEALTH INS	$166,244.00	$89,162.98	$77,081.02	53.63 %
10.4500.15.04.5 FIRE EMS IRS SECTION 125	$2,355.00	$1,319.97	$1,035.03	56.05 %
10.4500.15.05.5 FIRE EMS LT CARE INS	$1,015.00	$1,718.48	($703.48)	169.31 %
10.4500.15.07.5 FIRE EMS CITY RETIREMENT	$63,009.00	$39,607.23	$23,401.77	62.86 %
10.4500.15.08.5 FIRE EMS LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$13,979.00	$8,357.52	$5,621.48	59.79 %
10.4500.15.09.5 FIRE EMS UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$2,439.00	$2,974.40	($535.40)	121.95 %
10.4500.15.10.5 FIRE EMS WORKERS' COMP	$76,433.00	$55,092.86	$21,340.14	72.08 %
10.4500.15.12.5 FIRE EMS PARKING FEE	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.4500.18.00.5 FIRE EMS UNIFRMS/PROT CLOTH	$24,000.00	$12,344.09	$11,655.91	51.43 %
10.4500.20.00.5 FIRE EMS OFFICE SUPPLY	$2,400.00	$1,312.94	$1,087.06	54.71 %
10.4500.20.01.5 FIRE EMS POSTAGE	$1,000.00	$207.60	$792.40	20.76 %
10.4500.21.00.5 FIRE EMS OPERATING SUPPLY	$18,000.00	$10,595.08	$7,404.92	58.86 %
10.4500.21.01.5 FIRE EMS INTERNAL FUEL FLEET	$15,000.00	$6,553.58	$8,446.42	43.69 %
10.4500.23.00.5 FIRE EMS SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$1,000.00	$326.49	$673.51	32.65 %
10.4500.30.00.5 FIRE EMS ADVERTISING	$0.00	$90.00	($90.00)	0.00 %
10.4500.34.00.5 FIRE EMS TELE BASIC SVC	$0.00	$197.58	($197.58)	0.00 %
10.4500.34.03.5 FIRE EMS TELE CELL & PAGER	$2,400.00	$1,269.29	$1,130.71	52.89 %
10.4500.34.04.5 FIRE EMS COM OTHER	$1,500.00	$740.05	$759.95	49.34 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4500.40.00.5 FIRE EMS DUES/SUB/MTGS	$5,000.00	$1,709.48	$3,290.52	34.19 %
10.4500.48.00.5 FIRE EMS PROP & LIAB INS	$26,992.00	$18,049.05	$8,942.95	66.87 %
10.4500.50.00.5 FIRE EMS FIRE EQUIP RSV EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4500.50.01.5 FIRE EMS BAILEY AMBULANCE RSV	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4500.56.00.5 FIRE EMS OTR PUR SRVC	$6,000.00	$1,741.09	$4,258.91	29.02 %
10.4500.60.00.5 FIRE EMS PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$2,500.00	$83.00	$2,417.00	3.32 %
10.4500.62.00.5 FIRE EMS PRINTING & BINDING	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
10.4500.65.00.5 FIRE EMS RENTAL OF CITY EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4500.66.00.5 FIRE EMS OTHER RENTALS	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.4500.68.00.5 FIRE EMS EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$28,000.00	$18,103.98	$9,896.02	64.66 %
10.4500.68.01.5 FIRE EMS INTERNAL FLEET REPAIR	$10,000.00	$3,422.35	$6,577.65	34.22 %
10.4500.68.05.5 FIRE EMS EQUIP SERVICE CONTRACTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4500.69.00.5 FIRE EMS BLDG/GROUNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$2,000.00	$1,692.50	$307.50	84.63 %
10.4500.70.00.5 FIRE EMS COPIER	$2,800.00	$889.62	$1,910.38	31.77 %
10.4500.70.01.5 FIRE EMS COPIER PAPER	$800.00	$607.96	$192.04	76.00 %
10.4500.74.00.5 FIRE EMS TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$750.00	$5.50	$744.50	0.73 %
10.4500.75.00.5 FIRE EMS LEASE PURCHASE	$10,423.00	$10,423.02	($0.02)	100.00 %
10.4500.75.01.5 FIRE EMS AMBULANCE LEASE PAYMENT	$38,463.00	$0.00	$38,463.00	0.00 %
10.4500.76.01.5 FIRE EMS ELECTRIC	$8,000.00	$5,306.19	$2,693.81	66.33 %
10.4500.76.03.5 FIRE EMS TRASH REMOVAL	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
10.4500.76.04.5 FIRE EMS IN HOUSE UTILITIES	$2,300.00	$1,114.79	$1,185.21	48.47 %
10.4500.76.05.5 FIRE EMS PROPANE	$700.00	$372.50	$327.50	53.21 %
10.4500.83.00.5 FIRE EMS MACHINERY & EQUIPMENT	$0.00	$2,736.51	($2,736.51)	0.00 %
10.4500.85.00.5 FIRE EMS FED/STATE GRANT EXPENSE	$0.00	$51,994.00	($51,994.00)	0.00 %
10.4500.90.00.5 FIRE EMS PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS	$25,000.00	$25,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.4500.91.00.5 FIRE EMS INTEREST PAYMENTS	$4,299.00	$2,227.49	$2,071.51	51.81 %
10.4500.95.01.5 FIRE EMS PENSION INTEREST EXP	$41,831.00	$20,915.32	$20,915.68	50.00 %
TOTAL FIRE AND E.M.S	**$1,759,232.00**	**$1,068,252.88**	**$690,979.12**	**60.72%**
10.4600 BLDG CODE & HEALTH ENFORCEMENT				
10.4600.10.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF SALARY & WAGES	$51,651.00	$28,743.68	$22,907.32	55.65 %
10.4600.11.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF OVERTIME	$4,363.00	$1,431.51	$2,931.49	32.81 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4600.15.01.5 BLDG HLTH ENF DENTAL INS	$462.00	$231.70	$230.30	50.15 %
10.4600.15.02.5 BLDG HLTH ENF FICA/MCARE	$4,089.00	$2,152.19	$1,936.81	52.63 %
10.4600.15.03.5 BLDG HLTH ENF HLTH INS	$8,782.00	$4,622.16	$4,159.84	52.63 %
10.4600.15.04.5 BLDG HLTH ENF IRS SECT 125	$124.00	$67.69	$56.31	54.59 %
10.4600.15.05.5 BLDG HLTH ENF LT CARE INS	$53.00	$156.20	($103.20)	294.72 %
10.4600.15.07.5 BLDG HLTH ENF CITY RETIREMENT	$3,361.00	$1,961.37	$1,399.63	58.36 %
10.4600.15.08.5 BLDG HLTH ENF LIFE,STD,LTD INS	$736.00	$428.58	$307.42	58.23 %
10.4600.15.09.5 BLDG HLTH ENF UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$125.00	$152.53	($27.53)	122.02 %
10.4600.15.10.5 BLDG HLTH ENF WORKERS' COMP	$166.00	$121.13	$44.87	72.97 %
10.4600.15.12.5 BLDG HLTH ENF PARKING FEE	$600.00	$600.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.4600.20.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF OFFICE SUPPLY	$400.00	$480.21	($80.21)	120.05 %
10.4600.20.01.5 BLDG HLTH ENF POSTAGE	$800.00	$0.00	$800.00	0.00 %
10.4600.21.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF SUPPLY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4600.30.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF ADVERTISING	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
10.4600.34.03.5 BLDG HLTH ENF TELE CELL & PAGER	$1,000.00	$334.67	$665.33	33.47 %
10.4600.40.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF DUES/SUBS/MTGS	$1,500.00	$25.00	$1,475.00	1.67 %
10.4600.48.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF PROP & LIAB INS	$1,394.00	$925.60	$468.40	66.40 %
10.4600.60.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF SVC	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.4600.70.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF COPIER	$150.00	$45.64	$104.36	30.43 %
10.4600.70.01.5 BLDG HLTH ENF COPIER PAPER	$50.00	$31.64	$18.36	63.28 %
10.4600.74.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF TRAVEL/TRANS	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.4600.83.00.5 BLDG HLTH ENF EQUIP	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
10.4600.95.01.5 BLDG HLTH ENF PENSION INT EXP	$2,145.00	$1,072.58	$1,072.42	50.00 %
TOTAL BLDG CODE & HEALTH ENFORCEMENT	**$83,451.00**	**$43,584.08**	**$39,866.92**	**52.23%**
10.4700 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT				
10.4700.10.00.5 EMERG MGT SALARY & WAGES	$7,102.00	$1,180.34	$5,921.66	16.62 %
10.4700.11.00.5 EMERG MGT OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4700.15.01.5 EMERG MGT DENTAL INS	$93.00	$11.59	$81.41	12.46 %
10.4700.15.02.5 EMERG MGT FICA/MEDICARE	$518.00	$81.72	$436.28	15.78 %
10.4700.15.03.5 EMERG MGT HEALTH INS	$1,756.00	$377.59	$1,378.41	21.50 %
10.4700.15.04.5 EMERG MGT IRS SECTION 125	$24.00	$13.54	$10.46	56.42 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.4700.15.05.5 EMERG MGT LT CARE INS	$11.00	$15.58	($4.58)	141.64 %
10.4700.15.07.5 EMERG MGT CITY RETIREMENT	$426.00	$59.01	$366.99	13.85 %
10.4700.15.08.5 EMERG MGT LIFE,STD,LTD INS	$147.00	$85.72	$61.28	58.31 %
10.4700.15.09.5 EMERG MGT UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$25.00	$30.51	($5.51)	122.04 %
10.4700.15.10.5 EMERG MGT WORKERS' COMP	$22.00	$17.30	$4.70	78.64 %
10.4700.20.00.5 EMERG MGT OFFICE SUPPLY	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
10.4700.21.00.5 EMERG MGT OPERATING SUPPLY	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.4700.22.00.5 EMERG MGT FLOOD SUPPLY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4700.34.00.5 EMERG MGT FLOOD COM	$0.00	$523.45	($523.45)	0.00 %
10.4700.34.03.5 EMERG MGT TELE CELL &PAGER	$750.00	$0.00	$750.00	0.00 %
10.4700.40.00.5 EMERG MGT DUES/SUB/MTGS	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
10.4700.48.00.5 EMERG MGT PROP & LIAB INS	$277.00	$185.13	$91.87	66.83 %
10.4700.56.00.5 EMERG MGT FLOOD OTR PUR SRVC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4700.66.00.5 EMERG MGT FLOOD EQUIP RENTAL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.4700.68.00.5 EMERG MGT EQUIP REP & MAINT	$6,000.00	$0.00	$6,000.00	0.00 %
10.4700.70.00.5 EMERG MGT COPIER	$50.00	$9.13	$40.87	18.26 %
10.4700.70.01.5 EMERG MGT COPIER PAPER	$50.00	$6.32	$43.68	12.64 %
10.4700.74.00.5 EMERG MGT TRAVEL/TRANS	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.4700.95.01.5 EMERG MGT PENSION INT EXP	$429.00	$214.52	$214.48	50.00 %
TOTAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	**$20,380.00**	**$2,811.45**	**$17,568.55**	**13.80%**
10.5100 DPW STREETS				
10.5100.10.00.5 DPW ST SALARY & WAGES	$556,988.00	$299,879.09	$257,108.91	53.84 %
10.5100.11.00.5 DPW ST OVERTIME	$64,985.00	$27,705.00	$37,280.00	42.63 %
10.5100.15.01.5 DPW ST DENTAL INS	$5,578.00	$2,921.02	$2,656.98	52.37 %
10.5100.15.02.5 DPW ST FICA/MEDICARE	$45,404.00	$23,668.59	$21,735.41	52.13 %
10.5100.15.03.5 DPW ST HEALTH INS	$110,387.00	$54,031.32	$56,355.68	48.95 %
10.5100.15.04.5 DPW ST IRS SECTION 125	$1,510.00	$850.87	$659.13	56.35 %
10.5100.15.05.5 DPW ST- LT CARE INS	$651.00	$1,054.30	($403.30)	161.95 %
10.5100.15.07.5 DPW ST CITY RETIREMENT	$37,318.00	$20,612.49	$16,705.51	55.23 %
10.5100.15.08.5 DPW ST LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$8,961.00	$5,515.97	$3,445.03	61.56 %
10.5100.15.09.5 DPW ST UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$1,508.00	$1,963.10	($455.10)	130.18 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.5100.15.10.5 DPW ST WORKERS' COMP	$25,637.00	$17,855.92	$7,781.08	69.65 %
10.5100.15.12.5 DPW ST PARKING FEE	$762.00	$1,362.00	($600.00)	178.74 %
10.5100.18.00.5 DPW ST UNIFRMS/PROT CLOTHING	$5,800.00	$1,894.09	$3,905.91	32.66 %
10.5100.20.00.5 DPW ST OFFICE SUPPLY	$3,200.00	$1,294.91	$1,905.09	40.47 %
10.5100.20.01.5 DPW ST POSTAGE	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
10.5100.21.00.5 DPW ST OPERATING SUPPLY	$52,400.00	$35,203.91	$17,196.09	67.18 %
10.5100.21.01.5 DPW ST SALT-OPER SUPPLY	$191,400.00	$90,734.35	$100,665.65	47.41 %
10.5100.21.02.5 DPW ST SAND-OPER SUPPLY	$12,000.00	$262.54	$11,737.46	2.19 %
10.5100.21.03.5 DPW ST BITUMINOUS MAT-SUMMER	$40,000.00	$56,382.74	($16,382.74)	140.96 %
10.5100.21.04.5 DPW ST BITUMINOUS MAT-WINTER	$8,000.00	$3,432.63	$4,567.37	42.91 %
10.5100.21.05.5 DPW ST CONCRETE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.23.00.5 DPW ST SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$500.00	$31.12	$468.88	6.22 %
10.5100.30.00.5 DPW ST ADVERTISING	$1,000.00	$280.50	$719.50	28.05 %
10.5100.34.00.5 DPW ST COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.34.03.5 DPW ST CELL PHONE & PAGER	$3,500.00	$1,095.46	$2,404.54	31.30 %
10.5100.40.00.5 DPW ST DUES/SUB/MTGS	$4,100.00	$522.38	$3,577.62	12.74 %
10.5100.48.00.5 DPW ST PROP & LIAB INS	$17,439.00	$11,998.36	$5,440.64	68.80 %
10.5100.56.00.5 DPW ST OTR PUR SRVC	$26,000.00	$9,384.35	$16,615.65	36.09 %
10.5100.56.01.5 DPW ST BRIDGE MAINTENANCE	$15,000.00	$10,224.34	$4,775.66	68.16 %
10.5100.56.02.5 DPW ST CRACK SEAL MAINT	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.5100.56.03.5 DPW ST ROADSIDE MOWING	$8,000.00	$4,300.00	$3,700.00	53.75 %
10.5100.56.04.5 DPW ST- ST LIGHT LEASES/SVC CHG	$91,200.00	$39,300.81	$51,899.19	43.09 %
10.5100.56.05.5 DPW ST PAVEMT MARKING	$10,000.00	$4,198.35	$5,801.65	41.98 %
10.5100.60.00.5 DPW ST PROFESSIONAL SVC	$3,600.00	$472.00	$3,128.00	13.11 %
10.5100.60.01.5 DPW ST PROF SVC ELM ST SLIDE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.62.00.5 DPW ST PRINT & BINDING	$400.00	$0.00	$400.00	0.00 %
10.5100.65.00.5 DPW ST RENTAL OF CITY EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.66.00.5 DPW ST OTHER RENTALS	$18,010.00	$3,804.75	$14,205.25	21.13 %
10.5100.66.01.5 DPW ST OTHER RENTAL-ELM ST SLIDE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.67.00.5 DPW ST STREET MAINT	$8,000.00	$1,850.00	$6,150.00	23.13 %
10.5100.68.00.5 DPW ST VEH/EQUIP MAINT	$200.00	$606.30	($406.30)	303.15 %
10.5100.68.02.5 DPW ST METERED ST LIGHTS	$4,000.00	$0.00	$4,000.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.5100.68.03.5 DPW ST REPAIR PARTS-ST LIGHTS	$4,000.00	$362.68	$3,637.32	9.07 %
10.5100.70.00.5 DPW ST COPIER	$1,663.00	$587.16	$1,075.84	35.31 %
10.5100.70.01.5 DPW ST COPIER PAPER	$443.00	$392.04	$50.96	88.50 %
10.5100.72.00.5 DPW ST TAXES/LICENSE/REG	$800.00	$1.00	$799.00	0.13 %
10.5100.74.00.5 DPW ST TRAVEL/TRANSP	$1,950.00	$475.50	$1,474.50	24.38 %
10.5100.76.00.5 DPW ST UTILITIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.76.01.5 DPW ST ELECTRIC	$22,500.00	$9,577.75	$12,922.25	42.57 %
10.5100.76.03.5 DPW ST TRASH REMOVAL	$6,000.00	$1,977.77	$4,022.23	32.96 %
10.5100.79.00.5 DPW ST MISC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.83.00.5 DPW ST MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5100.95.01.5 DPW ST PENSION INT EXP	$25,871.00	$12,935.32	$12,935.68	50.00 %
TOTAL DPW STREETS	**$1,462,165.00**	**$776,002.78**	**$686,162.22**	**53.07%**
10.5300 DPW FLEET OPERATIONS				
10.5300.10.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS SALARY & WAGES	$144,630.00	$84,671.05	$59,958.95	58.54 %
10.5300.11.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS OVERTIME	$4,089.00	$3,395.05	$693.95	83.03 %
10.5300.15.01.5 DPW FLEET OPS DENTAL INS	$231.00	$713.40	($482.40)	308.83 %
10.5300.15.02.5 DPW FLEET OPS FICA/MEDICARE	$10,856.00	$6,450.94	$4,405.06	59.42 %
10.5300.15.03.5 DPW FLEET OPS HEALTH INS	$25,292.00	$10,163.17	$15,128.83	40.18 %
10.5300.15.04.5 DPW FLEET OPS IRS SECTION 125	$343.00	$200.36	$142.64	58.41 %
10.5300.15.05.5 DPW FLEET OPS LT CARE INS	$148.00	$266.12	($118.12)	179.81 %
10.5300.15.07.5 DPW FLEET OPS CITY RETIREMENT	$8,923.00	$5,358.27	$3,564.73	60.05 %
10.5300.15.08.5 DPW FLEET OPS LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$2,038.00	$1,268.64	$769.36	62.25 %
10.5300.15.09.5 DPW FLEET OPS UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$368.00	$451.49	($83.49)	122.69 %
10.5300.15.10.5 DPW FLEET OPS WORKERS' COMP	$7,688.00	$5,543.05	$2,144.95	72.10 %
10.5300.15.12.5 DPW FLEET OPS PARKING FEE	$144.00	$144.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.5300.18.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS PROT CLOTHING	$5,160.00	$2,045.13	$3,114.87	39.63 %
10.5300.20.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS OFFICE SUPPLY	$950.00	$847.38	$102.62	89.20 %
10.5300.20.01.5 DPW FLEET OPS POSTAGE	$75.00	$0.00	$75.00	0.00 %
10.5300.21.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS OPERATING SUPPLY	$198,040.00	$105,507.56	$92,532.44	53.28 %
10.5300.21.01.5 DPW FLEET OPS INT FUEL REIMB	($48,600.00)	($18,180.37)	($30,419.63)	37.41 %
10.5300.21.02.5 DPW FLEET OPS OIL &ANTI-FREEZE	$3,500.00	$0.00	$3,500.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.5300.23.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$8,000.00	$3,189.63	$4,810.37	39.87 %
10.5300.30.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS ADVERTISING	$700.00	$56.10	$643.90	8.01 %
10.5300.34.04.5 DPW FLEET OPS COMMUNICATIONS	$3,480.00	$9,424.33	($5,944.33)	270.81 %
10.5300.38.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5300.40.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS DUES/SUB/MTGS	$1,450.00	$73.30	$1,376.70	5.06 %
10.5300.48.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS PROP & LIAB INS	$4,129.00	$2,739.75	$1,389.25	66.35 %
10.5300.60.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS PROFESSIONAL SVC	$570.00	$118.00	$452.00	20.70 %
10.5300.68.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS VEH/EQUIP MAINT	$139,000.00	$64,487.62	$74,512.38	46.39 %
10.5300.68.01.5 DPW FLEET OPS INTNL REP REIMB	($18,000.00)	($8,374.04)	($9,625.96)	46.52 %
10.5300.70.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS COPIER	$407.00	$135.05	$271.95	33.18 %
10.5300.70.01.5 DPW FLEET OPS COPIER PAPER	$108.00	$92.93	$15.07	86.05 %
10.5300.72.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS TAXES/LIC/REG	$250.00	$82.00	$168.00	32.80 %
10.5300.74.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS TRAVEL/TRANS	$250.00	$0.00	$250.00	0.00 %
10.5300.83.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5300.90.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS PRINCIPAL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5300.91.00.5 DPW FLEET OPS INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5300.95.01.5 DPW FLEET OPS PENSION INT EXP	$6,328.00	$3,164.11	$3,163.89	50.00 %
TOTAL DPW FLEET OPERATIONS	**$510,547.00**	**$284,034.02**	**$226,512.98**	**55.63%**
10.5310 DPW BUILDING OPERATIONS				
10.5310.21.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS OPERATING SUPPLY	$2,500.00	$1,429.63	$1,070.37	57.19 %
10.5310.23.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS SMALL TOOLS &EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.5310.34.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS COM	$850.00	$0.00	$850.00	0.00 %
10.5310.56.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS OTR PUR SRVC	$6,000.00	$2,850.00	$3,150.00	47.50 %
10.5310.69.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS BLDG/GRNDS MAINT	$8,500.00	$5,348.82	$3,151.18	62.93 %
10.5310.72.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS TAXES/LIC/REG	$400.00	$200.00	$200.00	50.00 %
10.5310.76.01.5 DPW BLDG OPS ELECTRIC	$9,600.00	$5,733.76	$3,866.24	59.73 %
10.5310.76.02.5 DPW BLDG OPS HEATING FUEL	$22,500.00	$12,423.51	$10,076.49	55.22 %
10.5310.76.03.5 DPW BLDG OPS TRASH REMOVAL	$3,000.00	$659.23	$2,340.77	21.97 %
10.5310.76.04.5 DPW BLDG OPS IN HOUSE UTILITIES	$3,000.00	$1,004.74	$1,995.26	33.49 %
10.5310.76.05.5 DPW BLDG OPS PROPANE	$4,000.00	$2,696.84	$1,303.16	67.42 %
10.5310.82.00.5 DPW BLDG OPS CAPITAL IMPROV	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
TOTAL DPW BUILDING OPERATIONS	**$60,350.00**	**$32,346.53**	**$28,003.47**	**53.60%**
10.7270 WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH FUNDS				
10.7270.44.00.5 WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH CONTRIB	$4,007.00	$0.00	$4,007.00	0.00 %
TOTAL WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH FUNDS	**$4,007.00**	**$0.00**	**$4,007.00**	**0.00%**
10.7800 AGENCY CONTRIBUTION				
10.7800.44.00.5 AGENCY CONTRIB ON BALLOT ITEMS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.7800.45.00.5 OUTSIDE AGENCY CONTRIB	$118,675.00	$118,675.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL AGENCY CONTRIBUTION	**$118,675.00**	**$118,675.00**	**$0.00**	**100.00%**
10.7900 LIBRARY CONTRIBUTION				
10.7900.00.00.5 KELLOGG HUBBARD LIBRARY CONTRIB	$293,975.00	$293,975.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL LIBRARY CONTRIBUTION	**$293,975.00**	**$293,975.00**	**$0.00**	**100.00%**
10.8000 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT				
10.8000.00.00.5 COM ENH ARTS GRANT PROGRAM	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.01.5 COM ENH VT LOCAL GREEN UP DAY	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
10.8000.00.02.5 COM ENH MDCA	$20,000.00	$20,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.04.5 COM ENH JULY 4 CELEBRATION	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.12.5 COM ENH FALL-WINTER CELEBR	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.15.5 COM ENH WOOD ART GALLERY	$7,500.00	$7,500.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.16.5 COM ENH CAPITAL CITY BAND	$1,500.00	$1,500.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.17.5 COM ENH DIVERSION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8000.00.18.5 COM ENH WELCOME LEGISLATORS	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
10.8000.00.19.5 COM ENH HOLIDAY LIGHTS	$2,000.00	$2,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.8000.00.20.5 COM ENH JUSTICE CENTER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8000.00.21.5 COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT USS MONTPELIER	$1,000.00	$1,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT	**$48,800.00**	**$47,000.00**	**$1,800.00**	**96.31%**

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.8130 TREE MANAGEMENT				
10.8130.10.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT SALARIES & WAGES-WARDEN	$15,270.00	$1,596.06	$13,673.94	10.45 %
10.8130.15.01.5 TREE MANAGEMENT DENTAL INSURANCE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8130.15.02.5 TREE MANAGEMENT FICA/MEDICARE	$1,115.00	$115.24	$999.76	10.34 %
10.8130.15.03.5 TREE MANAGEMENT HEALTH INSURANCE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8130.15.04.5 TREE MANAGEMENT IRS SECTION 125	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8130.15.05.5 TREE MANAGEMENT LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8130.15.07.5 TREE MANAGEMENT CITY RETIREMENT	$0.00	$103.80	($103.80)	0.00 %
10.8130.15.08.5 TREE MANAGEMENT LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$0.00	$192.86	($192.86)	0.00 %
10.8130.15.09.5 TREE MANAGEMENT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$63.00	$68.63	($5.63)	108.94 %
10.8130.15.10.5 TREE MANAGEMENT WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$803.00	$579.68	$223.32	72.19 %
10.8130.23.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT SMALL TOOLS	$1,000.00	$0.00	$1,000.00	0.00 %
10.8130.30.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT ADVERTISING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8130.48.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$623.00	$416.52	$206.48	66.86 %
10.8130.56.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT OTR PUR SRVC	$5,000.00	$715.57	$4,284.43	14.31 %
10.8130.70.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT COPIER	$69.00	$17.63	$51.37	25.55 %
10.8130.70.01.5 TREE MANAGEMENT COPIER PAPER	$18.00	$18.04	($0.04)	100.22 %
10.8130.82.00.5 TREE MANAGEMENT CAP IMP- WARDEN & BOARD	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8130.95.01.5 PENSION INTEREST EXP-WARDEN	$1,073.00	$536.29	$536.71	49.98 %
TOTAL TREE MANAGEMENT	**$25,034.00**	**$4,360.32**	**$20,673.68**	**17.42%**
10.8135 TREE BOARD				
10.8135.21.00.5 TREE BOARD TREE NURSERY	$0.00	$45.94	($45.94)	0.00 %
10.8135.79.00.5 TREE BOARD MISC GRANT EXPENSE	$2,000.00	$1,415.10	$584.90	70.76 %
TOTAL TREE BOARD	**$2,000.00**	**$1,461.04**	**$538.96**	**73.05%**
10.8300 CONSERVATION COMMISSION				
10.8300.20.00.5 CONSERVATION OFFICE SUPPLIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8300.20.01.5 CONSERVATION POSTAGE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8300.56.00.5 CONSERVATION OTR PUR SRVC	$2,750.00	$0.00	$2,750.00	0.00 %
10.8300.62.00.5 CONSERVATION PRINTING & BINDING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.8300.70.00.5 CONSERVATION WETLANDS GRANT EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.8300.79.00.5 CONSERVATION MISCELLANEOUS PROJECTS	$3,500.00	$1,070.00	$2,430.00	30.57 %
10.8300.93.00.5 CONSERVATION BUDGET XFER TO RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	**$6,250.00**	**$1,070.00**	**$5,180.00**	**17.12%**
10.9100 DEBT SERVICE				
10.9100.90.00.5 DEBT SERVICE PRINCIPAL PAYMENTS	$435,000.00	$435,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9100.90.01.5 DEBT SERVICE PRINCIPAL PMNTS-NEW DEBT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9100.90.03.5 DEBT SERVICE MONTPELIER NET NOTE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9100.91.00.5 DEBT SERVICE INTEREST PAYMENTS	$212,691.00	$113,795.66	$98,895.34	53.50 %
10.9100.91.01.5 DEBT SERVICE INTEREST PMNT-NEW DEBT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9100.91.02.5 DEBT SERVICE PIONEER BRIDGE INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9100.91.03.5 DEBT SERVICE MONTPELIER NET INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9100.92.00.5 DEBT SERVICE ENERGY IMPROV LEASE PYMT	$37,126.00	$18,563.04	$18,562.96	50.00 %
10.9100.92.01.5 DEBT SERVICE ENERGY AUDIT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9100.92.02.5 DEBT SERVICE BOND ISSUANCE EXPENSES	$0.00	$600.00	($600.00)	0.00 %
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE	**$684,817.00**	**$567,958.70**	**$116,858.30**	**82.94%**
10.9200 ADMIN COPIER & POSTAGE				
10.9200.20.00.5 PHOTOCOPIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9200.20.01.5 ADMIN POSTAGE	$0.00	$12,898.31	($12,898.31)	0.00 %
10.9200.20.02.5 ADMIN OTHER SUPPLIES	$0.00	$479.25	($479.25)	0.00 %
10.9200.70.00.5 ADMIN COPIER LEASE PAYMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9200.70.01.5 ADMIN COPIER PAPER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL ADMIN COPIER & POSTAGE	**$0.00**	**$13,377.56**	**($13,377.56)**	**0.00%**
10.9300 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL				
10.9300.72.00.5 OTHER GOV AGENCIES WASHINGTON COUNTY TAX	$70,385.00	$70,385.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9300.72.01.5 OTHER GOVT AGENCIES SOLID WASTE DISTRICT FEE	$24,199.00	$16,873.50	$7,325.50	69.73 %
10.9300.72.02.5 OTHER GOVT AGENCIES GREEN MOUNTAIN TRANSIT	$29,371.00	$14,685.50	$14,685.50	50.00 %
10.9300.72.03.5 OTHER GOVT AGENCIES CENTRAL VT REG PLANNING	$8,382.00	$8,381.10	$0.90	99.99 %

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.9300.72.04.5 OTHER GOVT AGENCIES VERMONT LEAGUE OF CITIES	$7,400.00	$8,072.00	($672.00)	109.08 %
TOTAL OTHER GOVERNMENTAL	**$139,737.00**	**$118,397.10**	**$21,339.90**	**84.73%**
10.9390 TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS				
10.9390.00.00.5 XFER TO JUSTICE CENTER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9390.93.00.5 XFER TO WATER FUND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9390.94.00.5 XFER TO SEWER FUND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9390.96.00.5 XFER CEMETERY PROP TAX	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9390.96.01.5 XFER TO CEMETERY CIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9390.96.02.5 XFER CEMETERY SMALL PARKS	$23,000.00	$23,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.96.04.5 XFER CEMETERY OPERATIONS	$92,445.00	$92,445.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.97.00.5 XFER TO PARKING FUND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9390.98.00.5 XFER TO CAPITAL PROJECTS	$422,509.00	$422,509.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.99.00.5 XFER PARK OPERATIONS	$96,633.00	$96,633.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.99.01.5 XFER PARKS CIP	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.99.02.5 XFER PARKS EQUIPMENT	$1,750.00	$1,750.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.99.03.5 XFER TO HOUSING TRUST	$26,000.00	$26,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
10.9390.99.04.5 XFER TO SENIOR CENTER	$125,707.00	$125,707.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS	**$794,044.00**	**$794,044.00**	**$0.00**	**100.00%**
10.9400 EQUIPMENT PLAN				
10.9400.82.00.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - CAPITAL OUTLAY-ENERGY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9400.83.01.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - DPW	$113,164.00	$134,450.55	($21,286.55)	118.81 %
10.9400.83.02.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - POLICE	$28,300.00	$26,417.61	$1,882.39	93.35 %
10.9400.83.03.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - FIRE	$10,000.00	$7,584.00	$2,416.00	75.84 %
10.9400.83.04.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - CLERK/TREAS.	$6,500.00	$0.00	$6,500.00	0.00 %
10.9400.83.05.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - TECHNOLOGY	$49,534.00	$25,381.95	$24,152.05	51.24 %
10.9400.83.06.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN- PLANNING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9400.83.07.5 EQUIPMENT PLAN - FINANCE SOFTWARE	$0.00	$623.04	($623.04)	0.00 %
TOTAL EQUIPMENT PLAN	**$207,498.00**	**$194,457.15**	**$13,040.85**	**93.72%**

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.9900 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS				
10.9900.15.03.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS HLTH REIMB ARRANGEMENT DRAW DOWN	$0.00	$25,129.55	($25,129.55)	0.00 %
10.9900.15.04.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FLEX SPENDING ACCOUNT FUNDING	$0.00	$7,654.48	($7,654.48)	0.00 %
10.9900.15.05.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS HRA/FSA ADMINISTRATION EXP	$0.00	$1,712.08	($1,712.08)	0.00 %
10.9900.48.00.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS P&C INSURANCE CLAIM EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9900.48.01.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS PC - DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9900.79.00.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS MISCELLANEOUS - BENEFITS	$0.00	$1,686.91	($1,686.91)	0.00 %
10.9900.80.00.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS EMPLOYEE WELLNESS (RESERV	$0.00	$5,100.00	($5,100.00)	0.00 %
10.9900.95.00.5 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS VMERS PAYOFF PENSION EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	**$0.00**	**$41,283.02**	**($41,283.02)**	**0.00%**
10.9950 CONTINGENCY				
10.9950.92.00.5 CONTINGENCY GEN'L CONTINGENCY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9950.93.00.5 CONTINGENCY CAP ESCROW EXPENSES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL CONTINGENCY	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
10.9951 GF MISC EXP				
10.9951.60.00.5 MISC USE OF GF FUND BALANCE	$0.00	$24,400.00	($24,400.00)	0.00 %
10.9951.79.00.5 MISC MISCELLANEOUS EXP	$0.00	$1,049.25	($1,049.25)	0.00 %
10.9951.80.00.5 MISC PURCHASE OF LAND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9951.92.03.5 MISC KELLOGG LIBRARY APPROPRIA	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9951.93.00.5 MISC USE OF RECORDS RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
10.9951.94.00.5 MISC USE OF VMERS PAYOFF RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL GF MISC EXP	**$0.00**	**$25,449.25**	**($25,449.25)**	**0.00%**
10.9961 TAX ABATEMENTS/CREDITS				
10.9961.00.00.5 TAX ABATEMENTS/SPRINKLER	$50,000.00	$51,844.25	($1,844.25)	103.69 %
TOTAL TAX ABATEMENTS/CREDITS	**$50,000.00**	**$51,844.25**	**($1,844.25)**	**103.69%**
10.9962 GF MISC EXP				

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
10.9962.00.00.5 MISC A/R BAD DEBT WO	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL GF MISC EXP	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	**$10,376,887.00**	**$6,771,186.78**	**$3,605,700.22**	**65.25%**
GENERAL FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$2.00**	**$3,163,536.15**		

City of Montpelier
WATER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
11.2 PERMITS AND LICENSE REV				
11.2244.00.00.4 WATER AMORTIZATION CONTRIB CAP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2300.00.00.4 WATER REV GRANTS-STATE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2310.00.00.4 WATER REV GRANTS-FEDERAL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2313.00.00.4 BERLIN FIRE DISTRICT CLOSEOUT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2502.00.00.4 WATER REV WATER USE REVENUE	$2,178,100.00	$1,660,898.33	($517,201.67)	76.25 %
11.2502.00.01.4 WATER REV BERLIN FIRE DST #1 WATER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2503.00.00.4 WATER REV PENALTIES - WATER USE	$14,000.00	$8,357.20	($5,642.80)	59.69 %
11.2505.00.00.4 WATER REV DELINQUENT INTEREST	$13,000.00	$5,800.59	($7,199.41)	44.62 %
11.2570.00.00.4 WATER REV METER SALES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2595.00.00.4 WATER REV ON/OFF FEES	$5,000.00	$1,680.00	($3,320.00)	33.60 %
11.2599.00.00.4 WATER REV CONNECTION FEES	$10,000.00	$4,400.00	($5,600.00)	44.00 %
11.2605.00.00.4 WATER REV SPRINKLER SERV REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2614.00.11.4 WATER REV SALE OF LAND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2700.00.00.4 WATER REV INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2804.00.00.4 WATER REV DONATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2820.00.00.4 WATER REV W/C REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2990.00.00.4 WATER REV MISC REVENUE	$15,000.00	$225.30	($14,774.70)	1.50 %
11.2992.00.00.4 WATER REV XFER PARKS PEACE PARK	$300.00	$300.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.2993.00.00.4 WATER REV XFER FROM GENERAL FUND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2994.00.00.4 WATER REV WORK COMP REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2995.00.00.4 WATER REV WORK COMP REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.2997.00.00.4 WATER REV USE OF FUND BALANCE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL PERMITS AND LICENSE REV	**$2,235,400.00**	**$1,681,661.42**	**($553,738.58)**	**75.23%**
TOTAL WATER FUND REVENUES	**$2,235,400.00**	**$1,681,661.42**	**($553,738.58)**	**75.23%**

EXPENDITURES

11.6200 WATER ADMINISTRATION

City of Montpelier
WATER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
11.6200.10.00.5 ADMIN SALARIES & WAGES	$60,184.00	$31,984.19	$28,199.81	53.14 %
11.6200.11.00.5 ADMIN OVERTIME	$3,253.00	$2,112.50	$1,140.50	64.94 %
11.6200.15.01.5 ADMIN DENTAL INSURANCE	$689.00	$266.21	$422.79	38.64 %
11.6200.15.02.5 ADMIN FICA/MEDICARE	$4,694.00	$2,524.51	$2,169.49	53.78 %
11.6200.15.03.5 ADMIN HEALTH INSURANCE	$9,309.00	$3,920.15	$5,388.85	42.11 %
11.6200.15.04.5 ADMIN IRS SECTION 125	$170.00	$71.75	$98.25	42.21 %
11.6200.15.05.5 ADMIN LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$73.00	$108.12	($35.12)	148.11 %
11.6200.15.07.5 ADMIN CITY RETIREMENT	$3,806.00	$1,893.11	$1,912.89	49.74 %
11.6200.15.08.5 ADMIN LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$900.00	$454.30	$445.70	50.48 %
11.6200.15.09.5 ADMIN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$186.00	$161.68	$24.32	86.92 %
11.6200.15.10.5 ADMIN WORK COMP	$2,117.00	$1,525.64	$591.36	72.07 %
11.6200.15.12.5 ADMIN PARKING FEE	$462.00	$462.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6200.18.00.5 ADMIN UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$400.00	$1,162.05	($762.05)	290.51 %
11.6200.20.00.5 ADMIN OFFICE SUPPLIES	$1,000.00	$379.57	$620.43	37.96 %
11.6200.20.01.5 ADMIN POSTAGE	$3,000.00	$56.82	$2,943.18	1.89 %
11.6200.30.00.5 ADMIN ADVERTISING	$500.00	$76.50	$423.50	15.30 %
11.6200.34.00.5 ADMIN TELEPH BASIC SERVICE	$3,000.00	$1,962.22	$1,037.78	65.41 %
11.6200.34.01.5 ADMIN TELEPH LONG DISTANCE	$500.00	$332.64	$167.36	66.53 %
11.6200.34.02.5 ADMIN INTERNET WAN SERVICE	$2,700.00	$2,203.61	$496.39	81.62 %
11.6200.38.00.5 ADMIN DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.40.00.5 ADMIN DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$2,600.00	$894.13	$1,705.87	34.39 %
11.6200.48.00.5 ADMIN PROP & LIAB INS	$1,328.00	$981.13	$346.87	73.88 %
11.6200.48.01.5 ADMIN PC - DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.60.00.5 ADMIN PROF SVCS	$8,500.00	$2,464.50	$6,035.50	28.99 %
11.6200.61.00.5 ADMIN LEGAL SERVICES	$2,500.00	$2,850.25	($350.25)	114.01 %
11.6200.62.00.5 ADMIN PRINTING & BINDING	$500.00	$430.20	$69.80	86.04 %
11.6200.65.00.5 ADMIN EQUIP RENTAL COMPUTER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.66.00.5 ADMIN TOWN HILL LEASE	$44,226.00	$0.00	$44,226.00	0.00 %
11.6200.70.00.5 ADMIN COPIER	$205.00	$48.35	$156.65	23.59 %
11.6200.70.01.5 ADMIN COPY PAPER	$55.00	$40.94	$14.06	74.44 %
11.6200.72.00.5 ADMIN TAXES/LICENSE/REGIST	$14,000.00	$5,996.94	$8,003.06	42.84 %
11.6200.74.00.5 ADMIN TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$100.00	$39.00	$61.00	39.00 %

City of Montpelier
WATER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
11.6200.79.00.5 ADMIN MISC	$150.00	$60.24	$89.76	40.16 %
11.6200.83.00.5 ADMIN MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.83.01.5 ADMIN COMPUTER EQUIP ALLOC	$12,587.00	$9,555.46	$3,031.54	75.92 %
11.6200.83.02.5 ADMIN FINANCIAL SOFTWARE	$1,713.00	$0.00	$1,713.00	0.00 %
11.6200.88.01.5 ADMIN COMPUTER WIRELESS NETWORK	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.90.00.5 ADMIN PRINCIPAL	$420,519.00	$0.00	$420,519.00	0.00 %
11.6200.91.00.5 ADMIN INTEREST EXPENSE	$390,571.00	$200,011.57	$190,559.43	51.21 %
11.6200.92.00.5 ADMIN ENERGY IMPROV LEASE PYMT	$6,086.00	$3,043.12	$3,042.88	50.00 %
11.6200.92.01.5 ADMIN ENERGY AUDIT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.95.00.5 ADMIN VMERS PAYOFF PENSION EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6200.95.01.5 ADMIN PENSION INTEREST EXP	$3,059.00	$1,529.58	$1,529.42	50.00 %
11.6200.97.00.5 ADMIN ADMIN/MGMT SVCS	$263,164.00	$263,164.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL WATER ADMINISTRATION	**$1,268,806.00**	**$542,766.98**	**$726,039.02**	**42.78%**
11.6210 WATER SUPPLY & TREATMENT				
11.6210.10.00.5 WATER TREAT SALARIES & WAGES	$170,914.00	$93,556.23	$77,357.77	54.74 %
11.6210.11.00.5 WATER TREAT OVERTIME	$10,832.00	$2,745.26	$8,086.74	25.34 %
11.6210.15.01.5 WATER TREAT DENTAL INSURANCE	$1,540.00	$767.25	$772.75	49.82 %
11.6210.15.02.5 WATER TREAT FICA/MEDICARE	$13,449.00	$7,129.88	$6,319.12	53.01 %
11.6210.15.03.5 WATER TREAT HEALTH INSURANCE	$29,068.00	$12,072.61	$16,995.39	41.53 %
11.6210.15.04.5 WATER TREAT SECTION 125	$413.00	$224.06	$188.94	54.25 %
11.6210.15.05.5 WATER TREAT LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$178.00	$307.55	($129.55)	172.78 %
11.6210.15.07.5 WATER TREAT CITY RETIREMENT	$10,905.00	$5,678.19	$5,226.81	52.07 %
11.6210.15.08.5 WATER TREAT LIFE STD, LTD INSURANCE	$2,200.00	$1,418.64	$781.36	64.48 %
11.6210.15.09.5 WATER TREAT UNEMP INSURANCE	$417.00	$504.88	($87.88)	121.07 %
11.6210.15.10.5 WATER TREAT WORK COMP	$6,063.00	$4,372.14	$1,690.86	72.11 %
11.6210.15.12.5 WATER TREAT PARKING FEE	$96.00	$96.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6210.18.00.5 WATER TREAT UNIFORMS/PROTECTIVE CLOTH	$1,650.00	$651.46	$998.54	39.48 %
11.6210.20.00.5 WATER TREAT OFFICE SUPPLIES	$500.00	$243.53	$256.47	48.71 %
11.6210.21.00.5 WATER TREAT OPER SUPPLIES	$78,317.00	$32,212.89	$46,104.11	41.13 %
11.6210.23.00.5 WATER TREAT SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
11.6210.34.00.5 WATER TREAT COMMUNICATIONS	$5,640.00	$1,078.31	$4,561.69	19.12 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
11.6210.38.00.5 WATER TREAT DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6210.40.00.5 WATER TREAT DUES, SUBSCRIP, MTGS	$1,700.00	$343.00	$1,357.00	20.18 %
11.6210.48.00.5 WATER TREAT PROP & LIAB INS	$4,148.00	$3,063.71	$1,084.29	73.86 %
11.6210.60.00.5 WATER TREAT PROF SERVICES	$7,500.00	$400.00	$7,100.00	5.33 %
11.6210.65.00.5 WATER TREAT EQUIPMENT FLAT FEE	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6210.66.00.5 WATER TREAT OTHER RENTALS	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
11.6210.68.00.5 WATER TREAT VEH/EQ REPAIR & MAIN	$15,000.00	$21,036.79	($6,036.79)	140.25 %
11.6210.69.00.5 WATER TREAT BLDGS/GRNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$7,500.00	$2,745.96	$4,754.04	36.61 %
11.6210.70.00.5 WATER TREAT COPIER	$459.00	$151.03	$307.97	32.90 %
11.6210.70.01.5 WATER TREAT COPY PAPER	$122.00	$105.08	$16.92	86.13 %
11.6210.72.00.5 WATER TREAT TAXES/LICENSE/REGIST	$32,000.00	$6,972.58	$25,027.42	21.79 %
11.6210.74.00.5 WATER TREAT TRAVEL & TRANSP	$117.00	$0.00	$117.00	0.00 %
11.6210.76.01.5 WATER TREAT ELECTRIC	$60,000.00	$26,768.54	$33,231.46	44.61 %
11.6210.76.02.5 WATER TREAT HEATING FUEL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6210.76.05.5 WATER TREAT PROPANE	$25,600.00	$13,752.36	$11,847.64	53.72 %
11.6210.79.00.5 WATER TREAT MISCELLANEOUS	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
11.6210.83.00.5 WATER TREAT MACHINERY & EQUIPMENT	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6210.85.00.5 WATER TREAT WTP GRANT EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6210.95.01.5 WATER TREAT PENSION INTEREST EXP	$6,837.00	$3,418.46	$3,418.54	50.00 %
TOTAL WATER SUPPLY & TREATMENT	**$502,715.00**	**$250,316.39**	**$252,398.61**	**49.79%**
11.6220 WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM				
11.6220.10.00.5 WATER DISTRIB SALARIES & WAGES	$133,107.00	$72,928.12	$60,178.88	54.79 %
11.6220.11.00.5 WATER DISTRIB OVERTIME	$13,131.00	$10,893.28	$2,237.72	82.96 %
11.6220.15.01.5 WATER DISTRIB DENTAL INSURANCE	$1,684.00	$717.96	$966.04	42.63 %
11.6220.15.02.5 WATER DISTRIB FICA/MEDICARE	$10,822.00	$5,964.91	$4,857.09	55.12 %
11.6220.15.03.5 WATER DISTRIB HEALTH INSURANCE	$27,487.00	$15,109.61	$12,377.39	54.97 %
11.6220.15.04.5 WATER DISTRIB SECTION 125	$451.00	$211.87	$239.13	46.98 %
11.6220.15.05.5 WATER DISTRIB LONG TERM CARE INS	$195.00	$268.87	($73.87)	137.88 %
11.6220.15.07.5 WATER DISTRIB CITY RETIREMENT	$8,774.00	$5,170.37	$3,603.63	58.93 %
11.6220.15.08.5 WATER DISTRIB LIFE STD, LTD INSURANCE	$2,400.00	$1,341.49	$1,058.51	55.90 %
11.6220.15.09.5 WATER DISTRIB UNEMP INSURANCE	$455.00	$477.42	($22.42)	104.93 %

City of Montpelier
WATER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
11.6220.15.10.5 WATER DISTRIB WORK COMP	$4,780.00	$3,446.38	$1,333.62	72.10 %
11.6220.15.12.5 WATER DISTRIB PARKING FEE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6220.18.00.5 WATER DISTRIB UNIFORMS/PROTECTIVE EQUIP	$1,850.00	$0.00	$1,850.00	0.00 %
11.6220.20.00.5 WATER DISTRIB OFFICE SUPPLIES	$100.00	$25.98	$74.02	25.98 %
11.6220.21.00.5 WATER DISTRIB OPERATING SUPPLIES	$12,000.00	$13,267.71	($1,267.71)	110.56 %
11.6220.23.00.5 WATER DISTRIB SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$2,500.00	$317.67	$2,182.33	12.71 %
11.6220.34.00.5 WATER DISTRIB COMMUNICATIONS	$1,740.00	$20.00	$1,720.00	1.15 %
11.6220.38.00.5 WATER DISTRIB DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6220.48.00.5 WATER DISTRIB PROP & LIAB INS	$3,923.00	$2,897.10	$1,025.90	73.85 %
11.6220.48.01.5 WATER DISTRIB PC-DEDUCTIBLE EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6220.56.00.5 WATER DISTRIB OTR PUR SRVC	$8,700.00	$900.00	$7,800.00	10.34 %
11.6220.56.01.5 WATER DISTRIB STORAGE TK INSPECTION EXP	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
11.6220.65.00.5 WATER DISTRIB EQUIP USE	$98,908.00	$98,908.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6220.66.00.5 WATER DISTRIB OTHER RENTALS	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
11.6220.67.00.5 WATER DISTRIB STREET REPAIRS & MAINT	$8,000.00	$14,618.62	($6,618.62)	182.73 %
11.6220.68.00.5 WATER DISTRIB VEH/EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$9,000.00	$5,656.12	$3,343.88	62.85 %
11.6220.70.00.5 WATER DISTRIB COPIER	$502.00	$142.78	$359.22	28.44 %
11.6220.70.01.5 WATER DISTRIB COPY PAPER	$134.00	$108.24	$25.76	80.78 %
11.6220.72.00.5 WATER DISTRIB TAXES/LICENSE/REGIST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6220.76.01.5 WATER DISTRIB ELECTRIC	$9,000.00	$2,384.67	$6,615.33	26.50 %
11.6220.76.02.5 WATER DISTRIB HEATING FUEL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6220.76.05.5 WATER DISTRIB PROPANE	$500.00	$591.08	($91.08)	118.22 %
11.6220.82.00.5 WATER DISTRIB CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	$15,000.00	$11,753.00	$3,247.00	78.35 %
11.6220.83.00.5 WATER DISTRIB MACH & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6220.86.00.5 WATER DISTRIB HYDRANTS	$4,000.00	$0.00	$4,000.00	0.00 %
11.6220.95.01.5 WATER DISTRIB PENSION INTEREST EXP	$7,473.00	$3,736.70	$3,736.30	50.00 %
TOTAL WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	**$388,616.00**	**$271,857.95**	**$116,758.05**	**69.96%**
11.6230 DELQ WATER FEES COLLECTION				
11.6230.10.00.5 DEL WATER COLL SALARIES & WAGES	$13,731.00	$7,554.49	$6,176.51	55.02 %
11.6230.11.00.5 DEL WATER FEES COLLECTION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6230.15.01.5 DEL WATER COLL DENTAL INSURANCE	$92.00	$46.31	$45.69	50.34 %

City of Montpelier
WATER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
11.6230.15.02.5 DEL WATER COLL FICA/MEDICARE	$1,016.00	$573.15	$442.85	56.41 %
11.6230.15.03.5 DEL WATER COLL HEALTH INSURANCE	$1,756.00	$750.48	$1,005.52	42.74 %
11.6230.15.04.5 DEL WATER COLL SECTION 125	$25.00	$13.54	$11.46	54.16 %
11.6230.15.05.5 DEL WATER COLL LONG TERM CARE INS	$11.00	$43.63	($32.63)	396.64 %
11.6230.15.07.5 DEL WATER COLL CITY RETIREMENT	$824.00	$491.76	$332.24	59.68 %
11.6230.15.08.5 DEL WATER COLL LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$135.00	$85.72	$49.28	63.50 %
11.6230.15.09.5 DEL WATER COLL UNEMP INSURANCE	$25.00	$30.51	($5.51)	122.04 %
11.6230.15.10.5 DEL WATER COLL WORK COMP	$43.00	$31.72	$11.28	73.77 %
11.6230.15.12.5 DEL WATER COLL PARKING FEE	$120.00	$120.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6230.20.00.5 DEL WATER COLL OFFICE SUPPLIES	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
11.6230.20.01.5 DEL WATER COLL POSTAGE	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
11.6230.34.00.5 DEL WATER COLL COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$201.65	($201.65)	0.00 %
11.6230.40.00.5 DEL WATER COLL DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$350.00	$160.50	$189.50	45.86 %
11.6230.48.00.5 DEL WATER COLL PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$251.00	$185.13	$65.87	73.76 %
11.6230.70.00.5 DEL WATER COLL COPIER	$28.00	$9.13	$18.87	32.61 %
11.6230.70.01.5 DEL WATER COLL COPY PAPER	$7.00	$6.32	$0.68	90.29 %
11.6230.95.01.5 DEL WATER COLL PENSION INTEREST EXP	$411.00	$205.31	$205.69	49.95 %
TOTAL DELQ WATER FEES COLLECTION	**$19,075.00**	**$10,509.35**	**$8,565.65**	**55.09%**
11.6250 WATER METER OPERATIONS				
11.6250.10.00.5 WATER METER SALARIES & WAGES	$31,464.00	$17,649.63	$13,814.37	56.09 %
11.6250.11.00.5 WATER METER OVERTIME	$928.00	$832.59	$95.41	89.72 %
11.6250.15.01.5 WATER METER DENTAL INSURANCE	$351.00	$175.64	$175.36	50.04 %
11.6250.15.02.5 WATER METER FICA/MEDICARE	$2,397.00	$1,313.39	$1,083.61	54.79 %
11.6250.15.03.5 WATER METER HEALTH INSURANCE	$6,674.00	$2,943.82	$3,730.18	44.11 %
11.6250.15.04.5 WATER METER SECTION 125	$94.00	$51.45	$42.55	54.73 %
11.6250.15.05.5 WATER METER LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$41.00	$60.26	($19.26)	146.98 %
11.6250.15.07.5 WATER METER CITY RETIREMENT	$0.00	$1,190.59	($1,190.59)	0.00 %
11.6250.15.08.5 WATER METER LIFE STD, LTD INSURANCE	$510.00	$325.72	$184.28	63.87 %
11.6250.15.09.5 WATER METER UNEMP INSURANCE	$95.00	$115.93	($20.93)	122.03 %
11.6250.15.10.5 WATER METER WORK COMP	$1,089.00	$784.45	$304.55	72.03 %
11.6250.15.12.5 WATER METER PARKING FEE	$300.00	$300.00	$0.00	100.00 %

City of Montpelier
WATER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
11.6250.20.00.5 WATER METER OFFICE SUPPLIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6250.21.00.5 WATER METER OPERATING SUPPLIES	$1,000.00	$2,684.61	($1,684.61)	268.46 %
11.6250.23.00.5 WATER METER SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6250.48.00.5 WATER METER PROP & LIAB INS	$952.00	$703.44	$248.56	73.89 %
11.6250.60.00.5 WATER METER PROF SERVICES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6250.65.00.5 WATER METER EQUIPMENT FLAT FEE	$1,600.00	$1,600.00	$0.00	100.00 %
11.6250.70.00.5 WATER METER COPIER	$105.00	$34.67	$70.33	33.02 %
11.6250.70.01.5 WATER METER COPY PAPER	$28.00	$24.05	$3.95	85.89 %
11.6250.82.00.5 WATER METER CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
11.6250.84.00.5 WATER METER WATER METERS	$7,000.00	$1,536.99	$5,463.01	21.96 %
11.6250.95.01.5 WATER METER PENSION INTEREST EXP	$1,560.00	$780.19	$779.81	50.01 %
TOTAL WATER METER OPERATIONS	**$56,188.00**	**$33,107.42**	**$23,080.58**	**58.92%**
TOTAL WATER FUND EXPENDITURES	**$2,235,400.00**	**$1,108,558.09**	**$1,126,841.91**	**49.59%**
WATER FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$0.00**	**$573,103.33**		

City of Montpelier
SEWER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
12.2 PERMITS AND LICENSE REV				
12.2244.00.00.4 SEWER REV AMORTIZATION OF GRANTS	$0.00	$5,042.50	$5,042.50	0.00 %
12.2300.00.00.4 SEWER REV CAPITAL GRANTS-VT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2300.00.10.4 SEWER REV FEDERAL GRANTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2300.00.20.4 SEWER REV ARRA GRANT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2501.00.00.4 SEWER USE REV-METERED	$1,851,750.00	$1,333,399.43	($518,350.57)	72.01 %
12.2501.00.01.4 SEWER USE REV-FLAT RATE	$23,312.00	$0.00	($23,312.00)	0.00 %
12.2502.00.00.4 SEWER USE REV-BERLIN	$330,000.00	$195,253.04	($134,746.96)	59.17 %
12.2503.00.00.4 SEWER REV PENALTIES - SEWER USE	$15,000.00	$7,769.92	($7,230.08)	51.80 %
12.2504.00.00.4 SEWER REV CONNECTION FEES	$0.00	$3,200.00	$3,200.00	0.00 %
12.2505.00.00.4 SEWER REV DELINQ INTEREST	$14,000.00	$5,474.17	($8,525.83)	39.10 %
12.2522.00.00.4 SEWER BENEFIT CHARGE	$127,690.00	$190,407.47	$62,717.47	149.12 %
12.2525.00.00.4 SEWER CSO BENEFIT CHARGE	$638,453.00	$666,426.16	$27,973.16	104.38 %
12.2614.00.00.4 SEWER REV SALE OF EQUIPMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2615.00.00.4 SEWER REV VACTOR RENTAL FEES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2700.00.00.4 SEWER REV INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2807.00.00.4 SEWER WC /STD WAGE REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2820.00.00.4 SEWER REV W/C REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2920.00.00.4 SEWER REV BOND PROCEEDS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2986.00.00.4 SEWER SEPTAGE & LEACHATE FEES	$350,000.00	$201,438.45	($148,561.55)	57.55 %
12.2990.00.00.4 SEWER MISC REVENUE	$0.00	$1,322.20	$1,322.20	0.00 %
12.2992.00.00.4 SEWER MISC REIMBURSEMENTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2993.00.00.4 SEWER XFER FROM GENERAL FUND	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2995.00.00.4 SEWER REV WORK COMP REIMBURSEMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.2997.00.00.4 SEWER REV USE OF FUND BALANCE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL PERMITS AND LICENSE REV	**$3,350,205.00**	**$2,609,733.34**	**($740,471.66)**	**77.90%**
TOTAL SEWER FUND REVENUES	**$3,350,205.00**	**$2,609,733.34**	**($740,471.66)**	**77.90%**

EXPENDITURES

City of Montpelier
SEWER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5470 WASTEWATER TREATMENT				
12.5470.10.00.5 WW TREAT SALARIES & WAGES	$283,542.00	$150,654.68	$132,887.32	53.13 %
12.5470.11.00.5 WW TREAT OVERTIME	$19,254.00	$8,674.12	$10,579.88	45.05 %
12.5470.15.01.5 WW TREAT DENTAL INSURANCE	$2,368.00	$1,221.63	$1,146.37	51.59 %
12.5470.15.02.5 WW TREAT FICA/MEDICARE	$22,407.00	$11,618.70	$10,788.30	51.85 %
12.5470.15.03.5 WW TREAT HEALTH INSURANCE	$45,050.00	$20,441.12	$24,608.88	45.37 %
12.5470.15.04.5 WW TREAT SECTION 125	$635.00	$347.26	$287.74	54.69 %
12.5470.15.05.5 WW TREAT LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$274.00	$722.04	($448.04)	263.52 %
12.5470.15.07.5 WW TREAT CITY RETIREMENT	$18,168.00	$8,029.78	$10,138.22	44.20 %
12.5470.15.08.5 WW TREAT LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$3,300.00	$2,198.67	$1,101.33	66.63 %
12.5470.15.09.5 WW TREAT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$640.00	$782.50	($142.50)	122.27 %
12.5470.15.10.5 WW TREAT WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$9,992.00	$7,204.23	$2,787.77	72.10 %
12.5470.15.12.5 WW TREAT PARKING FEE	$84.00	$84.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5470.18.00.5 WW TREAT UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$2,500.00	$1,237.82	$1,262.18	49.51 %
12.5470.20.00.5 WW TREAT OFFICE SUPPLIES	$1,500.00	$554.94	$945.06	37.00 %
12.5470.20.01.5 WW TREAT POSTAGE	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
12.5470.21.00.5 WW TREAT OPERATING SUPPLIES	$173,335.00	$86,568.39	$86,766.61	49.94 %
12.5470.23.00.5 WW TREAT SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
12.5470.34.00.5 WW TREAT COMMUNICATIONS	$7,000.00	$689.71	$6,310.29	9.85 %
12.5470.38.00.5 WW TREAT DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5470.40.00.5 WW TREAT DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$2,000.00	$290.00	$1,710.00	14.50 %
12.5470.48.00.5 WW TREAT PROP & LIAB INS	$28,429.00	$21,248.28	$7,180.72	74.74 %
12.5470.56.00.5 WW TREAT OTR PUR SRVC	$180,300.00	$86,248.14	$94,051.86	47.84 %
12.5470.60.00.5 WW TREAT PROF SVCS	$20,110.00	$936.00	$19,174.00	4.65 %
12.5470.65.00.5 WW TREAT EQUIPMENT FLAT FEE	$10,500.00	$10,500.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5470.66.00.5 WW TREAT OTHER RENTALS	$9,500.00	$0.00	$9,500.00	0.00 %
12.5470.68.00.5 WW TREAT VEH/EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$63,000.00	$17,402.69	$45,597.31	27.62 %
12.5470.69.00.5 WW TREAT BLDGS/GRNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$26,500.00	$8,957.23	$17,542.77	33.80 %
12.5470.70.00.5 WW TREAT COPIER	$706.00	$234.06	$471.94	33.15 %
12.5470.70.01.5 WW TREAT COPY PAPER	$188.00	$162.13	$25.87	86.24 %
12.5470.72.00.5 WW TREAT TAXES/LICENSE/REGIST.	$500.00	$5,452.50	($4,952.50)	1,090.50 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5470.73.00.5 WW TREAT OPERATING FEE	$5,000.00	$0.00	$5,000.00	0.00 %
12.5470.74.00.5 WW TREAT TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$800.00	$0.00	$800.00	0.00 %
12.5470.76.01.5 WW TREAT ELECTRIC	$167,585.00	$94,248.66	$73,336.34	56.24 %
12.5470.76.02.5 WW TREAT FUEL OIL	$50,000.00	$44,541.39	$5,458.61	89.08 %
12.5470.76.03.5 WW TREAT TRASH REMOVAL	$2,100.00	$402.06	$1,697.94	19.15 %
12.5470.76.04.5 WW TREAT IN HOUSE UTILITIES	$285,000.00	$133,336.93	$151,663.07	46.78 %
12.5470.76.06.5 WW TREAT UV	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5470.79.00.5 WW TREAT MISC	$0.00	$51.67	($51.67)	0.00 %
12.5470.82.00.5 WW TREAT CAP IMPROVEMENTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5470.83.00.5 WW TREAT MACH & EQUIP	$6,000.00	$5,999.99	$0.01	100.00 %
12.5470.88.00.5 WW TREAT CAPITAL RESERVE	$0.00	$11,753.00	($11,753.00)	0.00 %
12.5470.90.00.5 WW TREAT DEBT PRINCIPAL	$174,171.00	$0.00	$174,171.00	0.00 %
12.5470.91.00.5 WW TREAT DEBT INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5470.95.01.5 WW TREAT PENSION INTEREST EXP	$12,037.00	$6,018.53	$6,018.47	50.00 %
12.5470.97.00.5 WW TREAT ADMIN/MGMT SVCS	$134,002.00	$134,002.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL WASTEWATER TREATMENT	**$1,769,177.00**	**$882,814.85**	**$886,362.15**	**49.90%**
12.5471 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT				
12.5471.10.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT SALARIES & WAGES	$56,720.00	$30,298.47	$26,421.53	53.42 %
12.5471.11.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT OVERTIME	$3,699.00	$2,154.28	$1,544.72	58.24 %
12.5471.15.01.5 STRM WTR MGMT DENTAL INSURANCE	$513.00	$246.40	$266.60	48.03 %
12.5471.15.02.5 STRM WTR MGMT FICA/MEDICARE	$4,471.00	$2,413.42	$2,057.58	53.98 %
12.5471.15.03.5 STRM WTR MGMT HEALTH INSURANCE	$9,309.00	$3,756.22	$5,552.78	40.35 %
12.5471.15.04.5 STRM WTR MGMT IRS SECTION 125	$138.00	$71.75	$66.25	51.99 %
12.5471.15.05.5 STRM WTR MGMT LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$60.00	$94.99	($34.99)	158.32 %
12.5471.15.07.5 STRM WTR MGMT CITY RETIREMENT	$3,625.00	$1,783.81	$1,841.19	49.21 %
12.5471.15.08.5 STRM WTR MGMT LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$800.00	$454.30	$345.70	56.79 %
12.5471.15.09.5 STRM WTR MGMT UNEMPLOYMENT INS	$139.00	$161.68	($22.68)	116.32 %
12.5471.15.10.5 STRM WTR MGMT WORKERS COMP INS	$2,005.00	$1,444.88	$560.12	72.06 %
12.5471.15.12.5 STRM WTR MGMT PARKING FEE	$390.00	$390.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5471.18.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.20.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT OFFICE SUPPLIES	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5471.21.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT OPERATING SUPPLIES	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
12.5471.23.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT SMALL TOOLS AND EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.34.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.40.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.48.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT PROPERTY & CASUALTY INS	$1,328.00	$981.13	$346.87	73.88 %
12.5471.60.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.65.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT RENTAL OF CITY EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.66.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT OTHER RENTALS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.67.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT STREET REPAIR/MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.68.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT VEH/EQUIP REPAIR/MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.69.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT BLDG/GRNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.70.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT COPIER	$153.00	$48.35	$104.65	31.60 %
12.5471.70.01.5 STRM WTR MGMT COPY PAPER	$41.00	$34.44	$6.56	84.00 %
12.5471.72.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT TAXES/LICENSES/REGISTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.74.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.79.00.5 STRM WTR MGMT MISC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5471.95.01.5 STRM WTR MGMT PENSION INTEREST EXP	$2,610.00	$1,304.80	$1,305.20	49.99 %
TOTAL STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	**$86,551.00**	**$45,638.92**	**$40,912.08**	**52.73%**
12.5480 SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM				
12.5480.10.00.5 COLLECTION SALARIES & WAGES	$138,765.00	$75,476.46	$63,288.54	54.39 %
12.5480.11.00.5 COLLECTION OVERTIME	$12,120.00	$10,302.97	$1,817.03	85.01 %
12.5480.15.01.5 COLLECTION DENTAL INSURANCE	$1,406.00	$735.68	$670.32	52.32 %
12.5480.15.02.5 COLLECTION FICA/MEDICARE	$11,165.00	$6,111.16	$5,053.84	54.73 %
12.5480.15.03.5 COLLECTION HEALTH INSURANCE	$28,629.00	$15,343.80	$13,285.20	53.60 %
12.5480.15.04.5 COLLECTION SECTION 125	$300.00	$220.67	$79.33	73.56 %
12.5480.15.05.5 COLLECTION LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$162.00	$273.47	($111.47)	168.81 %
12.5480.15.07.5 COLLECTION CITY RETIREMENT	$9,053.00	$5,342.20	$3,710.80	59.01 %
12.5480.15.08.5 COLLECTION LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$2,000.00	$1,397.21	$602.79	69.86 %
12.5480.15.09.5 COLLECTION UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$380.00	$497.26	($117.26)	130.86 %
12.5480.15.10.5 COLLECTION WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$4,948.00	$3,567.50	$1,380.50	72.10 %
12.5480.15.12.5 COLLECTION PARKING FEE	$48.00	$48.00	$0.00	100.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5480.18.00.5 COLLECTION UNIFORMS/PROTECTIVE CLOTH	$1,850.00	$900.10	$949.90	48.65 %
12.5480.20.00.5 COLLECTION OFFICE SUPPLIES	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
12.5480.21.00.5 COLLECTION OPERATING SUPPLIES	$18,500.00	$15,370.06	$3,129.94	83.08 %
12.5480.23.00.5 COLLECTION SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$50.00	$92.66	($42.66)	185.32 %
12.5480.34.00.5 COLLECTION COMMUNICATIONS	$4,900.00	$955.10	$3,944.90	19.49 %
12.5480.38.00.5 COLLECTION DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5480.48.00.5 COLLECTION PROP & LIAB INS	$4,086.00	$3,017.42	$1,068.58	73.85 %
12.5480.48.01.5 COLLECTION PC - DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$1,200.00	($1,200.00)	0.00 %
12.5480.56.00.5 COLLECTION OTR PUR SRVC	$28,000.00	$0.00	$28,000.00	0.00 %
12.5480.65.00.5 COLLECTION EQUIP USE ASSESSMENT	$76,045.00	$76,045.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5480.65.01.5 COLLECTION EQUIP FLAT FEE	$50,000.00	$50,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5480.65.02.5 COLLECTION VACTOR USE FEE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5480.66.00.5 COLLECTION OTHER RENTALS	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
12.5480.67.00.5 COLLECTION STREET REPAIR/MAINT	$8,000.00	$2,447.04	$5,552.96	30.59 %
12.5480.68.00.5 COLLECTION VEH/EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$15,000.00	$1,706.38	$13,293.62	11.38 %
12.5480.69.00.5 COLLECTION BLDGS/GRNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$750.00	$0.00	$750.00	0.00 %
12.5480.70.00.5 COLLECTION COPIER	$419.00	$148.98	$270.02	35.56 %
12.5480.70.01.5 COLLECTION COPY PAPER	$112.00	$99.17	$12.83	88.54 %
12.5480.76.01.5 COLLECTION ELECTRIC	$9,000.00	$3,546.03	$5,453.97	39.40 %
12.5480.79.00.5 COLLECTION MISC	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
12.5480.82.00.5 COLLECTION CAP IMPROVEMENTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5480.83.00.5 COLLECTION MACH/EQUIPMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5480.88.00.5 COLLECTION CAPITAL RSRV	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5480.90.00.5 COLLECTION CSO PRINCIPAL DEBT PAYMNT	$333,062.00	$0.00	$333,062.00	0.00 %
12.5480.91.00.5 COLLECTION CSO INTEREST DEBT PAYMENT	$67,223.00	$26,985.65	$40,237.35	40.14 %
12.5480.95.01.5 COLLECTION PENSION INTEREST EXP	$7,147.00	$3,573.50	$3,573.50	50.00 %
TOTAL SEWER COLLECTION SYSTEM	**$834,720.00**	**$305,403.47**	**$529,316.53**	**36.59%**
12.5481 WASTEWATER ADMINISTRATION				
12.5481.10.00.5 WW ADMIN SALARIES & WAGES	$78,244.00	$41,928.18	$36,315.82	53.59 %
12.5481.11.00.5 WW ADMIN OVERTIME	$8,060.00	$2,270.72	$5,789.28	28.17 %
12.5481.15.01.5 WW ADMIN DENTAL INSURANCE	$759.00	$379.17	$379.83	49.96 %

City of Montpelier
SEWER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5481.15.02.5 WW ADMIN FICA/MEDICARE	$6,386.00	$3,235.23	$3,150.77	50.66 %
12.5481.15.03.5 WW ADMIN HEALTH INSURANCE	$13,875.00	$5,899.14	$7,975.86	42.52 %
12.5481.15.04.5 WW ADMIN IRS SECTION 125	$188.00	$106.95	$81.05	56.89 %
12.5481.15.05.5 WW ADMIN LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$81.00	$146.44	($65.44)	180.79 %
12.5481.15.07.5 WW ADMIN CITY RETIREMENT	$5,178.00	$2,514.87	$2,663.13	48.57 %
12.5481.15.08.5 WW ADMIN LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$1,000.00	$677.17	$322.83	67.72 %
12.5481.15.09.5 WW ADMIN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$205.00	$241.00	($36.00)	117.56 %
12.5481.15.10.5 WW ADMIN WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$2,840.00	$2,047.64	$792.36	72.10 %
12.5481.15.11.5 WW ADMIN HEALTH INS DEDUCT REIMB.	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.15.12.5 WW ADMIN PARKING FEE	$600.00	$600.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5481.18.00.5 WW ADMIN UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.20.00.5 WW ADMIN OFFICE SUPPLIES	$800.00	$274.41	$525.59	34.30 %
12.5481.20.01.5 WW ADMIN POSTAGE	$2,800.00	$32.75	$2,767.25	1.17 %
12.5481.30.00.5 WW ADMIN ADVERTISING	$350.00	$76.50	$273.50	21.86 %
12.5481.34.00.5 WW ADMIN TELEPHONE BASIC SERVICE	$3,800.00	$2,658.91	$1,141.09	69.97 %
12.5481.34.01.5 WW ADMIN TELEPHONE LONG DISTANCE	$600.00	$379.38	$220.62	63.23 %
12.5481.34.02.5 WW ADMIN INTERNET WAN SERVICE	$3,400.00	$1,928.15	$1,471.85	56.71 %
12.5481.38.00.5 WW ADMIN DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.40.00.5 WW ADMIN DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$1,000.00	$149.05	$850.95	14.91 %
12.5481.48.00.5 WW ADMIN PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$1,980.00	$1,462.44	$517.56	73.86 %
12.5481.48.01.5 WW ADMIN PC - DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$500.00	($500.00)	0.00 %
12.5481.56.00.5 WW ADMIN - OTR PUR SRVC	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.60.00.5 WW ADMIN PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$3,300.00	$1,064.50	$2,235.50	32.26 %
12.5481.61.00.5 WW ADMIN LEGAL SERVICES	$10,000.00	$2,339.39	$7,660.61	23.39 %
12.5481.65.00.5 WW ADMIN EQUIPMENT VACTOR RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.70.00.5 WW ADMIN COPIER	$226.00	$72.06	$153.94	31.88 %
12.5481.70.01.5 WW ADMIN COPIER PAPER	$60.00	$50.71	$9.29	84.52 %
12.5481.79.00.5 WW ADMIN MISCELLANEOUS	$50.00	$0.00	$50.00	0.00 %
12.5481.83.00.5 WW ADMIN MACHINERY & EQUIPMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.83.01.5 WW ADMIN COMPUTER EQUIPMENT ALLOC	$14,355.00	$10,259.45	$4,095.55	71.47 %
12.5481.83.02.5 WW ADMIN FINANCIAL SOFTWARE	$1,953.00	$180.56	$1,772.44	9.25 %
12.5481.85.00.5 WW ADMIN FEB/STATE GRANT EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5481.88.01.5 WW ADMIN COMPUTER NETWORK RESERVE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.90.00.5 WW ADMIN WWTP DEBT PRINCIPAL	$114,481.00	$0.00	$114,481.00	0.00 %
12.5481.91.00.5 WW ADMIN WWTP DEBT INTEREST	$91,663.00	$42,209.80	$49,453.20	46.05 %
12.5481.92.00.5 WW ADMIN ENERGY IMPROV LEASE PYMT	$17,650.00	$8,825.04	$8,824.96	50.00 %
12.5481.92.01.5 WW ADMIN ENERGY AUDIT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.95.00.5 WW ADMIN VMERS PAYOFF PENSION EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5481.95.01.5 WW ADMIN PENSION INTEREST EXP	$3,856.00	$1,927.81	$1,928.19	50.00 %
12.5481.97.00.5 WW ADMIN ADMINISTRATIVE/MGMT SVCS	$228,166.00	$228,166.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL WASTEWATER ADMINISTRATION	**$617,906.00**	**$362,603.42**	**$255,302.58**	**58.68%**
12.5482 PRIVATE SEWER SYS MAINT				
12.5482.10.00.5 PRIV SWR MAINT SALARIES & WAGES	$2,662.00	$1,460.04	$1,201.96	54.85 %
12.5482.11.00.5 PRIV SWR MAINT OVERTIME	$72.00	$0.79	$71.21	1.10 %
12.5482.15.01.5 PRIV SWR MAINT DENTAL INSURANCE	$9.00	$8.41	$0.59	93.44 %
12.5482.15.02.5 PRIV SWR MAINT FICA/MEDICARE	$202.00	$107.36	$94.64	53.15 %
12.5482.15.03.5 PRIV SWR MAINT HEALTH INSURANCE	$351.00	$121.42	$229.58	34.59 %
12.5482.15.04.5 PRIV SWR MAINT SECTION 125	$2.00	$2.71	($0.71)	135.50 %
12.5482.15.05.5 PRIV SWR MAINT LONG TERM CARE INS	$2.00	$4.92	($2.92)	246.00 %
12.5482.15.07.5 PRIV SWR MAINT CITY RETIREMENT	$164.00	$85.36	$78.64	52.05 %
12.5482.15.08.5 PRIV SWR MAINT LIFE, STD, LTD INS	$30.00	$17.14	$12.86	57.13 %
12.5482.15.09.5 PRIV SWR MAINT UNEMPLOY INSURANCE	$5.00	$6.11	($1.11)	122.20 %
12.5482.15.10.5 PRIV SWR MAINT WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$92.00	$66.33	$25.67	72.10 %
12.5482.20.00.5 PRIV SWR MAINT OFFICE SUPPLIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5482.48.00.5 PRIV SWR MAINT PROP/LIAB INS	$50.00	$37.03	$12.97	74.06 %
12.5482.56.00.5 PRIV SWR MAINT OTR PUR SRVC	$4,500.00	$2,580.46	$1,919.54	57.34 %
12.5482.70.00.5 PRIV SWR MAINT COPIER	$3.00	$1.58	$1.42	52.67 %
12.5482.70.01.5 PRIV SWR MAINT COPY PAPER	$1.00	$0.91	$0.09	91.00 %
12.5482.95.01.5 PRIV SWR MAINT PENSION INTEREST EXP	$47.00	$23.51	$23.49	50.02 %
TOTAL PRIVATE SEWER SYS MAINT	**$8,192.00**	**$4,524.08**	**$3,667.92**	**55.23%**
12.5491 DELQ SEWER FEES COLLECTION				
12.5491.10.00.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL SALARIES & WAGES	$13,731.00	$7,554.49	$6,176.51	55.02 %

City of Montpelier
SEWER FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
12.5491.11.00.5 DELQ SEWER FEES COLLECTION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
12.5491.15.01.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL DENTAL INSURANCE	$93.00	$46.31	$46.69	49.80 %
12.5491.15.02.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL FICA/MEDICARE	$1,023.00	$573.15	$449.85	56.03 %
12.5491.15.03.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL HEALTH INSURANCE	$1,756.00	$750.48	$1,005.52	42.74 %
12.5491.15.04.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL IRS SECTION 125	$25.00	$13.54	$11.46	54.16 %
12.5491.15.05.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$11.00	$43.63	($32.63)	396.64 %
12.5491.15.07.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL CITY RETIREMENT	$824.00	$491.76	$332.24	59.68 %
12.5491.15.08.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$135.00	$85.72	$49.28	63.50 %
12.5491.15.09.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$25.00	$30.51	($5.51)	122.04 %
12.5491.15.10.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$43.00	$31.72	$11.28	73.77 %
12.5491.15.12.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL PARKING FEE	$120.00	$120.00	$0.00	100.00 %
12.5491.20.00.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL OFFICE SUPPLIES	$100.00	$103.49	($3.49)	103.49 %
12.5491.20.01.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL POSTAGE	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
12.5491.34.00.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL COMMUNICATIONS	$0.00	$201.68	($201.68)	0.00 %
12.5491.40.00.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$300.00	$160.50	$139.50	53.50 %
12.5491.48.00.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$251.00	$185.13	$65.87	73.76 %
12.5491.70.00.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL COPIER	$28.00	$9.13	$18.87	32.61 %
12.5491.70.01.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL COPIER PAPER	$7.00	$6.33	$0.67	90.43 %
12.5491.95.01.5 DELQ SEWER TAX COLL PENSION INTEREST EXP	$470.00	$235.10	$234.90	50.02 %
TOTAL DELQ SEWER FEES COLLECTION	**$19,142.00**	**$10,642.67**	**$8,499.33**	**55.60%**
TOTAL SEWER FUND EXPENDITURES	**$3,335,688.00**	**$1,611,627.41**	**$1,724,060.59**	**48.31%**
SEWER FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$14,517.00**	**$998,105.93**		

City of Montpelier
CEMETERY FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
17.2 RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES				
17.2550.00.00.4 CEMETERY XFER CMTRY TRST-EXP	$27,000.00	$0.00	($27,000.00)	0.00 %
17.2660.00.00.4 CEMETERY OUTSIDE BURIALS	$2,875.00	$0.00	($2,875.00)	0.00 %
17.2700.00.00.4 CEMETERY INTEREST	$0.00	$0.93	$0.93	0.00 %
17.2701.00.00.4 CEMETERY CHANGE IN MARKET VALUE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2770.00.00.4 CEMETERY ENDOWNMENT CARE	$10,425.00	$2,780.00	($7,645.00)	26.67 %
17.2771.00.00.4 CEMETERY GRAVE OPENINGS	$27,500.00	$9,225.00	($18,275.00)	33.55 %
17.2771.00.01.4 CEMETERY GRAVE OPEN FULL BURIAL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2771.00.02.4 CEMETERY GRAVE OPEN CREMATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2772.00.00.4 CEMETERY FOUNDATIONS	$4,000.00	$2,332.50	($1,667.50)	58.31 %
17.2773.00.00.4 CEMETERY VAULT CHARGES	$2,000.00	$175.00	($1,825.00)	8.75 %
17.2920.00.00.4 CEMETERY BOND PROCEEDS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2960.00.00.4 CEMETERY LOT SALES	$6,400.00	$1,995.00	($4,405.00)	31.17 %
17.2990.00.00.4 CEMETERY MISC REV	$0.00	$731.00	$731.00	0.00 %
17.2990.00.01.4 CEMETERY MONUMENT SALES/REPAIR	$1,000.00	$0.00	($1,000.00)	0.00 %
17.2990.00.02.4 CEMETERY MONUMENT INSTALLATIONS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2990.00.03.4 CEMETERY MONUMENT REPAIR	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2990.00.04.4 CEMETERY MONUNMENT SALES/SANDBLAST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.2992.00.00.4 CEMETERY MISC REIMBS	$0.00	$75.00	$75.00	0.00 %
17.2994.00.00.4 CEMETERY XFER GF OPERATIONS	$92,445.00	$92,445.00	$0.00	100.00 %
17.2995.00.00.4 CEMETERY XFER PARKING FUND	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
17.2996.00.00.4 CEMETERY XFER DPW SMALL PARKS	$23,000.00	$23,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
17.2997.00.00.4 CEMETERY XFER GF CIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES	**$206,645.00**	**$142,759.43**	**($63,885.57)**	**69.08%**
TOTAL CEMETERY FUND REVENUES	**$206,645.00**	**$142,759.43**	**($63,885.57)**	**69.08%**

EXPENDITURES

17.7000 GREEN MOUNT CEMETERY

City of Montpelier
CEMETERY FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
17.7000.10.00.5 CEMETERY SALARIES & WAGES	$79,373.00	$44,048.72	$35,324.28	55.50 %
17.7000.11.00.5 CEMETERY OVERTIME	$4,500.00	$1,534.39	$2,965.61	34.10 %
17.7000.15.01.5 CEMETERY DENTAL INSURANCE	$800.00	$394.69	$405.31	49.34 %
17.7000.15.02.5 CEMETERY FICA/MEDICARE	$6,207.00	$3,316.27	$2,890.73	53.43 %
17.7000.15.03.5 CEMETERY HEALTH INSURANCE	$12,055.00	$3,860.35	$8,194.65	32.02 %
17.7000.15.04.5 CEMETERY IRS SECTION 125	$234.00	$45.36	$188.64	19.38 %
17.7000.15.05.5 CEMETERY LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$110.00	$133.15	($23.15)	121.05 %
17.7000.15.07.5 CEMETERY CITY RETIREMENT	$5,032.00	$2,962.89	$2,069.11	58.88 %
17.7000.15.08.5 CEMETERY LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$1,387.00	$715.74	$671.26	51.60 %
17.7000.15.09.5 CEMETERY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$250.00	$254.73	($4.73)	101.89 %
17.7000.15.10.5 CEMETERY WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$3,758.00	$2,710.96	$1,047.04	72.14 %
17.7000.18.00.5 CEMETERY UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$500.00	$121.83	$378.17	24.37 %
17.7000.20.00.5 CEMETERY OFFICE SUPPLIES	$700.00	$520.46	$179.54	74.35 %
17.7000.20.01.5 CEMETERY POSTAGE	$75.00	$0.00	$75.00	0.00 %
17.7000.21.00.5 CEMETERY OPERATING SUPPLIES	$2,000.00	$374.34	$1,625.66	18.72 %
17.7000.21.01.5 CEMETERY FUEL	$6,000.00	$2,207.19	$3,792.81	36.79 %
17.7000.23.00.5 CEMETERY SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$300.00	$65.97	$234.03	21.99 %
17.7000.30.00.5 CEMETERY ADVERTISING	$800.00	$0.00	$800.00	0.00 %
17.7000.34.00.5 CEMETERY TELEPHONE BASIC SERVICE	$250.00	$124.21	$125.79	49.68 %
17.7000.34.01.5 CEMETERY TELEPHONE LONG DISTANCE	$50.00	$32.44	$17.56	64.88 %
17.7000.34.02.5 CEMETERY INTERNET WAN SERVICE	$325.00	$275.45	$49.55	84.75 %
17.7000.34.03.5 CEMETERY CELL PHONE & PAGER	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.40.00.5 CEMETERY DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$1,000.00	$470.00	$530.00	47.00 %
17.7000.48.00.5 CEMETERY PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$2,506.00	$1,545.73	$960.27	61.68 %
17.7000.48.01.5 CEMETERY PC - DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.49.00.5 CEMETERY OTHER INSURANCE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.56.00.5 CEMETERY CORRECTIONS - LABOR COST	$23,000.00	$15,600.00	$7,400.00	67.83 %
17.7000.57.00.5 CEMETERY MONUMENT INSTALLATION	$2,000.00	$1,097.20	$902.80	54.86 %
17.7000.57.01.5 CEMETERY MONUMENT REPAIR	$500.00	$35.11	$464.89	7.02 %
17.7000.57.02.5 CEMETERY MONUMENT SALES/SANDBLAST	$500.00	$394.00	$106.00	78.80 %
17.7000.58.00.5 CEMETERY FLOWER FUND	$500.00	$214.00	$286.00	42.80 %
17.7000.58.01.5 CEMETERY ENDOWMENT CARE	$10,425.00	$0.00	$10,425.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
CEMETERY FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
17.7000.60.00.5 CEMETERY PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$750.00	$710.00	$40.00	94.67 %
17.7000.66.00.5 CEMETERY OTHER RENTALS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.67.00.5 CEMETERY STREET REPAIR & MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.68.00.5 CEMETERY VEH/EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$6,000.00	$4,244.53	$1,755.47	70.74 %
17.7000.68.01.5 CEMETERY TRUCK REPAIR & MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.68.02.5 CEMETERY MOWING REPAIR & MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.68.03.5 CEMETERY EXCAVATOR REPAIR & MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.68.04.5 CEMETERY TRACTOR REPAIR & MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.69.00.5 CEMETERY BLDGS/GRNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$1,000.00	$139.62	$860.38	13.96 %
17.7000.69.01.5 CEMETERY SMALL PARKS MAINTENANCE	$3,000.00	$45.42	$2,954.58	1.51 %
17.7000.70.00.5 CEMETERY COPIER	$230.00	$71.15	$158.85	30.93 %
17.7000.70.01.5 CEMETERY COPIER PAPER	$61.00	$57.86	$3.14	94.85 %
17.7000.72.00.5 CEMETERY TAXES/LICENSE/REGIST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.74.00.5 CEMETERY TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.76.01.5 CEMETERY ELECTRIC	$1,000.00	$559.45	$440.55	55.95 %
17.7000.76.02.5 CEMETERY HEATING FUEL	$1,500.00	$509.50	$990.50	33.97 %
17.7000.76.03.5 CEMETERY TRASH REMOVAL	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.76.04.5 CEMETERY IN HOUSE UTILITIES/WATER	$750.00	$716.47	$33.53	95.53 %
17.7000.76.05.5 CEMETERY PORTOLET	$1,700.00	$1,290.62	$409.38	75.92 %
17.7000.79.00.5 CEMETERY MISC	$0.00	$17.06	($17.06)	0.00 %
17.7000.80.00.5 CEMETERY ELM STREET CEMETERY	$0.00	$212.62	($212.62)	0.00 %
17.7000.80.01.5 CEMETERY TREES, BULBS, SHRUBS	$1,500.00	$21.75	$1,478.25	1.45 %
17.7000.82.00.5 CEMETERY CIP PLAN CEMETERY	$6,000.00	$5,917.52	$82.48	98.63 %
17.7000.83.00.5 CEMETERY EQUIPMENT PLAN CEMETERY	$15,742.00	$550.99	$15,191.01	3.50 %
17.7000.91.00.5 CEMETERY INTEREST EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.95.00.5 CEMETERY VMERS PAYOFF PENSION EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
17.7000.95.01.5 CEMETERY PENSION INTEREST EXP	$2,275.00	$1,137.68	$1,137.32	50.01 %
TOTAL GREEN MOUNT CEMETERY	**$206,645.00**	**$99,257.42**	**$107,387.58**	**48.03%**
17.9900 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS				
17.9900.48.01.5 PC DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
CEMETERY FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
TOTAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
TOTAL CEMETERY FUND EXPENDITURES	**$206,645.00**	**$99,257.42**	**$107,387.58**	**48.03%**
CEMETERY FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$0.00**	**$43,502.01**		

City of Montpelier
PARKS FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
18.22 PERMITS AND LICENSE REV				
18.2245.00.00.4 PARKS NO. BR BRIDGE AOT GRANT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.2280.00.00.4 PARKS MISC GRANT REVENUE	$6,000.00	$1,000.00	($5,000.00)	16.67 %
TOTAL PERMITS AND LICENSE REV	**$6,000.00**	**$1,000.00**	**($5,000.00)**	**16.67%**
18.23 INTERGOVERNMENTAL REV				
18.2300.00.00.4 PARKS TOWER GRANT REVENUE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL REV	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
18.261 EQUIPMENT/LAND REVENUE				
18.2614.00.00.4 PARKS SALE OF EQUIPMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL EQUIPMENT/LAND REVENUE	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
18.264 OTHER REVENUE				
18.2648.00.00.4 PARKS VISTA	$0.00	$2,325.00	$2,325.00	0.00 %
18.2649.00.00.4 PARKS MISC CONTRIBS	$0.00	$1,045.00	$1,045.00	0.00 %
TOTAL OTHER REVENUE	**$0.00**	**$3,370.00**	**$3,370.00**	**0.00%**
18.268 OTHER REVENUE				
18.2680.00.00.4 PARK ENCHANTED FOREST RECEIPTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.2685.00.00.4 PARKS SHELTER RESERVATION	$0.00	$230.00	$230.00	0.00 %
TOTAL OTHER REVENUE	**$0.00**	**$230.00**	**$230.00**	**0.00%**
18.29 OPERATING TRANSFERS				
18.2900.00.00.4 PARKS INTEREST REV	$0.00	$94.18	$94.18	0.00 %
18.2907.00.00.4 PARKS W/C REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.2910.00.00.4 PARKS XFER GF OPERATIONS	$96,633.00	$96,633.00	$0.00	100.00 %
18.2915.00.00.4 PARKS XFER FROM FUND 30	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
18.2920.00.00.4 PARKS BOND PROCEEDS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.2983.00.00.4 PARKS RANGER HOUSE RENTAL	$3,240.00	$1,619.93	($1,620.07)	50.00 %
18.2984.00.00.4 PARKS XFER FROM OTHER FUNDS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.2985.00.00.4 PARKS XFER GF EQUIPMENT	$1,750.00	$1,750.00	$0.00	100.00 %
18.2987.00.00.4 PARKS XFER GF CIP	$6,000.00	$6,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
18.2990.00.00.4 PARKS MISC. REVENUE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.2992.00.00.4 PARKS MISC REIMB	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL OPERATING TRANSFERS	**$107,623.00**	**$106,097.11**	**($1,525.89)**	**98.58%**
TOTAL PARKS FUND REVENUES	**$113,623.00**	**$110,697.11**	**($2,925.89)**	**97.42%**

EXPENDITURES

18.76 PARKS GRANT EXP

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
18.7612.00.00.5 PARKS TRAIL GRANT-BOARDWALK	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.7614.00.00.5 PARKS PEACE PARK GRANT PROJECT	$300.00	$300.00	$0.00	100.00 %
18.7615.00.00.5 PARKS STATE HOUSE TRAIL	$900.00	$0.00	$900.00	0.00 %
18.7621.00.00.5 PARKS GRANT EXP-COMMUNITY GARDEN	$0.00	$54.08	($54.08)	0.00 %
TOTAL PARKS GRANT EXP	**$1,200.00**	**$354.08**	**$845.92**	**29.51%**

18.7600 PARKS OPERATIONS

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
18.7600.10.00.5 PARKS SALARIES & WAGES	$49,075.00	$39,775.41	$9,299.59	81.05 %
18.7600.10.01.5 PARKS AMERICORP & SUMMER WAGES	$10,000.00	$4,023.61	$5,976.39	40.24 %
18.7600.11.00.5 PARKS OVERTIME	$0.00	$99.53	($99.53)	0.00 %
18.7600.15.01.5 PARKS DENTAL INSURANCE	$462.00	$231.70	$230.30	50.15 %
18.7600.15.02.5 PARKS FICA/MEDICARE	$3,631.00	$2,758.08	$872.92	75.96 %
18.7600.15.03.5 PARKS HEALTH INSURANCE	$8,782.00	$6,132.17	$2,649.83	69.83 %
18.7600.15.04.5 PARKS IRS SECTION 125	$124.00	$67.69	$56.31	54.59 %
18.7600.15.05.5 PARKS LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$53.00	$137.45	($84.45)	259.34 %
18.7600.15.07.5 PARKS CITY RETIREMENT	$2,944.00	$1,815.55	$1,128.45	61.67 %
18.7600.15.08.5 PARKS LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$700.00	$428.58	$271.42	61.23 %
18.7600.15.09.5 PARKS UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$125.00	$152.53	($27.53)	122.02 %

City of Montpelier
PARKS FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
18.7600.15.10.5 PARKS WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$1,938.00	$1,398.74	$539.26	72.17 %
18.7600.20.00.5 PARKS OFFICE SUPPLIES	$700.00	$16.99	$683.01	2.43 %
18.7600.20.01.5 PARKS POSTAGE	$70.00	$0.00	$70.00	0.00 %
18.7600.21.00.5 PARKS OPERATING SUPPLIES	$1,200.00	$2,225.05	($1,025.05)	185.42 %
18.7600.23.00.5 PARKS SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$800.00	$1,239.92	($439.92)	154.99 %
18.7600.30.00.5 PARKS ADVERTISING	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
18.7600.34.00.5 PARKS TELEPHONE BASIC SERVICE	$144.00	$99.31	$44.69	68.97 %
18.7600.34.01.5 PARKS TELEPHONE LONG DISTANCE	$22.00	$14.94	$7.06	67.91 %
18.7600.34.02.5 PARKS INTERNET WAN SERVICE	$0.00	$138.39	($138.39)	0.00 %
18.7600.34.03.5 PARKS CELL PHONE & PAGER	$900.00	$509.59	$390.41	56.62 %
18.7600.40.00.5 PARKS DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$400.00	$215.00	$185.00	53.75 %
18.7600.48.00.5 PARKS PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$1,253.00	$925.60	$327.40	73.87 %
18.7600.48.01.5 PARKS PC - DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.7600.56.00.5 PARKS OTR PUR SRVC	$1,500.00	$1,303.61	$196.39	86.91 %
18.7600.62.00.5 PARKS PRINTING & BINDING	$200.00	$0.00	$200.00	0.00 %
18.7600.67.00.5 PARKS ROADS/REPAIR/MAINT	$2,000.00	$11.07	$1,988.93	0.55 %
18.7600.68.00.5 PARKS VEHS/EQUIP REPAIR/MAINT	$6,500.00	$4,110.61	$2,389.39	63.24 %
18.7600.69.00.5 PARKS BLDG/GRNDS REPAIR/MAINT	$2,000.00	$1,877.49	$122.51	93.87 %
18.7600.69.01.5 PARKS NON RE-OCCURRING MAINT	$2,000.00	$470.10	$1,529.90	23.51 %
18.7600.69.02.5 PARKS TOWER REPAIRS/MAINT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.7600.70.00.5 PARKS COPIER	$138.00	$45.64	$92.36	33.07 %
18.7600.70.01.5 PARKS COPIER PAPER	$37.00	$31.64	$5.36	85.51 %
18.7600.74.00.5 PARKS TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$400.00	$0.00	$400.00	0.00 %
18.7600.76.00.5 PARKS UTILITIES	$0.00	$285.13	($285.13)	0.00 %
18.7600.76.01.5 PARKS ELECTRIC	$350.00	$147.13	$202.87	42.04 %
18.7600.76.03.5 PARKS TRASH REMOVAL	$100.00	$76.68	$23.32	76.68 %
18.7600.76.04.5 PARKS IN HOUSE UTILITIES/WATER	$400.00	$164.51	$235.49	41.13 %
18.7600.79.00.5 PARKS MISC	$250.00	$2,146.41	($1,896.41)	858.56 %
18.7600.79.01.5 PARKS OFFICE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.7600.82.00.5 PARKS CIP PLAN PARKS	$6,000.00	$4,244.97	$1,755.03	70.75 %
18.7600.83.00.5 PARKS EQUIPMENT PLAN PARKS	$1,750.00	$0.00	$1,750.00	0.00 %
18.7600.83.01.5 PARKS TOWER RESTORATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
PARKS FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
18.7600.91.00.5 PARKS INTEREST EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.7600.95.00.5 PARKS VMERS PAYOFF PENSION EXP	$2,275.00	$0.00	$2,275.00	0.00 %
18.7600.95.01.5 PARKS PENSION INTEREST EXP	$0.00	$1,137.68	($1,137.68)	0.00 %
18.7600.99.01.5 PARKS XFER TO GF-TREE WARDEN ASST	$3,000.00	$3,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL PARKS OPERATIONS	**$112,423.00**	**$81,458.50**	**$30,964.50**	**72.46%**
18.764 PARKS MISC EXP				
18.7643.00.00.5 PARKS PEACE PARK	$0.00	$113.97	($113.97)	0.00 %
18.7644.00.00.5 PARKS IMPACT EXP (XFR TO GF)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
18.7647.00.00.5 PARKS TOWER IMPROVEMNT EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL PARKS MISC EXP	**$0.00**	**$113.97**	**($113.97)**	**0.00%**
TOTAL PARKS FUND EXPENDITURES	**$113,623.00**	**$81,926.55**	**$31,696.45**	**72.10%**
PARKS FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$0.00**	**$28,770.56**		

City of Montpelier
SENIOR CENTER FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
38.20 PROPERTY TAX REVENUE				
38.2000.00.00.4 SR CTR CITY APPROPRIATION	$125,707.00	$125,707.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUE	**$125,707.00**	**$125,707.00**	**$0.00**	**100.00%**
38.24 FEES & CHARGES FOR SERVICES				
38.2401.00.00.4 SR CTR MEMBERSHIP DUES	$9,000.00	$8,673.00	($327.00)	96.37 %
38.2403.00.00.4 SR CTR CLASS FEES	$21,000.00	$16,717.74	($4,282.26)	79.61 %
38.2405.00.00.4 SR CTR MEAL CONTRIBUTIONS	$7,500.00	$1,282.00	($6,218.00)	17.09 %
38.2407.00.00.4 SR CTR TRIP INCOME	$24,000.00	$8,579.75	($15,420.25)	35.75 %
38.2409.00.00.4 SR CTR SPECIAL DINNERS	$500.00	$238.00	($262.00)	47.60 %
38.2411.00.00.4 SR CTR SPECIAL FOODS	$200.00	$0.00	($200.00)	0.00 %
38.2425.00.00.4 SR CTR SPECIAL PROJECTS	$300.00	$110.00	($190.00)	36.67 %
TOTAL FEES & CHARGES FOR SERVICES	**$62,500.00**	**$35,600.49**	**($26,899.51)**	**56.96%**
38.27 INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE				
38.2700.00.00.4 SR CTR CORRY FUND-OPERATIONS	$25,000.00	$34,564.85	$9,564.85	138.26 %
38.2701.00.00.4 SR CTR CORRY FUND-INVESTMENT REVENUE	$20,000.00	$0.00	($20,000.00)	0.00 %
38.2705.00.00.4 SR CTR INTEREST INCOME	$0.00	$118.52	$118.52	0.00 %
38.2705.00.01.4 SR CTR REALIZED GAIN	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.2705.00.02.4 SR CTR UNREALIZED GAIN	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.2706.00.00.4 SR CTR INVESTMENT INCOME	$13,000.00	$2,389.55	($10,610.45)	18.38 %
TOTAL INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE	**$58,000.00**	**$37,072.92**	**($20,927.08)**	**63.92%**
38.28 MISC REVENUE				
38.2801.00.00.4 SR CTR CONTRIBUTIONS	$2,000.00	$924.88	($1,075.12)	46.24 %
38.2802.00.00.4 SR CTR MEMORIAL GIFTS	$500.00	$175.00	($325.00)	35.00 %
38.2803.00.00.4 SR CTR FUND RAISING-BAZAAR/WINDOW	$2,500.00	$0.00	($2,500.00)	0.00 %
38.2804.00.00.4 SR CTR FUND RAISING-MERCHANDISE SALE	$500.00	$0.00	($500.00)	0.00 %
38.2805.00.00.4 SR CTR FUND RAISING-RUMMAGE SALE	$2,500.00	$0.00	($2,500.00)	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
SENIOR CENTER FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
38.2810.00.00.4 SR CTR OTHER TOWNS CONTRIBUTION	$1,200.00	$899.00	($301.00)	74.92 %
38.2816.00.00.4 SR CTR TRANSFER FROM SMITH BARNEY ACCOUNT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.2820.00.00.4 SR CTR MISC INCOME	$2,000.00	$724.80	($1,275.20)	36.24 %
TOTAL MISC REVENUE	**$11,200.00**	**$2,723.68**	**($8,476.32)**	**24.32%**
TOTAL SENIOR CENTER REVENUES	**$257,407.00**	**$201,104.09**	**($56,302.91)**	**78.13%**

EXPENDITURES

38.3800 SENIOR CTR OPERATIONS

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
38.3800.10.00.5 SR CTR SALARIES & WAGES	$64,562.00	$38,389.82	$26,172.18	59.46 %
38.3800.11.00.5 SR CTR OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.3800.15.01.5 SR CTR DENTAL INSURANCE	$823.00	$254.93	$568.07	30.98 %
38.3800.15.02.5 SR CTR FICA/MEDICARE	$4,778.00	$2,799.42	$1,978.58	58.59 %
38.3800.15.03.5 SR CTR HEALTH INSURANCE	$4,680.00	$4,127.64	$552.36	88.20 %
38.3800.15.04.5 SR CTR SECTION 125	$25.00	$74.46	($49.46)	297.84 %
38.3800.15.05.5 SR CTR LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$95.00	$99.79	($4.79)	105.04 %
38.3800.15.07.5 SR CTR CITY RETIREMENT	$2,407.00	$1,267.37	$1,139.63	52.65 %
38.3800.15.08.5 SR CTR LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$1,200.00	$814.33	$385.67	67.86 %
38.3800.15.09.5 SR CTR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$300.00	$289.81	$10.19	96.60 %
38.3800.15.10.5 SR CTR WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$201.00	$144.20	$56.80	71.74 %
38.3800.20.00.5 SR CTR OFFICE SUPPLIES	$2,000.00	$408.52	$1,591.48	20.43 %
38.3800.20.01.5 SR CTR POSTAGE	$2,000.00	$1,088.00	$912.00	54.40 %
38.3800.20.02.5 SR CTR PROGRAM SUPPLIES	$250.00	$0.00	$250.00	0.00 %
38.3800.21.00.5 SR CTR OPERATING SUPPLIES	$2,000.00	$288.94	$1,711.06	14.45 %
38.3800.21.01.5 SR CTR FUEL-VAN	$3,000.00	$927.89	$2,072.11	30.93 %
38.3800.23.00.5 SR CTR SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$100.00	$358.80	($258.80)	358.80 %
38.3800.30.00.5 SR CTR ADVERTISING	$750.00	$0.00	$750.00	0.00 %
38.3800.34.00.5 SR CTR TELEPHONE	$500.00	$0.00	$500.00	0.00 %
38.3800.34.02.5 SR CTR INTERNET WAN SERVICE	$600.00	$0.00	$600.00	0.00 %
38.3800.34.03.5 SR CTR CABLE TV	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
38.3800.40.00.5 SR CTR DUES/SUBSCRIPTIONS/MTGS	$100.00	$85.00	$15.00	85.00 %
38.3800.41.00.5 SR CTR TRAINING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
SENIOR CENTER FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
38.3800.48.00.5 SR CTR PROP & LIAB INS	$2,381.00	$1,789.12	$591.88	75.14 %
38.3800.56.00.5 SR CTR CONTRACT SVCS-INSTRUCTION	$20,000.00	$12,940.00	$7,060.00	64.70 %
38.3800.56.01.5 SR CTR SWIMMING PROGRAM	$15,000.00	$6,935.00	$8,065.00	46.23 %
38.3800.56.02.5 SR CTR BOWLING PROGRAM	$5,000.00	$984.00	$4,016.00	19.68 %
38.3800.56.03.5 SR CTR OTHER PROGRAMS	$2,875.00	$1,534.86	$1,340.14	53.39 %
38.3800.56.04.5 SR CENTER CLEANING SERVICES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.3800.60.00.5 SR CTR PROF SERVICES	$1,500.00	$2,362.50	($862.50)	157.50 %
38.3800.62.00.5 SR CTR PRINTING/COPIER	$7,200.00	$1,594.49	$5,605.51	22.15 %
38.3800.66.00.5 SR CTR RENT	$27,500.00	$27,500.00	$0.00	100.00 %
38.3800.68.00.5 SR CTR EQUIPMENT MAINT/RENTAL	$1,000.00	$264.01	$735.99	26.40 %
38.3800.68.01.5 SR CTR VAN REPAIRS/MAINT	$500.00	$101.55	$398.45	20.31 %
38.3800.70.00.5 SR CTR COPIER-CITY ALLOCATION	$245.00	$86.66	$158.34	35.37 %
38.3800.70.01.5 SR CTR COY PAPER-CITY ALLOCAT	$65.00	$57.96	$7.04	89.17 %
38.3800.74.00.5 SR CTR TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$200.00	$20.00	$180.00	10.00 %
38.3800.79.00.5 SR CTR MISC	$0.00	$2,537.28	($2,537.28)	0.00 %
38.3800.83.00.5 SR CTR EQUIP/COMPUTERS/WEBSITE	$1,250.00	$0.00	$1,250.00	0.00 %
38.3800.83.01.5 SR CTR COMPUTER EQUIP ALLOCATION	$0.00	$59.97	($59.97)	0.00 %
38.3800.88.01.5 SR CTR COMPUTER NETWORK	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.3800.95.01.5 SR CTR PENSION INTEREST EXP	$4,241.00	$2,112.83	$2,128.17	49.82 %
38.3800.97.00.5 SR CTR ADMIN/MGMT SVCS	$14,400.00	$14,400.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL SENIOR CTR OPERATIONS	**$194,028.00**	**$126,699.15**	**$67,328.85**	**65.30%**
38.3801 SENIOR CTR FOOD SERVICE				
38.3801.10.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC SALARIES & WAGES	$21,763.00	$0.00	$21,763.00	0.00 %
38.3801.11.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC OVERTIME	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.3801.15.01.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC DENTAL INSURANCE	$439.00	$0.00	$439.00	0.00 %
38.3801.15.02.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC FICA/MEDICARE	$1,611.00	$0.00	$1,611.00	0.00 %
38.3801.15.03.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC HEALTH INSURANCE	$6,586.00	$862.93	$5,723.07	13.10 %
38.3801.15.04.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC IRS SECTION 125	$120.00	$50.77	$69.23	42.31 %
38.3801.15.05.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$51.00	$58.43	($7.43)	114.57 %
38.3801.15.07.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC CITY RETIREMENT	$1,306.00	$0.00	$1,306.00	0.00 %
38.3801.15.08.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$700.00	$321.51	$378.49	45.93 %

City of Montpelier
SENIOR CENTER FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
38.3801.15.09.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$130.00	$114.42	$15.58	88.02 %
38.3801.15.10.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$67.00	$49.03	$17.97	73.18 %
38.3801.21.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC FOOD & WATER	$7,500.00	$4,014.90	$3,485.10	53.53 %
38.3801.21.01.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC KITCHEN SUPPLIES	$0.00	$435.58	($435.58)	0.00 %
38.3801.48.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$940.00	$694.19	$245.81	73.85 %
38.3801.56.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC OTP PUR SRVC	$500.00	$725.00	($225.00)	145.00 %
38.3801.66.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC OTHER RENTALS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
38.3801.70.00.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC COPIER	$131.00	$34.11	$96.89	26.04 %
38.3801.70.01.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC COPIER PAPER	$35.00	$27.35	$7.65	78.14 %
38.3801.76.05.5 SR CTR FOOD SVC PROPANE	$1,500.00	$0.00	$1,500.00	0.00 %
TOTAL SENIOR CTR FOOD SERVICE	**$43,379.00**	**$7,388.22**	**$35,990.78**	**17.03%**
38.3802 SENIOR CTR FIELD TRIP/TOURS				
38.3802.74.00.5 SR CTR FIELD TRIP/TOURS EXP	$20,000.00	$4,965.95	$15,034.05	24.83 %
TOTAL SENIOR CTR FIELD TRIP/TOURS	**$20,000.00**	**$4,965.95**	**$15,034.05**	**24.83%**
38.3803 SENIOR CTR CAPITAL IMP.				
38.3803.82.00.5 SR CTR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	$0.00	$92.50	($92.50)	0.00 %
38.3803.83.00.5 SR CTR VEHICLE PUR ENDOWMENT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL SENIOR CTR CAPITAL IMP.	**$0.00**	**$92.50**	**($92.50)**	**0.00%**
TOTAL SENIOR CENTER EXPENDITURES	**$257,407.00**	**$139,145.82**	**$118,261.18**	**54.06%**
SENIOR CENTER NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$0.00**	**$61,958.27**		

City of Montpelier
PARKING FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
40.25 RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES				
40.2560.00.00.4 PARKING METER REV	$340,000.00	$175,056.98	($164,943.02)	51.49 %
40.2560.00.01.4 PARKING METERS REV-JACOBS LOT	$16,000.00	$8,995.71	($7,004.29)	56.22 %
40.2560.01.00.4 PARKING VENDING-BLANCHARD	$14,500.00	$6,252.60	($8,247.40)	43.12 %
40.2560.02.00.4 PARKING VENDING-CAP PLAZA	$25,200.00	$10,818.61	($14,381.39)	42.93 %
40.2560.03.00.4 PARKING VENDING-60 STATE ST	$20,100.00	$10,882.05	($9,217.95)	54.14 %
40.2560.04.00.4 PARKING VENDING-TAYLOR ST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.2560.05.00.4 PARKING VENDING-STONECUTTER	$1,800.00	$2,879.75	$1,079.75	159.99 %
40.2560.06.00.4 PARKING KEY REVENUE	$15,500.00	$7,546.99	($7,953.01)	48.69 %
40.2560.07.00.4 PARKING HOLIDAY METER REV (2 WKS)	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.2561.00.00.4 PARKING TICKETS REV	$200,000.00	$99,892.84	($100,107.16)	49.95 %
40.2563.00.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-BLANCHARD	$5,400.00	$5,400.00	$0.00	100.00 %
40.2563.01.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-CAP PLAZA	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.2563.02.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-JACOBS	$19,880.00	$21,420.00	$1,540.00	107.75 %
40.2563.03.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-60 STATE	$13,200.00	$13,200.00	$0.00	100.00 %
40.2563.04.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-TAYLOR ST	$4,000.00	$0.00	($4,000.00)	0.00 %
40.2563.05.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-STONECUTTER'S WAY	$11,000.00	$10,000.00	($1,000.00)	90.91 %
40.2563.06.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-PITKIN COURT CIRC	$1,300.00	$0.00	($1,300.00)	0.00 %
40.2563.07.00.4 PARKING PERMITS-VLCT LOT	$3,840.00	$3,360.00	($480.00)	87.50 %
TOTAL RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES	**$691,720.00**	**$375,705.53**	**($316,014.47)**	**54.31%**
40.27 INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE				
40.2700.00.00.4 PARKING INTEREST	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
40.29 OPERATING TRANSFERS				
40.2910.00.00.4 PARKING REVENUE FRM GEN'	$24,948.00	$24,996.00	$48.00	100.19 %
40.2990.00.00.4 PARKING MISC REV	$0.00	$21.00	$21.00	0.00 %
40.2992.00.00.4 PARKING MISC REIMBS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %

City of Montpelier
PARKING FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
40.2995.00.00.4 PARKING REPLACEMENT FEES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL OPERATING TRANSFERS	**$24,948.00**	**$25,017.00**	**$69.00**	**100.28%**
TOTAL PARKING FUND REVENUES	**$716,668.00**	**$400,722.53**	**($315,945.47)**	**55.91%**

EXPENDITURES

40.4400 PARKING ENFORCEMENT

40.4400.10.00.5 PARKING ENF SALARIES & WAGES	$198,968.00	$119,713.72	$79,254.28	60.17 %
40.4400.11.00.5 PARKING ENF OVERTIME	$10,950.00	$11,187.84	($237.84)	102.17 %
40.4400.15.01.5 PARKING ENF DENTAL INSURANCE	$2,123.00	$1,110.10	$1,012.90	52.29 %
40.4400.15.02.5 PARKING ENF FICA/MEDICARE	$15,534.00	$9,381.53	$6,152.47	60.39 %
40.4400.15.03.5 PARKING ENF HEALTH INSURANCE	$35,039.00	$17,877.98	$17,161.02	51.02 %
40.4400.15.04.5 PARKING ENF SECTION 125	$568.00	$270.08	$297.92	47.55 %
40.4400.15.05.5 PARKING ENF LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$245.00	$371.14	($126.14)	151.49 %
40.4400.15.07.5 PARKING ENF CITY RETIREMENT	$12,595.00	$6,881.45	$5,713.55	54.64 %
40.4400.15.08.5 PARKING ENF LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$3,223.00	$1,967.23	$1,255.77	61.04 %
40.4400.15.09.5 PARKING ENF UNEMPLOY INSURANCE	$574.00	$700.13	($126.13)	121.97 %
40.4400.15.10.5 PARKING ENF WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$7,739.00	$5,580.54	$2,158.46	72.11 %
40.4400.15.12.5 PARKING ENF PARKING FEE	$1,506.00	$456.00	$1,050.00	30.28 %
40.4400.18.00.5 PARKING ENF UNIFRMS/PROTECT CLOTHING	$1,050.00	$279.96	$770.04	26.66 %
40.4400.20.00.5 PARKING ENF OFFICE SUPPLIES	$1,570.00	$429.98	$1,140.02	27.39 %
40.4400.20.01.5 PARKING ENF POSTAGE	$4,500.00	$382.01	$4,117.99	8.49 %
40.4400.21.00.5 PARKING ENF OPERATING SUPPLIES	$5,610.00	$3,951.03	$1,658.97	70.43 %
40.4400.23.00.5 PARKING ENF SMALL TOOLS & EQUIP	$100.00	$0.00	$100.00	0.00 %
40.4400.30.00.5 PARKING ENF ADVERTISING	$0.00	$198.00	($198.00)	0.00 %
40.4400.34.00.5 PARKING ENF TELEPHONE BASIC SERVICE	$800.00	$390.45	$409.55	48.81 %
40.4400.34.01.5 PARKING ENF TELEPHONE LONG DISTANCE	$96.00	$84.24	$11.76	87.75 %
40.4400.34.02.5 PARKING ENF INTERNET WAN SERVICE	$904.00	$550.90	$353.10	60.94 %
40.4400.34.04.5 PARKING ENF TELEPHONE OTHER DPS LINE	$3,105.00	$2,050.50	$1,054.50	66.04 %
40.4400.38.00.5 PARKING ENF DEPRECIATION	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.40.00.5 PARKING ENF DUES/SUBSCRIPTS/MTGS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.48.00.5 PARKING ENF PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$5,752.00	$4,248.47	$1,503.53	73.86 %

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
40.4400.48.01.5 PARKING ENF PC DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.56.00.5 PARKING ENF OTP PUR SRVC	$6,573.00	$3,241.58	$3,331.42	49.32 %
40.4400.60.00.5 PARKING ENF PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.62.00.5 PARKING ENF PRINTING & BINDING	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.65.00.5 PARKING ENF EQUIPMENT FLAT FEE	$5,603.00	$5,603.00	$0.00	100.00 %
40.4400.66.00.5 PARKING ENF PARKING LOT LEASES	$87,500.00	$60,972.80	$26,527.20	69.68 %
40.4400.68.00.5 PARKING ENF VEH/EQUIP REPAIR & MAINT	$6,368.00	$4,555.08	$1,812.92	71.53 %
40.4400.70.00.5 PARKING ENF COPIER	$633.00	$209.42	$423.58	33.08 %
40.4400.70.01.5 PARKING ENF COPY PAPER	$219.00	$145.04	$73.96	66.23 %
40.4400.72.00.5 PARKING ENF PARKING LOT TAXES	$14,000.00	$4,889.02	$9,110.98	34.92 %
40.4400.74.00.5 PARKING ENF TRAVEL/TRANSPORTATION	$300.00	$0.00	$300.00	0.00 %
40.4400.76.01.5 PARKING ENF ELECTRIC	$5,355.00	$2,373.44	$2,981.56	44.32 %
40.4400.76.02.5 PARKING ENF HEATING FUEL	$1,950.00	$673.38	$1,276.62	34.53 %
40.4400.76.04.5 PARKING ENF IN HOUSE UTILITIES	$250.00	$127.47	$122.53	50.99 %
40.4400.77.00.5 PARKING ENF PARKING BAD DEBT	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.82.00.5 PARKING ENF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.83.00.5 PARKING ENF MACHINERY & EQUIP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4400.83.01.5 PARKING ENF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT ALLOC	$3,186.00	$2,134.28	$1,051.72	66.99 %
40.4400.88.01.5 PARKING ENF COMPUTER SOFTWARE	$434.00	$40.08	$393.92	9.24 %
40.4400.95.01.5 PARKING ENF PENSION INTEREST EXP	$9,654.00	$4,826.99	$4,827.01	50.00 %
40.4400.97.00.5 PARKING ENF ADMINISTRATIVE/MGMT SVCS	$39,027.00	$39,027.00	$0.00	100.00 %
TOTAL PARKING ENFORCEMENT	**$493,603.00**	**$316,881.86**	**$176,721.14**	**64.20%**
40.4401 DPW-PARKING MAINT				
40.4401.10.00.5 PARKING MAINT SALARIES & WAGES	$65,921.00	$32,779.96	$33,141.04	49.73 %
40.4401.11.00.5 PARKING MAINT OVERTIME	$11,055.00	$3,099.56	$7,955.44	28.04 %
40.4401.15.01.5 PARKING MAINT DENTAL INSURANCE	$629.00	$311.98	$317.02	49.60 %
40.4401.15.02.5 PARKING MAINT FICA/MEDICARE	$5,696.00	$2,615.61	$3,080.39	45.92 %
40.4401.15.03.5 PARKING MAINT HEALTH INSURANCE	$12,646.00	$5,926.07	$6,719.93	46.86 %
40.4401.15.04.5 PARKING MAINT IRS SECTION 125	$180.00	$97.47	$82.53	54.15 %
40.4401.15.05.5 PARKING MAINT LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE	$78.00	$124.72	($46.72)	159.90 %
40.4401.15.07.5 PARKING MAINT CITY RETIREMENT	$4,231.00	$2,257.55	$1,973.45	53.36 %

City of Montpelier
PARKING FUND FY 2011 Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
40.4401.15.08.5 PARKING MAINT LIFE, STD, LTD INSURANCE	$927.00	$630.02	$296.98	67.96 %
40.4401.15.09.5 PARKING MAINT UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	$170.00	$224.22	($54.22)	131.89 %
40.4401.15.10.5 PARKING MAINT WORKERS' COMPENSATION	$2,658.00	$1,917.86	$740.14	72.15 %
40.4401.15.12.5 PARKING MAINT PARKING FEE	$0.00	$54.00	($54.00)	0.00 %
40.4401.20.00.5 PARKING MAINT OFFICE SUPPLIES	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4401.21.00.5 PARKING MAINT OPERATING SUPPLIES	$4,820.00	$0.00	$4,820.00	0.00 %
40.4401.30.00.5 PARKING MAINT ADVERTISING	$250.00	$0.00	$250.00	0.00 %
40.4401.48.00.5 PARKING MAINT PROPERTY & LIABILITY INS	$1,805.00	$1,360.62	$444.38	75.38 %
40.4401.56.00.5 PARKING MAINT OTP PUR SRVC	$10,000.00	$4,831.90	$5,168.10	48.32 %
40.4401.60.00.5 PARKING MAINT PROFESSIONAL SVCS	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4401.65.00.5 PARKING MAINT EQUIPMENT FLAT FEE	$7,000.00	$7,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
40.4401.66.00.5 PARKING MAINT OTHER RENTALS	$2,000.00	$0.00	$2,000.00	0.00 %
40.4401.70.00.5 PARKING MAINT COPIER	$188.00	$67.08	$120.92	35.68 %
40.4401.70.01.5 PARKING MAINT COPIER PAPER	$50.00	$44.52	$5.48	89.04 %
40.4401.82.00.5 PARKING MAINT CIP PARKING LOT RESURFACE/MAINT	$10,000.00	$0.00	$10,000.00	0.00 %
40.4401.82.05.5 PARKING MAINT TRAFFIC CIRCULATION STUDY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4401.82.10.5 PARKING MAINT XFER TO RESERVES/REPAY GF	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4401.91.00.5 PARKING MAINT INTEREST EXPENSE	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
40.4401.93.00.5 PARKING MAINT TRANSFER TO CEMETERY FUND	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$0.00	100.00 %
40.4401.95.01.5 PARKING MAINT PENSION INTEREST EXP	$2,860.00	$1,430.22	$1,429.78	50.01 %
TOTAL DPW-PARKING MAINT	**$153,164.00**	**$74,773.36**	**$78,390.64**	**48.82%**
40.9900 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS				
40.9900.95.01.5 PARKING MAINT VMERS PAYOFF PENSION EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00 %
TOTAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**$0.00**	**0.00%**
TOTAL PARKING FUND EXPENDITURES	**$646,767.00**	**$391,655.22**	**$255,111.78**	**60.56%**
PARKING FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	**$69,901.00**	**$9,067.31**		

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Summary Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
REVENUES				
TOTAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUE	$6,970,545.00	$6,949,568.57	($20,976.43)	99.70%
TOTAL STATE/LOCAL PILOT	$711,620.00	$800,857.04	$89,237.04	112.54%
TOTAL PERMITS AND LICENSE REV	$83,500.00	$24,244.04	($59,255.96)	29.03%
TOTAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL REV	$746,650.00	$551,837.50	($194,812.50)	73.91%
TOTAL FEES & CHARGES FOR SERVICES	$584,417.00	$407,170.94	($177,246.06)	69.67%
TOTAL RENTS & COMMISSIONS/UTILITY FEES	$53,100.00	$28,000.00	($25,100.00)	52.73%
TOTAL FINES & FORFEITURES	$36,000.00	$21,398.61	($14,601.39)	59.44%
TOTAL EQUIPMENT/LAND REVENUE	$351,231.00	$324,934.32	($26,296.68)	92.51%
TOTAL INTEREST/INVESTMENT REVENUE	$50,000.00	$4,406.82	($45,593.18)	8.81%
TOTAL MISC REVENUE	$41,167.00	$72,388.28	$31,221.28	175.84%
TOTAL OPERATING TRANSFERS	$748,659.00	$749,916.81	$1,257.81	100.17%
TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES	$10,376,889.00	$9,934,722.93	($442,166.07)	95.74%
EXPENDITURES				
TOTAL CITY COUNCIL	$28,702.00	$12,978.19	$15,723.81	45.22%
TOTAL CITY MANAGER	$301,294.00	$182,057.07	$119,236.93	60.43%
TOTAL CLERK-TREASURER	$226,869.00	$130,405.54	$96,463.46	57.48%
TOTAL FINANCE	$301,490.00	$206,246.53	$95,243.47	68.41%
TOTAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES	$195,186.00	$106,199.39	$88,986.61	54.41%
TOTAL PROPERTY ASSESSOR	$214,799.00	$115,307.94	$99,491.06	53.68%
TOTAL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	$371,936.00	$195,531.80	$176,404.20	52.57%

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Summary Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
TOTAL CITY HALL MAINT	$188,016.00	$93,243.14	$94,772.86	49.59%
TOTAL 58 BARRE ST BLDG MAINT	$108,626.00	$7,230.00	$101,396.00	6.66%
TOTAL POLICE OPERATIONS	$1,479,652.00	$824,760.43	$654,891.57	55.74%
TOTAL POLICE COMMUNICATIONS	$469,473.00	$267,795.86	$201,677.14	57.04%
TOTAL OUTSIDE PAY POLICE	$0.00	$435.21	($435.21)	0.00%
TOTAL POLICE CANINE UNIT	$0.00	$583.21	($583.21)	0.00%
TOTAL POLICE SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER	$82,335.00	$46,842.41	$35,492.59	56.89%
TOTAL COMMUNITY JUSTICE CENTER	$137,547.00	$62,556.93	$74,990.07	45.48%
TOTAL RE-ENTRY PROGRAM	$0.00	$38,629.00	($38,629.00)	0.00%
TOTAL FIRE AND E.M.S	$1,759,232.00	$1,068,252.88	$690,979.12	60.72%
TOTAL BLDG CODE & HEALTH ENFORCEMENT	$83,451.00	$43,584.08	$39,866.92	52.23%
TOTAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	$20,380.00	$2,811.45	$17,568.55	13.80%
TOTAL DPW STREETS	$1,462,165.00	$776,002.78	$686,162.22	53.07%
TOTAL DPW FLEET OPERATIONS	$510,547.00	$284,034.02	$226,512.98	55.63%
TOTAL DPW BUILDING OPERATIONS	$60,350.00	$32,346.53	$28,003.47	53.60%
TOTAL WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH FUNDS	$4,007.00	$0.00	$4,007.00	0.00%
TOTAL AGENCY CONTRIBUTION	$118,675.00	$118,675.00	$0.00	100.00%
TOTAL LIBRARY CONTRIBUTION	$293,975.00	$293,975.00	$0.00	100.00%
TOTAL COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT	$48,800.00	$47,000.00	$1,800.00	96.31%
TOTAL TREE MANAGEMENT	$25,034.00	$4,360.32	$20,673.68	17.42%
TOTAL TREE BOARD	$2,000.00	$1,461.04	$538.96	73.05%

City of Montpelier
GENERAL FUND FY 2011 Summary Budget Report
As Of and For The
7 Months Ending 1/31/2011
58% of Fiscal Year Completed

Account Number and Description	Budget FY 2011	Actual to Date Through 1/31/2011	Variance	Percent of Budget
TOTAL CONSERVATION COMMISSION	$6,250.00	$1,070.00	$5,180.00	17.12%
TOTAL DEBT SERVICE	$684,817.00	$567,958.70	$116,858.30	82.94%
TOTAL ADMIN COPIER & POSTAGE	$0.00	$13,377.56	($13,377.56)	0.00%
TOTAL OTHER GOVERNMENTAL	$139,737.00	$118,397.10	$21,339.90	84.73%
TOTAL TRANSFERS TO OTHER FUNDS	$794,044.00	$794,044.00	$0.00	100.00%
TOTAL EQUIPMENT PLAN	$207,498.00	$194,457.15	$13,040.85	93.72%
TOTAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	$0.00	$41,283.02	($41,283.02)	0.00%
TOTAL CONTINGENCY	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL GF MISC EXP	$0.00	$25,449.25	($25,449.25)	0.00%
TOTAL TAX ABATEMENTS/CREDITS	$50,000.00	$51,844.25	($1,844.25)	103.69%
TOTAL GF MISC EXP	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%
TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	$10,376,887.00	$6,771,186.78	$3,605,700.22	65.25%
GENERAL FUND NET EXCESS / (DEFICIT)	$2.00	$3,163,536.15		

5

City of Montpelier
Department of Public Works
Memorandum

To: **William J. Fraser, City Manager**

From: **Thomas McArdle, Assistant Director**

Date: **March 3, 2011**

Subject: **Ridge Street Slope Stabilization**
Professional Services RFP - Selection of Consulting Engineer

This memorandum serves as a recommendation for the selection of a consulting engineer with geotechnical expertise to assist us with the analysis and assessment of the stability of the slope supporting Ridge Street. We ask that review of this recommendation and award of a professional services contract be placed on the first available City Council agenda.

Ridge Street Stabilization is an identified project in the Capital Improvements Program to correct the long history of deteriorating road conditions due to poor soil conditions and side slope instability. The selected consultant will develop alternative stabilization solutions for staff and neighborhood review, design and prepare contract documents for construction of the selected stabilization system with associated street repairs, and provide bid and construction phase related engineering services.

The consultant selection recommendation was arrived at by a "Request for Proposals" (RFP) process consisting of separately sealed technical and cost proposals. RFPs were mailed to thirteen area consultants and also listed on "VT Bid System.com". A total of six proposals were received, reviewed and analyzed independently by Kurt, Todd and myself. The evaluation review is attached and summarized as follows:

Technical Proposal Average Score (105 possible points)

Phelps Engineering (& GeoDesign)	Civil Engineering Associates	Marsh Engineering (& Knight Consulting Engineers)	CHA	Stantec Consulting Services	DeWolfe Engineering Assoc. (& John Stevens, Geotechnical Engineer)
92.6 points	**87.3 points**	**83 points**	**82 points**	**75 points**	**72 points**

Cost Proposal Comparison

Upon completion of the technical proposal scoring, the cost proposals are then opened and reviewed. Costs are based on estimated work hours which the consultants are required to itemize. Review of the cost proposal includes an evaluation and comparison of the reasonableness of the estimated level of effort to complete the work.

DeWolfe Engineering Assoc.	Marsh Engineering Services	Civil Engineering Associates	Stantec Consulting Services	CHA	Phelps Engineering
$24,960	**$30,330**	**$45,300**	**$46,972**	**$63,727**	**$73,204**

Conclusion / Recommendation

The Phelps Engineering & GeoDesign team achieved the highest technical proposal score but they submitted the most expensive cost proposal. The cost reflects a seemingly excessive amount of engineering hours to complete the project. The DeWolfe Engineering Assoc. team (DEA) submitted the lowest cost proposal but their technical proposal received the lowest marks. It was noted that DEA's cost proposal reflects the lowest total number of engineering hours to complete the design, alternatives, and analysis phase.

Looking at the second highest ranked technical proposal as submitted by Civil Engineering Associates, we found the cost for their services also exceeds a cost felt to be reasonable for this project. The Marsh Engineering & Knight Consulting team submitted the second lowest cost proposal while achieving a 3rd place in the technical category. It was noted that the Marsh / Knight team included about twice the number of hours than Civil Engineering Assoc estimated for the design, alternatives, and analysis phase. The Marsh / Knight team's total engineering hours is about 10% more than Civil Engineering Associates but at a lower cost. Based on this comparison, we believe the Marsh / Knight team have a winning combination.

We have a great deal of experience with Marsh Engineering and have found this firm to be responsive, highly professional and well qualified. We also have confidence in Knight Consulting through our collective familiarity with their work over the years. Therefore, we are pleased to recommend to you and the City Council that a professional engineering services contract be executed with the Marsh Engineering & Knight Consulting Engineers team. We further suggest that you be designated as the city's duly authorized agent to execute a professional services agreement. If you and/or the City Council have any questions or would like to review the proposals, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Encl.
C: Todd Law, P.E., Director of Public Works
Kurt Motyka, P.E., Staff Engineer
RFP Respondents

Ridge Street Slope Stabilization
Request for Proposals – Professional Engineering Services
Review Summary of Consultant Proposals

March 2, 2011

Review Team: Todd Law, Director of Public Works
Kurt Motyka, Staff Engineer
Tom McArdle, Assistant Director of Public Works

Qualification Evaluation Scoring Method:

a)	Understanding of the project	15 pts
b)	Knowledge of the project area	10 pts
c)	Availability of technical disciplines	25 pts
d)	Qualifications / Experience of staff	10 pts
e)	Ability to meet schedule & budget	10 pts
f)	Past performance on similar projects	25 pts
g)	Knowledge of Federal, State & Local standards, policies, & permits	10 pts
Total Possible Score =		105 pts

Consultant (sub consultant)	Kurt	Todd	Tom	Total Points / Rank
Phelps Engineering (GeoDesign)	93	88	97	278 / 1st
Civil Engineering Assoc.	92	79	91	262 / 2nd
Marsh Engineering (Knight Consulting)	85	72	92	249 / 3rd
CHA	90	71	85	246 / 4th
Stantec Consulting Services	81	67	77	225 / 5th
DeWolfe Engineering (John Stevens)	78	71	67	216 / 6th

Ranking by average scores:

1) Phelps Engineering:	92.6
2) Civil Engineering Assoc:	87.3
3) Marsh Engineering:	83.0
4) CHA:	82.0
5) Stantec Consulting Services:	75.0
6) DeWolfe Engineering:	72.0

Ranking by individual scorer:

Kurt: 1) Phelps; 2) Civil Eng Assoc.; 3) CHA; 4) Marsh Eng.; 4) Stantec; 5) DeWolfe Eng.
Todd: 1) Phelps; 2) Civil Eng Assoc.; 3) Marsh Eng.; 4) CHA; 4) DeWolfe Eng.; 5) Stantec
Tom: 1) Phelps; 2) Marsh Eng.; 3) Civil Eng Assoc.; 4) CHA; 5) Stantec; 6) DeWolfe Eng.

Consultant Comparison / Ranking by Cost Proposal:

1. **DeWolfe Engineering Associates: $24,960.00 (not incl soil borings & testing @ $2,420)**
2. **Marsh Engineering Services: $30,330.00 (incl testing but not borings)**
3. **Civil Engineering Associates: $45,300.00 (not incl soil borings & testing @ $2,000)**
4. **Stantec Consulting Services: $46,972.00 (not incl soil borings)**
5. **CHA: $63,726.60 (not incl soil borings)**
6. **Phelps Engineering: $73,204.00 (incl testing but not borings)**

CITY OF MONTPELIER

APPLICATION FOR CITY LICENSE

Applicant's Name David Pecor Jr

Doing Business as Twin City Taxi LLC

Address of Business 10 Diane Lane Graniteville Vt 05654

Mailing Address if different P.O. Box 863 Montpelier Vt. 05601

Telephone Number (802) 522-0181

Type of License Taxicab Vehicle License

Vt. Tax I.D. Number 620-274443459F-01 Vt. Health Dept Number ____________

Please Check One: New Application ✓ Renewal ____________

Is Business Insured: Circle One YES NO If yes policy limits 1,000,000

FEE: ____________

DATE PAID ____________ RECEIPT NUMBER ____________

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT David B Pecor

APPROVED BY: ______________________________

Signature and Title

Date License Sent ____________

Cab Operator's and Owners see back of form

CITY OF MONTPELIER

APPLICATION FOR CITY LICENSE

Applicant's Name David Pecor Jr

Doing Business as Twin City Taxi

Address of Business 10 Diane Lane Graniteville Vt. 05654

Mailing Address if different P.O. Box 863 Montpelier Vt. 05601

Telephone Number (802) 522-0181

Type of License Taxicab Operator License

Vt. Tax I.D. Number 62027448459 F01 Vt. Health Dept Number ____

Please Check One: New Application ✓ Renewal ____

Is Business Insured: Circle One YES NO If yes policy limits 1,000,000

FEE: ____

DATE PAID ____ RECEIPT NUMBER ____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT [signature]

APPROVED BY: ____

Signature and Title

Date License Sent ____

Cab Operator's and Owners see back of form

CITY OF MONTPELIER

APPLICATION FOR CITY LICENSE

Applicant's Name Cathy Owen

Doing Business as Twin City Taxi

Address of Business 10 Diane Lane Graniteville Vt. 05654

Mailing Address if different P.O. Box 863 Montpelier Vt. 05601

Telephone Number (802) 522-0181

Type of License Taxicab Operator License

Vt. Tax I.D. Number 620274443459F01 Vt. Health Dept Number ____________

Please Check One: New Application ✓ Renewal__________

Is Business Insured: Circle One YES NO If yes policy limits 1,000,000

FEE:______________

DATE PAID________________ RECEIPT NUMBER_________

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT Catherine Owen

APPROVED BY:_______________________________________
Signature and Title

Date License Sent_____________

Cab Operator's and Owners see back of form

CITY OF MONTPELIER

APPLICATION FOR CITY LICENSE

Applicant's Name Daniel Casavant

Doing Business as Twin City Taxi

Address of Business 10 Diane Lane Graniteville Vt. 05654

Mailing Address if different P.O. Box 863 Montpelier Vt. 05601

Telephone Number (802) 522-0181

Type of License Taxicab Operator License

Vt. Tax I.D. Number 2027-4443459F-01 Vt. Health Dept Number ____

Please Check One: New Application ✓ Renewal ____

Is Business Insured: Circle One YES NO If yes policy limits 1,000,000

FEE: ____

DATE PAID ____ RECEIPT NUMBER ____

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT [signature]

APPROVED BY: ____
Signature and Title

Date License Sent ____

Cab Operator's and Owners see back of form

City of Montpelier, Vermont
"The Smallest Capital City in the United States"

Mayor Mary S. Hooper

City Council:

Sarah Jarvis, President
T. Andrew Hooper, Vice President
Nancy Sherman
Tom Golonka
Jim Sheridan
Alan H. Weiss, Parliamentarian

William J. Fraser
City Manager
wfraser@montpelier-vt.org

Beverlee Pembroke Hill,
Assistant City Manager
bhill@montpelier-vt.org

February 22, 2011

The Times-Argus
Att: Classifieds

Please insert the following with City of Montpelier notices on Thursday, February 24th, 2011:

CITY OF MONTPELIER
Tree Board Vacancies

The Montpelier City Council is seeking individuals interested in filling two full-time positions on the City's Tree Board. Both are 3-year terms and will expire in March, 2014. Letters of interest and/or resumes should be submitted to the Office of the City Manager, City Hall - 39 Main Street, Montpelier, on or by noon on Thursday, March 3rd. They can be mailed or sent electronically to **spitonyak@montpelier-vt.org**. The City Council will make these appointments at their Wednesday, March 9th City Council Meeting; applicants are encouraged to attend. All meeting rooms and facilities in City Hall are accessible to disabled persons. Further information may also be obtained by contacting Commission Co-chair Wendy Blakeman (229-0185).

William J. Fraser
City Manager

(802) 223-9502, Telephone *39 Main Street, Montpelier, VT 05602* *www.montpelier-vt.org* *(802) 223-9519, Fax*

2/22 - 2/24

Sandy Pitonyak

From: jeanjolley@myfairpoint.net
Sent: Tuesday, March 01, 2011 12:53 PM
To: Sandy Pitonyak
Subject: Tree Board Appointment

Dear Sandy,

This letter is to express my interest in remaining on the Tree Board. I enjoy working with Geoff and other members of the board.

Thank you.

Jean Jolley
6 Parkside Drive
Montpelier, VT 05602

PH: 223-7984

Sandy Pitonyak

From: Clare Rock [clarerock@cvregion.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 03, 2011 9:42 AM
To: Sandy Pitonyak
Subject: Tree Board Appointment

Hello Sandy,

Please consider this email as a "Letter of Interest" to be reconsidered for a Tree Board re-appointment by the Montpelier City Council.

If you need additional information please don't hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

~Clare

Clare Rock, Regional Planner
Central Vermont Regional Planning Commission
29 Main Street, Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602
(p) 802.229.0389 (f) 802.223.1977
email: clarerock@cvregion.com
web: www.centralvtplanning.org