

Part II

Explanatory Information

Notes...

Youth-In-Action Child Care for Town Meeting Tuesday, May 12, 2009

YIA will be offering child care from 7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. the night of Hanover Town Meeting. Families **must pre-register** for this service by **Friday, May 8th, 2009**.

Please pre-register by e-mailing Jessica Eakin at via@dresden.us or by calling her at 643-4313.

Chapter 1: Information for Town Meeting

Part II: Explanatory Information

What is Town Meeting? All Hanover citizens are encouraged to participate in the yearly Town Meeting, a living example of direct democracy. Town Meeting is a meeting of citizens who come together to form the legislative body of the town. It is held yearly, the second Tuesday in May, to elect town officers, adopt the town budget, and consider other issues that require Town Meeting approval. This year, Town Meeting will be held on May 12.

What is the Warrant? The Town Meeting agenda is called “the Warrant”; each agenda item is called an “article”. The official Warrant precedes this document in Part I. The Warrant includes two sets of articles:

1. **Ballot voting** (Articles One through Four): Voting on Articles One through Four - which includes voting for candidates for office and for amendments to the Hanover Zoning Ordinance - is conducted by ballot during the day of Town Meeting (Tuesday, May 12, 2009) from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, in the Hanover High School Gymnasium. The daytime ballot voting is held by secret ballot, referred to as the “Australian Ballot” or the “Official Ballot”.
2. **Business meeting** (Articles Five through Twenty-Four): Discussion of and voting on Articles Five through Twenty-Four – including the proposed budget in Article Twelve takes place at an open meeting, called the “Business Meeting”, which begins at 7:00 pm on Tuesday, May 12, in the Hanover High School Gymnasium. At the Business Meeting portion of Town Meeting, citizens sit down together and discuss, modify, and vote.

What if you cannot attend? If you cannot attend Town Meeting...

1. **Ballot items:** You may vote by absentee ballot on the items decided by Australian or Official Ballot voting by requesting an absentee ballot from the

Town Clerk's office at Town Hall, and delivering it in person by 5:00 pm the day before Town Meeting or postmarked by mail by 5:00 pm on the day of Town Meeting.

2. **Business Meeting items:** You must be present, however, to vote on or contribute to discussion of any Warrant items to be discussed at the Business Meeting. By state law, no absentee balloting is allowed on these items.

How can you register to vote? To become a registered voter, you must be a U.S. citizen, eighteen years or older, and a Hanover resident. Information that must be provided at registration includes name, address (mailing and legal residence), place and date of birth, and proof of citizenship. You may register: (1) at the polls on Town Meeting day, May 12; or (2) in advance at the Town Clerk's Office in Town Hall up to ten days before the election; or (3) with the Supervisors of the Checklist whose public voter registration sessions are advertised before any election.

What is explained in the rest of this chapter? The rest of this chapter, prepared by the Town staff, provides an explanation of all of the articles in the Warrant. The official Warrant precedes this document on page I-7.

Ballot Voting Articles One – Four

Voting on Articles One through Four will be conducted by official ballot on Tuesday, May 12, 2009 from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm in the Gymnasium of Hanover High School.

Article One: Election of Town Officers

The **Selectmen**, so named because members are selected on Town Meeting day, govern the Town and perform most of the Town's legislative functions as prescribed in the Town Charter, outside the legislative role granted voters at Town Meeting by state law. Two positions, currently held by Bill Baschnagel and Katherine Connolly, are each to be filled in 2009 for a three-year term. Katherine Connolly has filed for re-election; Bill Baschnagel has decided not to run for another term. Judith Doherty has filed to fill the position vacated by Bill Baschnagel.

The **Town Moderator** oversees all elections and also presides over the business portion of Town Meeting. The incumbent, Marilyn W. "Willy" Black resigned in January, prior to the completion of her term. The Supervisors of the Checklist, who are tasked with appointing an Interim Moderator, appointed Daniel Nelson to fulfill the responsibilities on an interim basis through Town Meeting on May 12th. Daniel Nelson has also filed for one year to finish out Marilyn "Willy" Black's term as Town Moderator.

The **Treasurer** is responsible for receipt and disbursement of Town funds and the short-term investment of excess funds. The position is elected annually and the current elected Treasurer is Michael Ahern. As State law allows Town Meeting to vote to establish the Town Treasurer position as an appointed position rather than an elected position, the

Selectmen placed this item on the warrant for consideration by the 2008 Town Meeting, which adopted this provision. Effective May 13, 2009, the Town Treasurer will become an appointed position based on qualifications and experience.

Both the Howe Library and the Etna Library are Town-supported. Each has a Board of Trustees which governs the respective library in areas of fundraising and some program functions, but they are elected differently based on the type of organization originally established. The **Howe Library Trustees** are elected by members of the Howe Corporation which is a private non-profit corporation. The Etna Library, which is the original Town Library, is governed by the **Etna Library Trustees** who are elected by Town Meeting for a three-year term. One Etna Library Trustee is up for election and the incumbent, Elizabeth Vesley-Gross has decided not to run again. Rhonda N.S. Siegel has filed for the position.

The **Trustees of Trust Funds** oversee the funds reserved for special purposes, and their responsibilities are governed by state statute. One Trustee position is up for election and the incumbent Trustee, Jay Pierson, has filed for re-election to a three-year term.

Note: The following Articles Two through Four are Amendments No. 1 – 3 to the Hanover Zoning Ordinance, which must be approved by Town Meeting. All of the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance have been approved by the Planning Board.

Article Two: Amendment No. 1 —Electrical Transformers

At a public hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Hanover Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that Town Meeting adopt this zoning amendment. The full text of this amendment is included in the Appendix, which follows this section of the Town Report.

Until last summer, the placement of transformers by a public utility was not understood to require any prior permitting or approval by the Town. Four decisions of the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) in 2008, however, have determined that under the existing Zoning Ordinance the placement of a transformer could require a Special Exception and that these could not be located in required lot setbacks except in particular circumstances.

The proposed zoning amendment would clarify the zoning status of electrical transformers:

- By defining an electrical transformer as one of the minor items excluded from the zoning category of Essential Services, along with such other items as streetlights, fire hydrants, wire, pipes, and fire alarm boxes, the installation of electrical transformers would not require a Special Exception; and

- By clarifying that an electrical transformer is not a structure, similar to such other utility-related items as utility distribution systems, poles, wires, mains, drains, pipes, and the like; and that electrical transformers would be allowed within required lot-line setbacks without regard to any specific functional necessity of locating it there.

Article Three: Amendment No. 2 —Scoreboards

At a public hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Hanover Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that Town Meeting adopt this zoning amendment. The full text of this amendment is included in the Appendix, which follows this section of the Town Report.

The current Zoning Ordinance allows for athletic scoreboards, and it states that an athletic scoreboard may bear only the name of the home and visitor teams, but does not allow for identification of the field or facility and recognition of the donors.

The proposed change would give an institution, whether the Town, Dartmouth College or the Hanover schools, an opportunity to include on an athletic scoreboard the team logo, the name of the athletic facility and identification of the facility donor(s). The amendment would also clarify that the display of commercial advertising on scoreboards is not allowed.

Article Four: Amendment No. 3 —Parking Arrangements and Dimensions in Planned Residential Developments

At a public hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Hanover Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that Town Meeting adopt this zoning amendment. The full text of this amendment is included in the Appendix, which follows this section of the Town Report.

In discussions with the developer of a proposed Planned Residential Development (PRD), the Planning Board realized that the parking layout standards in the Zoning Ordinance did not allow site design and layout flexibility which is inherent to the purpose of PRDs or consistent with design and layout allowances in other regards which the Zoning Ordinance already grants to PRDs as exemptions from the standards governing individual lots in subdivisions.

The proposed amendment would give the Planning Board, in review and approval of Planned Residential Developments, the discretion to approve any arrangement and dimensions of required parking spaces which the Board would deem appropriate to the safety and design of the development. It would not allow the Planning Board to approve any lesser number of parking spaces than the Zoning Ordinance requires for PRDs in Sections 404 and 502.5F.

Business Meeting Voting Articles Five through Twenty-Four

Article Five: Election of Additional Town Officers

This article includes election of additional Town Officers that do not need to be elected by written ballot. The officials are:

One member of the **Advisory Board of Assessors** for a term of three (3) years. The Advisory Board of Assessors reviews requests for property abatements and makes recommendations for resolution to the Board of Selectmen.

Three **Fence Viewers**, each for a term of one (1) year. The Fence Viewers, dating back to the colonial era, are available to adjudicate property line disputes.

Two **Surveyors of Wood and Timber**, each for a term of one (1) year. The Surveyors of Wood and Timber also date back to the colonial era, and are elected to adjudicate disputes regarding the sufficiency of a delivered cord of wood. While no longer utilized, many New Hampshire towns still elect Surveyors to maintain this colonial tradition.

One **Pine Park Commissioner** for a term of three (3) years, to participate in overseeing the maintenance and use of Pine Park.

Article Six: Resolutions

During consideration of this article, the Parks and Recreation Board will read a resolution honoring the Recreation Volunteer of the Year.

A motion will be made to approve Article Seven through Article Eleven jointly as written, however anyone is free to discuss any part of these articles and may move for separate action on any one article.

Article Seven: Distribution of Revenue into the Land and Capital Improvements Fund

The 1999 Town Meeting voted to create a Land and Capital Improvements Fund and a Conservation Fund, and then annually to consider taking the proceeds from the preceding fiscal year's Land Use Change Tax and distributing one-half to the Land and Capital Improvements Fund and one-half to the Conservation Fund. This article distributes one-half of the Land Use Change Tax revenue from the fiscal year 2007-2008 into the Land and Capital Improvements Fund. The Land and Capital Improvements Fund can be utilized to purchase land for Town facilities or to assist in the construction or renovation of Town facilities, and has a current unencumbered balance of \$172,558, prior to action on this warrant article.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Eight: Distribution of Revenue into the Conservation Fund

Mirroring the action in the preceding warrant article, this article distributes one-half of the fiscal year 2007-2008 Land Use Change Tax revenue into the Conservation Fund. This fund can be utilized to purchase conservation land, conservation easements, or to implement land conservation-related activities. The current balance in this Fund, prior to any action taken on this warrant article, is \$509,595.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Nine: Payment into Capital Reserve Funds

This article appropriates and authorizes the payment of monies into various Capital Reserve Funds. All of these actions are taken as part of the recommended budget for fiscal year 2009-2010. The Town has a history of making regular, annual contributions to these various funds and then, as required, expending monies from the funds to replace vehicles and equipment, or for other stipulated purposes of the fund.

This article authorizes the appropriation of the following amounts into the eight different capital reserve funds outlined below:

Ambulance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$50,100
Bridge Replacement and Renovation Capital Reserve Fund	\$30,000
Building Maintenance and Improvement Capital Reserve Fund	\$50,000
Dispatch Equipment and Dispatch Center Enhancements and Capital Reserve Fund	\$10,000
Fire Department Vehicle and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$64,000
Highway Construction and Maintenance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$240,000
Parking Operations Vehicles and Parking Facility Improvements Capital Reserve Fund	\$62,210
Police Vehicles and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$66,000
Road Construction and Improvements Capital Reserve Fund	\$20,000
Sewer Equipment and Facilities Improvements Capital Reserve Fund	\$580,260
Town Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund	\$15,000

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Ten: Withdrawals from Capital Reserve Funds

There are several Capital Reserve Funds established to smooth out the budget impact of purchases of significant pieces of equipment and vehicles. The previous warrant article authorizes the deposit into these several funds; this warrant article authorizes the withdrawal from the specified Capital Reserve Funds for purchases of equipment and vehicles, or for other stipulated purposes of the Fund.

This article authorizes the withdrawal of funds from four different Capital Reserve Funds to replace the following vehicles and pieces of equipment:

Ambulance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	
<i>Ambulance 150</i>	\$161,000
Highway Construction and Maintenance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	
<i>Leaf vacuum, Truck 03, Chipper, Dozer, V- Box Sander</i>	\$169,700
Police Vehicles and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	
<i>Cruiser – Utility Vehicle</i>	\$39,286

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Eleven: Transfer of Funds Collected into the Municipal Transportation Improvement Fund

State statute enables New Hampshire communities to establish a Municipal Transportation Improvement Fund, pursuant to RSA 261:153 VI. Such a fund is created by adopting a motor vehicle registration surcharge of up to \$5.00, which is collected each time a motor vehicle is registered within the municipality. Town Meeting voted to collect the additional \$5.00 surcharge at the May 2000 Town Meeting, as well as to establish the Municipal Transportation Improvement Fund. Proceeds from the Fund are to be used to support eligible local transportation improvement projects such as public transportation initiatives, roadway improvements, signal upgrades, and the development of bicycle and pedestrian paths. This article authorizes the transfer of this surcharge collected in fiscal year 2007-2008 into the Municipal Transportation Improvement Fund.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

End of articles proposed to be jointly voted on.

Article Twelve: Proposed Municipal Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010

The table below outlines the net appropriation required by this warrant article, which when added to all of the additional appropriation warrant articles outlined above, funds the Town's total budget for the fiscal year 2009-2010.

Appropriation for the Proposed Municipal Budget for FY 2009-2010	\$18,154,412
Appropriation for Payment into Various Capital Reserve Funds	\$1,187,570
Appropriation for Purchases to be Funded from Withdrawals from Various Capital Reserve Funds	<u>\$369,986</u>
Grand Total of All Funds – See Budget Analysis on page 21	<u>\$19,711,968</u>

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Thirteen: State Budget Cuts and Impact on Local Budgets

In February, Governor John Lynch announced his proposed budget for the next biennium, for the period from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2011. Included in his proposed budget were a series of proposed reductions in municipal revenue that were far more severe than cities and towns were expecting. Specifically, the Governor proposed “suspending”: 1) all revenue sharing for municipalities (\$95,258 projected for Hanover in FY 2009-10); 2) all Rooms and Meals Tax distribution to municipalities (\$487,000 for Hanover in FY 2009-10); and 3) reducing the State's share of the employer-paid portion of Group I Teachers and Group II Fire and Police retirements from the current 35% to 30% (\$62,000 for Police and Fire in FY 2009-2010). The combined total impact was \$644,258 which translated to a total tax rate impact of 8.95%.

Suffice it to say, the collective sense is that the Governor intends to implement permanent reductions in state shared revenues distributed to cities and towns as a means of balancing a portion of the state budget. If this comes to pass, communities will either have to reduce expenditures or raise taxes. This is a clear example of down-shifting costs to local governments rather than simply reducing state expenses. The key question facing the Board of Selectmen is how to respond to this sort of action on the part of the State.

As of this writing, the Governor moved to restore state funding of the Rooms and Meals Tax shared revenue to cities and towns (\$487,000 for Hanover) and the House of Representatives approved a State budget on April 8th with full Rooms and Meals Tax funding for municipalities restored. However, funding for municipal general revenue sharing was not reinstated in the budget adopted by the House, which is a \$95,258 reduction for Hanover. In addition, the House also approved a reduction in the State contribution toward the employer share of Police, Fire and Teacher retirement contributions from 35% to 30% in FY 2009-2010 and from 30% to 25% in FY 2010-2011, which results in a \$31,144 hit in FY 2009-2010 and a \$62,244 hit in FY 2010-2011. For now it appears the House has approved a 2 year increase in the employee rather than the employer contribution to make-up this reduction in State support, but it is still not clear how this will be implemented. Cities and Towns can only assume that the State will look to further

reduce that contribution by 5% per year until they are no longer making any contribution on behalf of municipal Police and Fire personnel. Given that the State also contributes the same portion of the employer-required payment for Group I Teachers in New Hampshire, the impact on the Hanover and Dresden School District side will be even more severe and this issue will clearly become an issue for negotiation at local bargaining tables.

Now that the House of Representatives has voted on the State budget, it travels over to the Senate for further refinement and, ultimately, a Committee of Conference to be finalized. The final local impact of the budget will not be clear until mid-summer, once the Legislature has completed its work.

The Hanover Selectmen, in adopting a recommended Town budget for FY 2009-2010, opted to assume that no reductions in State revenue would ultimately be approved by the State Legislature. To the extent any reductions are ultimately adopted by the Legislature in June of 2009, the Town will send a letter to all residents alerting them to the tax rate impact of these cuts and urging residents to share their concerns with State Representatives Sharon Nordgren, Bernie Benn, David Pierce and Beatriz Pastor, State Senator Matthew Houde and Governor John Lynch. As noted above, any attempt by the State to reduce the State deficit by reducing or eliminating revenue previously directed toward municipalities is simply an act of cost shifting and not an act of cost cutting. To the extent the State engages in that sort of action, the Board of Selectmen feels the State needs to be held accountable for their actions by passing these costs along to taxpayers in the form of a tax rate increase.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Fourteen: Municipalization of the Hanover Water Works Company

Currently water is supplied to the Town of Hanover by a private company, the Hanover Water Works Company (HWWC). The HWWC is jointly owned by Dartmouth College (52.8%) and the Town of Hanover (47.2%), and is regulated by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

The Board of Selectmen believes that it is in the best interest of the rate payers to municipalize these services and has approached the College to consider this change. Municipalization will allow for more efficient and cost effective operations and less expensive funding of future capital needs to the benefit of the rate payers. Municipalization will also allow Dartmouth College to disengage from an activity which is unrelated to its academic mission.

Municipalization will be accomplished by the HWWC transferring to the Town the hard assets (filtration plant, reservoirs, distribution system, etc.) and the liabilities associated with those assets. Those assets and liabilities will be incorporated in a separate water enterprise fund for operating purposes, just as the Town's wastewater operation is now managed. The HWWC will retain most of the land it currently owns, but will change its corporate ownership structure to 50/50 between the Town and College.

Nothing about this transaction will result in increased user rates. Anticipated savings resulting from municipalization will be used to create a capital reserve fund. There will be no impact on property taxes. Future increases in operating expenses may result in increased user rates.

This change requires the approval of the Trustees of Dartmouth College and two separate Town Meeting votes. If approved, the change will be effective July, 2010.

The Appendix immediately following this section includes a “Frequently Asked Questions” piece which was mailed to Hanover property owners in late March of this year, outlining the proposed municipalization in detail.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Fifteen: Partial Delegation of Site Plan Review

New Hampshire state statute (RSA 674:43 III) enables Town Meeting to authorize the Planning Board to delegate to qualified municipal administrators the review and approval or disapproval of minor site plans. By other state statute, Site Plan Review applies to proposed multi-family and non-residential projects. The Planning Board, after considerable deliberation, has voted in public hearing to request this authorization.

The statute leaves it up to the Planning Board to define in its Site Plan Regulations what “minor site plans” are, and to set-up procedures that the staff committee must follow.

In exercising the delegated authority, the staff committee would have to abide by all the procedures set forth in RSA 676:4, including:

- Determining application completeness;
- Scheduling an administrative hearing;
- Advertising and sending out abutters notices the same way and over the same timeframe as for Planning Board public hearings;
- Holding the administrative hearing, according to public hearing procedures, and taking minutes;
- Issuing a Notice of Action.

Following this, an applicant or an abutter may, within a twenty-day period, appeal the staff committee’s action to the Planning Board, which would take up the matter in public hearing in the same way as for regular, or “major”, site plan proposals not so delegated.

The Planning Board feels that such a delegation would have several advantages, in that it would:

- Enable a quicker review of minor projects, saving time for applicants;
- Relieve the Board of the time it takes to hear minor site plan proposals, freeing up the Board to attend to larger cases and planning programs; and
- Entail little additional staff time, given that the staff already reviews proposals to determine application completeness and to make recommendations to the Board.

The protections to the public would still remain. Abutters would receive notices of the administrative hearings the same way they do now for the Board’s Public Hearings. Minutes of administrative hearings would be taken and be available to the public. If any applicant or abutter objects to the decision, they can exercise their rights to make appeal to the Planning Board.

Existing rights that applicants or abutters have then to appeal the Board's decision to the courts would not be abridged in any way.

With this authorization by Town Meeting, the Planning Board would be free at any time to alter the definition of minor site plans and review procedures, within the scope of statute, as experience with this process is obtained, in order to improve the provision of appropriate and expeditious review of minor site plan cases.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

**Article Sixteen: Conservation Commission Contributions to Qualified Organizations and
Article Seventeen: Conservation Commission Contributions to Land Located Outside
Hanover**

In the spring of 2008, the New Hampshire Legislature passed Senate Bill 381 that authorizes towns to contribute conservation funds to projects sponsored by private conservation groups such as the Hanover Conservation Council or Upper Valley Land Trust without having to hold a legal interest in property. The new law resolves a grey area in the law that had long divided municipal attorneys. Specifically, the bill adds language to the state statute governing town conservation commissions (RSA 36-A), authorizing them to make contributions from their conservation funds to "qualified organizations," for acquisitions of property interests (fee or easement) held by the organizations, and/or transaction costs related to these purchases. The bill also adds language to statute declaring town expenditures to such organizations as a public purpose because they protect the state's natural resources. There is also a section of the new law that specifically allows towns to purchase property outside of the town boundaries.

Purchasing and caring for conservation land has substantial costs in money, time and responsibility. There are times when partnering with another organization such as a land trust may be the most efficient use of conservation dollars. Important natural resources such as drinking water supplies, aquifers, wildlife corridors, etc. often cross municipal boundaries. Working together across contiguous municipal boundaries allows communities to work to protect the whole resource.

If Article Sixteen is passed, the Conservation Commission is NOT required to get Town Meeting approval before specific expenditures are made if these expenditures are less than \$50,000 in any fiscal year, unless the expenditures are for property interests outside of municipal boundaries, which does require approval by the Board of Selectmen. In Hanover expenditures over \$50,000 require Selectboard approval and Town Meeting approval or reporting. The statute requires a public hearing before expenditures are made in other towns.

The Hanover Conservation Commission wishes to have the ability to contribute to land conservation projects without holding an interest in real estate, and to be able to expend funds on land outside of town boundaries, so recommends that Town Meeting consider and approve these articles.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Eighteen: Affordable Housing Commission

In the 2008 session, the New Hampshire legislature adopted House Bill 1259, signed by the Governor, which authorizes a municipality to establish a Housing Commission and to establish an affordable housing revolving fund for carrying out the purposes of such a Housing Commission. The Act amended a variety of state laws, including:

- RSA 673:1 to authorize a municipality to establish a housing commission, on a legal par with a historical, heritage, or agricultural commission;
- RSA 31:95-h to authorize a municipality to establish a revolving fund for affordable housing purposes—in this context a revolving fund means a municipal account which can accumulate funds from year to year, rather than having the year-end balance revert to the general fund;
- Various sections of RSA 673, and RSA 674:44-h and i, which govern the composition, conduct, activities, meeting requirements, and abolition of a housing commission; and
- RSA 674:44-j, by which a town or city may appropriate money to a duly established housing commission and place such money in a revolving fund to carry out the purposes of the housing commission.

This article was requested by the Hanover Affordable Housing Commission in order to take advantage of these statutory amendments. If adopted by Town Meeting, this article would enable the existing Affordable Housing Commission to be restructured so as to obtain the legal and fiduciary status allowed by the new legislation.

This article would enable the Town to set up an affordable housing revolving fund which can, as approved by the Board of Selectmen, receive and retain appropriated public funds, donations of money and assets from private sources, and receipts from fees, charges, or income from Commission services or assets. It would also enable the Town to make expenditures from the fund as approved by the Board of Selectmen in order to carry out the Affordable Housing Commission's purposes and functions.

The Hanover Affordable Housing Commission is not to be confused with the Hanover Housing Authority. The Hanover Housing Authority was formed in the early 1970's to facilitate the construction of HUD-subsidized housing for senior and disabled citizens known as Summer Park. The Board of Selectmen acts as the Hanover Housing Authority and has the responsibility for overseeing the management of the Summer Park complex as well as approving the annual operating budget for this housing facility.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Nineteen: WCNH Broadband Project and Formal Creation of Consortium

The goal of the WCNH Broadband Project is to install a fiber optics cable to every home and business in an eight town area including Hanover. This cable would be used to provide telephone, cable-like television, very high speed Internet, and could also be used in the future for streaming movies, providing live security systems, supporting very computer intensive business,

etc. Standard cable or services over copper wires (telephone and DSL Internet connection) or present-day wireless Internet are available to some Hanover residents and businesses now and are adequate for many purposes. Extending these to all homes and businesses would be a clear step forward. However, fiber to the home and business looks toward the future in addition to present needs. For a business that is computer intensive, the commonly available Internet service is just not adequate even now.

To date, WCNH has retained a consultant who was hired to do an initial feasibility study. This was followed by a detailed study including an extensive survey of present capability, interest, needs, service providers, preliminary engineering, etc. Finally, the consultant did a detailed financial analysis to determine costs, payback periods, etc. In addition, extensive legal work has been done on a structure for a consortium that could be formed by the eight towns to control and eventually own the fiber network as well as study the laws which would govern a project like this in New Hampshire. Some of the legal impediments have been identified and plans are under way to remove some of those hurdles.

The network being planned is called "open access". The consortium of towns will not sell any services, but provide a route to get these services to the customers served. Providers will contract to use the network. There would likely be more than one provider for each type of service. The analogy is the highway system, where towns and the state have built roads which are then "rented" (through vehicle registration fees) to several package delivery companies, all of whom use the road system.

The estimated cost for construction is approximately \$30 million. The current plan is to finance the cost through a capital lease. Investors would provide the money to the consortium to construct the system and would derive their capital return and dividends through user fees. After a period of 15-20 years, the lease would expire and the consortium would have clear ownership. No town money would be used for construction, and if the project failed the investors would take ownership, with no obligation on the part of the towns. This financing structure is similar to the mechanism that was used to finance Burlington Telecom and is proposed by the EC Fiber project in Vermont. The present national economic downturn is currently making financing of this sort difficult but the future remains bright.

In order to proceed, a more detailed engineering study will ultimately be needed to finalize cost estimates and the financial model will need further refinement before it is ready for consideration by investors. Securing investors will also need to wait until the economy rebounds, although the Committee is working with State officials to determine the feasibility of securing stimulus funding. The immediate need is to secure Town Meeting approval to enter into an inter-municipal agreement between the eight towns to allow creation of a non-profit corporation. This corporation would be able to receive grant funds, donations and could enter into a non-recourse capital lease in the event financing of the broadband project becomes possible in the near-term. This article will not obligate any expenditure on the part of any member town.

To date, seven of the eight WCNH New Hampshire communities have voted to enter into such an inter-municipal agreement at their Town Meetings held in March of this year. Hanover will be the last community to vote on this issue as a result of our community's May Town Meeting date.

The Board of Selectmen voted 5-0 to support this warrant article during the Pre-Town Meeting public hearing held on April 6, 2009.

Article Twenty: New Hampshire Association for the Blind

FY 2009-2010 is the third year that the Town of Hanover has received a funding request from the New Hampshire Association for the Blind to help offset the costs of delivering programs and services serving the blind and visually-impaired.

Article Twenty-One: Tri-County Community Action Agency

FY 2009-2010 is the third year that the Town of Hanover has received a funding request from the Tri-County Community Action Program. This agency serves the three northern counties of New Hampshire and provides fuel assistance, electrical assistance, and homeless outreach services.

Article Twenty-Two: Court Appointed Special Advocates

FY 2009-2010 is the second year that the Town of Hanover has received a funding request from the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA). This agency advocates for children in the foster care system, having been removed from their homes due to abusive circumstances.

Article Twenty-Three: Outreach House

FY 2009-2010 is the second year that the Town of Hanover has received a funding request from the Outreach House. This agency, located in Hanover, provides a comfortable home for senior family members who require some assistance.

Article Twenty-Four: Other Items

This warrant article allows attendees at Town Meeting to raise any other items for consideration.

APPENDIX A

Full Text of Proposed Amendments to the Hanover Zoning Ordinance, reflecting Actions of the Hanover Planning Board at a Public Hearing held on March 10, 2009

Full Text of Article Two, Amendment No. 1

Electrical Transformers

(text proposed to be amended is shown in *bold italics* and ~~*bold-italic-strikethrough*~~)

“Section 902 Term Definitions

Essential Services:

The erection, construction or major alteration by public utilities or municipal or other governmental agencies of underground or overhead gas, electrical, sewer, steam, or water transmission or distribution systems, including poles, wires, mains, drains, sewers, pipes, conduit cables, and similar equipment and accessories in connection therewith, and including buildings, reasonably necessary for the furnishing of adequate service by such public utilities or municipal or other governmental agencies or for the public health or safety or general welfare. For the purposes of this Ordinance, Essential Services shall not include the replacement of facilities (other than buildings) or minor relocations or minor additions such as streetlights, hydrants, wire, *electrical transformers*, fire alarm boxes or pipes.

Structures:

Anything constructed or erected with a fixed location on, above or below the ground, or attached to something having a fixed location on, above, or below the ground. Structures include, but are not limited to, buildings, swimming pools, manufactured housing, billboards, and poster panels. It shall not include minor installations such as fences and safety fences, mailboxes, flagpoles, and retaining walls of a height of 4 feet or less as measured from the toe of the wall to the top of the wall at its tallest point. For the purposes of this definition *electrical transformers and* the following essential services are not considered structures: underground or overhead gas, electrical, sewer, steam, or water transmission or distribution systems, including poles, wires, mains, drains, sewers, pipes, conduit-cables, and similar equipment and accessories in connection therewith.”

Full Text of Article Three, Amendment No. 2

Scoreboards

(text proposed to be amended is shown in *bold italics* and ~~*bold-italic-strikethrough*~~)

“317.2 In NP, F, RR, RO, SR, GR and I districts, signs or advertising devices pertaining to the use of the premises on which they are placed are permitted only as follows:

- E. Athletic scoreboards bearing the name of the home and visitor teams *as well as institutional logo, team name, name of the field and the name of the field donor(s)* are permitted for public or private institutions. *Scoreboards shall not display commercial advertising of any type.*”

Full Text of Article Four, Amendment No. 3

Parking Arrangements and Dimensions in Planned Residential Developments

(text proposed to be amended is shown in *bold italics* and ~~*bold-italic-strikethrough*~~)

“502.5 Other Requirements:

The following requirements shall be included in any Planned Residential Development:

- G. *Within a Planned Residential Development, in lieu of the stipulations of Article IV and Section 902, the Planning Board may approve any arrangement and dimensions of parking spaces required for each dwelling unit in the development, as it deems appropriate for the safety and design of the development.*”

APPENDIX B

Proposed Municipalization of the Hanover Water Works Company

Frequently Asked Questions

Overview

Currently water is supplied to the Town of Hanover by a private company, the Hanover Water Works Company (HWWC). The HWWC is jointly owned by Dartmouth College (52.8%) and the Town of Hanover (47.2%), and is regulated by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

The Town believes that it is in the best interest of the rate payers to municipalize these services and has approached the College to consider this change. Municipalization will allow for more efficient and cost effective operations and less expensive funding of future capital needs to the benefit of the rate payers. Municipalization will also allow Dartmouth College to disengage from an activity which is unrelated to its academic mission.

Municipalization will be accomplished by the HWWC transferring to the Town the hard assets (filtration plant, reservoirs, distribution system, etc.) and the liabilities associated with those assets. Those assets and liabilities will be incorporated in a separate water enterprise fund for operating purposes, just as the Town's wastewater operation is now managed. The HWWC will retain most of the land it currently owns, but will change its corporate ownership structure to 50/50 between the Town and College.

Nothing about this transaction will result in increased user rates. Anticipated savings resulting from municipalization will be used to create a capital reserve fund. There will be no impact on property taxes. Future increases in operating expenses may result in increased user rates.

This change requires the approval of the Trustees of Dartmouth College and two separate Town Meeting votes. If approved, the change will be effective July, 2010.

Following is additional information concerning the proposed changes in the form of answers to frequently asked questions.

Frequently Asked Questions

- **What is the Hanover Water Works Company?**

The Hanover Water Works Company (HWWC) was incorporated in 1893 as a private company owned jointly between Dartmouth College (52.8 %) and the Town of Hanover (47.2%) in response to a fire safety and growing domestic water need at that time. Establishment of a municipal water utility was apparently not considered at the time, largely due to the lack of such municipal models in the U.S. at the turn of the century. Additional history is provided at the end of this document.

- **What assets does the HWWC own?**

The HWWC owns three reservoirs; the new William E. Boyle Water Filtration Facility located on Grasse Road and related buildings; 1,440 acres of surrounding watershed land; two pump stations, four water tanks capable of storing a combined 2.5 million gallons, and 38 miles of primary and secondary water distribution lines.

- **Who are the customers of the HWWC?**

The HWWC serves over 8,000 individuals across 1,826 metered accounts in the downtown commercial and more densely populated residential neighborhood areas, the entire Dartmouth campus, residences and businesses north along Route 10 to Kendal, out Greensboro Road and south down Great Hollow Road. There are no plans to extend the distribution system beyond these areas.

- **What does the Town of Hanover now do for the HWWC?**

The Town of Hanover has operated the HWWC under contract since 2003. HWWC employees are hired by the Town and come under the supervision of the Public Works Director. The direct and indirect expenses incurred by the Town in operating the HWWC are charged back to the Company. In addition to operating the HWWC, Town staff worked with engineering consultants to design all of the recent improvements to the HWWC including the construction of the new water filtration facility, two new large water storage tanks, two upgraded pump stations and several miles of upgraded water lines. Town staff also prepares the applications for State revolving loan funds and grant funds and represents the HWWC at rate hearings conducted by the PUC.

- **What will happen to water rates if the company is converted to a municipal utility?**

No increase in water rates is anticipated as a result of the proposed municipalization. As noted above, the current water rates reflect the cost of operating the water utility, including all required bond and loan principal and interest payments. The savings from municipalization outlined below will be directed into a capital reserve to be used to help offset the cost of future capital improvements.

- **Why does converting the company into a municipal utility make sense for the Town of Hanover?**

There are a number of reasons why the Town has requested that the College consider allowing conversion of the HWWC to a municipal utility. The bottom line is that the Town believes, based on its experience running the HWWC, that it can achieve significant cost savings through municipalization that will favorably affect the rate payers.

1. **Regulation by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission is costly and has limitations.**

As a private utility, the HWWC is regulated by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (PUC). Being regulated by the PUC has many limitations.

The PUC does not allow utilities to build into their rates money to be set aside and accumulated for future capital improvements. Rather, any capital improvement must be financed up-front, usually at a premium cost, and once implemented, recovered by filing a rate case with the PUC at an additional cost of between \$25,000 and \$50,000 per case. This is a cumbersome and expensive process. As a municipal service, the Town would establish a separate entity fund (similar to what it has for wastewater treatment) and the savings resulting from municipalization would be used to build reserves in that fund to pay for important capital improvements as they become necessary.

2. The Town can achieve other cost savings not available to the HWWC.

Full municipalization will allow the Town to bring the water utility under its property and liability insurance policy, saving considerable expense. It will also allow the Town to save expense by combining what are now separate Town and HWWC billing and accounts payable functions, save on annual audit expenses, save on bank fees, software license fees, postage, materials, etc. Savings would also result by streamlining the process by which utility fees would be reviewed and adjusted under the municipal utility model. Expensive trips to the PUC would no longer be required to seek approval for rate increases; rather, rate setting would be the role of the Board of Selectmen through a local public hearing process.

3. Municipalities have Access to Lower Rates of Borrowing and Other Funds.

Municipalities have access to municipal bond rates which are typically lower than rates available to private companies. In addition, State and Federal low-interest loan and grant programs are typically more readily available to municipal water utilities, thereby lowering the cost of borrowing even further.

4. Municipal Utilities do not Pay State or Federal Taxes.

Municipal utilities need not pay state utility taxes, PUC annual utility taxes or state or federal business profits taxes, which would save \$57,000 annually.

• **Why does converting the company into a municipal utility make sense for Dartmouth College?**

There are a number of reasons why the College has agreed to municipalize the HWWC:

1. Owning and operating a water utility does not fit with the mission of Dartmouth College.

The College and the Town made the original decision to launch the HWWC as a private enterprise during a much earlier era. If the need to establish a water utility were being considered for the first time today, the College would not have sought to be a partner in such a venture, which is far removed from its educational mission.

2. A municipality is in a better position to operate a water service.

In the increasingly complex world of water supply, filtration and distribution, which is heavily regulated by federal and state agencies, private academic institutions simply are not equipped to manage, operate or insure such a utility. Municipalities are, as government institutions, in a much better position to perform such tasks – they are accustomed to managing heavily regulated municipal operations; they have access to management resources at the municipal, state and federal level; they have access to funding sources which private

institutions do not, and they have access to municipal insurance programs designed solely for public utilities.

3. As the largest customer of the HWWC, the College shares the Town’s interest in the cost savings and efficiency that would be achieved by converting the company into a municipal service.

• **What are the terms of the municipalization proposal?**

The HWWC will turn over all of its “hard” assets to the Town. These “hard” assets would consist of the following:

- New Water Filtration Plant and related storage and maintenance buildings located on Grasse Road, as well as land on which the buildings are situated and sufficient surrounding land to accommodate any future expansion of these facilities;
- Four water storage tanks located on Grasse Road, Balch Hill, Sand Hill and Greensboro Road, two of which were only recently constructed;
- Two water pump stations, one fully upgraded pump station located at the top of Sand Hill and the other upgraded station within the Water Treatment Facility;
- Three reservoirs located on Grasse Road, west of Dogford Road, and off Hanover Center Road;
- All reservoir-related dams/earthwork;
- All water distribution lines and fire hydrants;
- All of the related rolling stock and operational equipment currently owned by the HWWC.

These assets would be turned over to the Town, subject to Town Meeting approval, for the sum of \$1.00.

The Town would also assume all outstanding loan obligations of the HWWC.

Most current assets and current liabilities of the HWWC would also be assumed by the Town.

The HWWC audited balance sheet as of 12/31/2008 is summarized below:

ASSETS	
Utility plant, net	\$ 13,021,331
Current assets	928,687
Other non-current assets	189,475
Total assets	\$ 14,139,493
LIABILITIES	
Long-term debt	\$ 9,785,852
Current liabilities	501,139
Other non-current liabilities	515,586
Contributions in aid of construction, net	1,247,010
Total liabilities	\$ 12,049,587
EQUITY	\$ 2,089,906

In the future, the only significant work that remains to be completed is the gradual replacement of older secondary distribution lines. The water capital reserve fund that will be established utilizing the savings generated by municipalization will be earmarked for this work over time.

- **What happens to the land owned by the HWWC?**

The land which is not located directly under or around the current HWWC buildings, tanks, and pump stations or immediately around the three reservoirs, would be retained by a reconstituted Hanover Water Works Company. The HWWC would function as a land-holding/land management company, and its ownership would shift from the current 52.8 – Dartmouth owned/47.2 – Town owned to a 50/50 ownership split.

Based on a local ordinance adopted in 1973 which was designed to protect the watershed, the land would remain fenced and posted and inaccessible to the general public. The 50/50 company ownership, along with the existing “Forestry” zoning of the land which requires Town Meeting approval to modify, gives the Town a strong say in its future use.

- **Is this a good time for the Town to municipalize the water utility, given the general economic uncertainty?**

The Town has entered into this proposal very carefully. No additional funding will be required to accomplish this transaction. Rather, the Town will acquire a utility it is accustomed to operating, will save expense as a result of municipalizing, and will be able to channel those savings into a capital reserve which can then be used to fund future upgrades to the older portions of the water distribution system.

- **Doesn't the HWWC currently pay property taxes to the Town of Hanover? If the utility is municipalized, will the General Fund lose the benefit of these taxes, resulting in higher Town property tax rates?**

As a private company, the HWWC currently pays \$280,000 in property taxes to the General Fund, School District and Grafton County for its hard assets and an additional \$4,702 on the land, all of which is in “current use.” The Town is seeking special legislation which will enable the municipal water utility enterprise fund to continue these property tax payments. This will assure that the General Fund, School District and County tax revenues and rate will not be negatively affected by this transaction.

- **What is the Approval Process and Timing?**

This change requires the approval of the Trustees of Dartmouth College and of Town Meeting. Town Meeting approval is in two steps; in May, 2009 the Town will be asked to give the Selectmen approval to consider municipalization of the HWWC by making a formal request of Dartmouth College and, if so directed, the Selectmen would then call a Special Town Meeting in September, 2009 to seek approval of the specific agreement with full terms and conditions.

- **Additional History Background**

The HWWC was incorporated in 1893 by representatives of Dartmouth College and the Precinct of Hanover, after the NH Legislature adopted a special act creating the corporation. The action

was taken by the College and the Precinct in response to a devastating series of fires in Downtown Hanover and on the campus which demonstrated the lack of adequate fire protection previously provided by a series of large rooftop cisterns. In addition, a set of wells on campus and Downtown were not capable of meeting the growing demand for domestic water. Given the College's strong interest in this issue and their ability to commit cash to the venture, the private corporation approach was deemed the most effective ownership structure at the time. Establishment of a municipal water utility was apparently not considered at the time, largely due to the lack of such municipal models in the U.S. at the turn of the century.

Over the years, large capital expenditures such as the construction of the first reservoir and dam on Grasse Road and construction of the initial water distribution system from the first reservoir to Downtown and the campus were funded by the issuance of HWWC stock to the College and to the Precinct. At the present time, the College holds 52.8% of the stock and the Town holds 47.2%, with that ownership share dating to the early days of the HWWC's founding. Over the years, HWWC has been managed by a Board of Directors comprised of senior staff representatives of both the College and the Town and has employed staff to oversee the operation of the system.

In 1903, a typhoid epidemic in Ithaca, New York which affected almost 10% of the local resident and Cornell student population drew attention to the need for water supply protection to reduce the potential for water borne illnesses. The College and the Precinct worked together through the HWWC to ultimately acquire 1,245 acres of farm and forestland surrounding the reservoir to safeguard the watershed. In addition, over the years, the Company has made significant improvements to water treatment and filtration as technological advancements became available, has constructed two additional reservoirs (between Trescott and Dogford Roads and off Hanover Center Road), has acquired an additional 200 acres of watershed land for protection, has constructed four water tanks to allow water storage and enhanced fire protection, and has extended and upgraded the water distribution system.

HWWC now serves customers in the Downtown area, on campus, north to Kendal, and out Greensboro Road to Great Hollow Road. All of these investments have been made by the Company, via a combination of private sector borrowing, low interest State revolving loan funds, State grants, and direct financial contributions made by the College and by the Town.

Notes...

Hanover

Finance Committee

Report

Hanover Finance Committee: Comments on Hanover FY10 Town Budget

The Hanover Board of Selectmen met four times from late February (23 and 25) to early March (9 and 10) to plan the FY10 budget. The first three meetings were detailed reviews of individual town departments' budgets, and the fourth meeting was a summary board discussion of and vote on the FY10 budget. Finance committee members attended all four meetings.

At the Finance Committee meeting on February 23, 2009 (immediately before the first Board of Selectmen budget meeting), the committee approved a resolution that recommended the board hold the "blended" tax rate increase to under 3%. (The blended tax rate is an artificial rate that incorporates combined general fund and fire fund tax rates proportionally distributed across the three fire districts. No property actually sees this rate—it is a benchmark.) The Finance Committee supported the principle that the board should construct the town's budget to meet town needs given reasonable assumptions about revenues, including traditional revenues from the state, and not cut the budget merely to anticipate potential state impacts, and/or higher county taxes due to the jail project. That is, the committee recommended that the town's leadership should craft a budget to meet the town's needs for services, and not make up for the county's and/or the state's issues. Additionally, the committee felt it would be unwise to skip expenses in FY10 that would only need to be made in FY11 or later.

The Finance Committee commends the board and town administration for their rigorous, careful, and coherent process to developing the FY10 budget in a calamitous financial environment. The committee particularly recognizes the work of Betsy McClain, Director of Administrative Services; Penny Hoisington, Executive Assistant; and all the department heads.

The committee notes that the board, in preparing the town's FY10 budget, was attentive to a potential contraction in local revenues given the degraded financial environment—for example, building permits and motor vehicle registrations—and the significant uncertainties regarding the state's finances—revenue sharing, and rooms and meals taxes. During budget planning, the town administration planned multiple budgets incorporating a range of tax rate changes, including 0%. Town administration prepared a list of potential expense reductions, grouped in several tiers from least impactful on town services to most impactful.

The board opted to budget an increase for support of social services agencies—approximately 10% in recognition of the community's heightened need for these services in the struggling economy.

Total proposed FY10 appropriations for the General Fund, the major tax-supported fund, are \$37,179 less than the current FY09 budget. Despite this reduction in projected expenditures, additional tax revenues must be generated to offset reduced building permit fees, motor vehicle registration fees, and short-term interest income. Consequently, a 3.17% increase in the General Fund tax rate is proposed.

The total amount of Fire District taxes to be raised is decreasing by \$131,440, or 5.0%, due to a reduction in overall costs and a transfer in from undesignated fund balances. Because there are three distinct fire districts, and because FY10 is year three of a five-year phase-in of these three fire districts, the fire district tax rate impact will vary depending upon the fire district.

	FY2009 Adopted	FY2010 Proposed	\$ Change	% Change
<i>Gross Expenditures</i>				
General Fund	11,924,572	11,887,393	(37,179)	-0.31%
Fire Fund	2,901,711	2,830,209	(71,502)	-2.46%
Total Appropriations	14,826,283	14,717,602	(108,681)	-0.73%
<i>Property Taxes to be Raised</i>				
General Fund - Muni Tax Levy	7,164,422	7,486,873	322,451	4.50%
Fire Tax Levy	2,631,582	2,500,142	(131,440)	-4.99%
	9,796,004	9,987,015	191,011	1.95%

The budget approved by the board at its March 10 meeting has this implication for tax rates:

Year Three of Five-Year Phase-in of New Fire Districts			
	FY2009	FY2010	% Chg
Muni Rate	3.78	3.90	3.17%
FD #1 Rate	1.61	1.46	-9.32%
Total	5.39	5.36	-0.56%
On \$482.5K Property	\$2,600.68	\$2,586.20	-0.56%
Muni Rate	3.78	3.90	3.17%
FD #2 Rate	0.86	0.92	6.98%
Total	4.64	4.82	3.88%
On \$482.5K Property	\$2,238.80	\$2,325.65	3.88%
Muni Rate	3.78	3.90	3.17%
FD #3 Rate	0.43	0.46	6.98%
Total	4.21	4.36	3.56%
on \$482.5K property	\$2,031.33	\$2,103.70	3.56%
Weight Total Combined Rate 70% FD#1 - 29% FD#2 - 1% FD#3			
	5.16	5.19	0.63%
<i>note: \$482,500 is the median value of a single-family residence in the Town of Hanover.</i>			

That is, the blended tax rate increase is less than 1%, meeting the committee's February 23 suggested benchmark. The increase is negative 0.56% for Fire District #1 (which includes approximately 70% of the town's households), a 3.88% increase for Fire District #2, and a 3.56% increase for Fire District #3. These variable percentage changes are driven by a five-year phase-in of a transition to a more equitable allocation of the cost of fire department personnel and equipment costs among all town properties. After a careful study of the issues, the Board of Selectmen adopted the current fire districts in 2007 and stipulated that the tax impact to Fire

Districts #2 and #3 be phased-in over a five year period to gradually introduce the increased tax burden to residents.

At its meeting on March 16, 2009, the Finance Committee approved the following statement:

Statement on Hanover Town Budget, 2009-10

At its meeting on March 16, 2009, the Hanover Finance Committee (HFC) unanimously endorsed the town budget as approved by the Hanover Selectboard at its meeting on March 10, 2009.

The HFC reached this decision after carefully reviewing details of the projected revenues and expenditures as presented in the town budget proposal and discussing these details with town officers. Representatives of the HFC also attended all of the public meetings held by the Select Board in which the budget was discussed and approved.

Mindful of the very difficult current economic and financial conditions, the HFC commended the Selectboard and town officials for their efforts to cut costs in light of contracting local revenues while maintaining essential public services, especially for the town's least fortunate. The HFC had earlier recommended that the town general fund budget for FY2009-10 be formulated in a manner that would strive to produce a tax rate increase for Hanover of no more than 3% without jeopardizing essential community services. The projected municipal tax rate for the general fund is estimated at 3.17%, which the HFC feels is fully consistent with its recommendation.

Richard Podolec, Chair

Tom Blinkhorn

William F. Garrity

Michael Gerling

John Hochreiter

Peter L. Christie, Hanover Board of Selectmen Representative

Steve Woods, Hanover School Board Representative