

**Town of Raymond**  
June 6, 2017  
**ANNUAL TOWN MEETING WARRANT**

TO: Nathan White, a resident of the Town of Raymond, in the County of Cumberland and State of Maine.

GREETINGS:

In the name of the State of Maine, you are hereby required to notify and warn the inhabitants of the Town of Raymond, qualified by law to vote in Town affairs, to meet at the Jordan-Small Middle School gymnasium in said town on Tuesday, June 6, 2017 at 6:00 P.M., then and there to act on Articles 1 through 41 as set out below.

The continuation of said meeting will be held at the Jordan-Small Middle School gymnasium in said town on Tuesday, the 13<sup>th</sup> day of June, A.D. 2017, at seven o'clock in the forenoon, then and there to act upon by secret ballot on Articles 42 through 43 as set out below, the polling hours thereof to be from seven o'clock in the forenoon until eight o'clock in the evening.

**ARTICLE 1:** To elect a moderator to preside at said meeting.

**BEGINNING OF ORDINANCE CHANGES**

**ARTICLE 2:** Shall Article 10.C.1.j (Site Plan Review – Administration – Expiration of Approval) of the Raymond Land Use Ordinance, as adopted May 21, 1994, and amended through June 7, 2016, be further amended by adding the underscored language and deleting the language in strikethrough type as shown below?

The Planning Board recommends Article 2

The Selectmen recommend Article 2

*DESCRIPTION:*

*Language has been added to the Land Use Ordinance calling for the expiration of subdivision plans, in addition to site plans. There are several approved subdivisions in the Town which have not been completed, and this amendment gives the Town the ability to have these outstanding subdivisions expire if they do not commence within two years and are not completed within four years. The Town Attorney, Shana Cook Mueller provided a memo to the Planning Board dated December 14, 2016 in support of this amendment.*

*[Note: The use of the word "Article" within the ordinance does not indicate a separate warrant article.]*

ARTICLE 10 – SITE PLAN REVIEW

...

C. Administration

1. The following procedure and requirements shall apply to all applications for site plan review:

...

j. Expiration of approval.

~~Site plan approval shall expire and be void if the activity approved is not commenced within 12 months, and completed within two (2) years after the date of approval unless the reviewing authority, at the time of approval, establishes a different commencement and completion schedule but in no case will such period exceed five (5) years. Upon application for an extension of the approval received before approval expires, an extension of up to two (2) years may be granted by the reviewing authority.~~

Site Plan and Subdivision Plan approvals shall expire and be void if the construction activity associated with the approval is not commenced within two (2) years, and completed within four (4) years after the date of the site plan or subdivision plan approval unless the reviewing authority, at the time of approval, establishes a different completion schedule, but in no case shall the initial approval period exceed five (5) years to commence and complete. A property owner/developer or their agent may request an extension of the period to commence and/or complete construction by submitting a request to the reviewing authority that issued the site plan or subdivision plan approval prior to the expiration of the initial term of approval. The reviewing authority may grant a one-time extension of up to two years to commence and/or complete construction. If construction is not commenced or completed within the approval time frame, the applicant must reapply for, and receive approval prior to beginning or continuing construction.

Projects approved as Phased Developments shall only be approved by the Planning Board, and the above expiration of approval terms shall apply to any one phase of construction activity.

For the purposes of this Section, this section, “commencement of construction” shall be defined to include, but not be limited to, any land/site or vegetation clearing, site disturbance, stockpiling or excavation of soil on the site property, or building expansion or alterations in accordance with the approved plans. The determination of whether construction has commenced shall be in the sole discretion of the Code Enforcement Officer.

**ARTICLE 3:** Shall Article 9.L.10.a (Minimum Standards – Signs) of the Raymond Land Use Ordinance, as adopted May 21, 1994, and amended through June 7, 2016, be further amended by adding the underscored language as shown below?

The Planning Board recommends Article 3  
The Selectmen recommend Article 3

*DESCRIPTION:*

*Town staff is recommending a change to specific sign standards in order to allow approved agricultural uses within the residential zones to have more appropriate signage for their use by applying the sign standards for commercial zones to these properties.*

*[Note: The use of the word "Article" within the ordinance does not indicate a separate warrant article.]*

ARTICLE 9 – MINIMUM STANDARDS

...

L. Signs

...

10. Specific Standards

a. The following provisions shall govern the use of signs in the Resource Protection, Stream Protection, Limited Residential-Recreation I, Limited Residential-Recreation II, Village Residential I, Village Residential II, Rural and Rural Residential districts, and any other residentially-zoned districts.

1. Signs related to goods and services lawfully sold on the premises are allowed, but shall not exceed six (6) square feet in area, and shall not exceed two (2) signs per premises except as otherwise allowed pursuant subparagraph (4) below.

2. Residential users may display a single sign not over three (3) square feet in area relating to the sale, rental, or lease of the premises.

3. No sign shall extend higher than twenty (20) feet above the ground.

4. Signs advertising approved commercial uses in the residential zones fronting on Route 302, will be allowed to the maximum size and number allowed in the commercial zone.

5. Signs advertising approved agricultural uses in the residential zones will be allowed to the maximum size and number allowed in the commercial zone.

**ARTICLE 4:** Shall Article 10.B.2 (Site Plan Review – Authority and Classification of Site Plans) of the Raymond Land Use Ordinance, as adopted May 21, 1994, and amended through June 7, 2016, be further amended by adding the underscored language as shown below?

The Planning Board recommends Article 4

The Selectmen recommend Article 4

*DESCRIPTION:*

*Town staff is recommending changes to the site plan regulations to clarify that back lots are subject to Staff Site Plan Review.*

*[Note: The use of the word "Article" within the ordinance does not indicate a separate warrant article.]*

## ARTICLE 10 – SITE PLAN REVIEW

...

### B. Authority and Classification of Site Plans *[Amended 06/02/09]*

1. Except for single-family dwellings, duplex dwellings, accessory uses to single-family or duplex dwellings, maintenance of an existing building or facility, or interior renovations to an existing building or facility which do not change the use(s) or increase the amount of parking required under Article 9, Section C, no building permit shall be issued for a new building, a new facility, an exterior renovation to an existing building or facility, any alteration to or addition of impervious areas, or any substantial change to the use of an existing building or facility until the plans, drawings, sketches, and other documents required under this section have been reviewed and approved in accordance with the Site Plan Review provisions set out in this section below.

2. Site Plan Reviews shall be classified by the Town Planner as follows:

a. Staff Review. A site plan application shall be classified as a Staff Site Plan Review so long as, in any two year period: *[Amended 06/03/2014]*

1. any new building or any additions to existing buildings proposed by the application are more than 500 square feet but do not exceed 2,400 square feet of new Gross Floor Area, and
2. any exterior building renovation proposed by the application do not exceed 2,400 square feet of building surface area, and
3. any additional or altered impervious surface proposed by the application does not exceed, separately or in combination, 10,000 square feet.
4. the proposed development project includes the development of back lots and/or construction of back lot driveways under Article 9 – Minimum Standards, Section T.

b. Minor Review. A site plan application which exceeds the thresholds for Staff Site Plan Review shall be classified as a Minor Site Plan Review so long as, in any period:

1. any new building or any additions to existing buildings proposed by the application do not exceed 4,800 square feet of new Gross Floor Area, and
2. any exterior building renovation proposed by the application do not exceed 4,800 square feet of building surface area, and
3. any additional or altered impervious surface proposed by the application does not exceed, separately or in combination, 20,000 square feet.
4. the proposed development project includes new construction, or alteration to, or the extension of, a private or public street which does not warrant review under Town of Raymond Subdivision Regulations.

**ARTICLE 5:** Shall Article 9.U.5 (Minimum Standards – Lots – Stormwater Quality and Phosphorus Control) of the Raymond Land Use Ordinance, as adopted May 21, 1994, and amended through June 7, 2016, be further amended by deleting the language in strikethrough type as shown below?

The Planning Board recommends Article 5  
The Selectmen recommend Article 5

*DESCRIPTION:*

*Town staff is recommending striking the Stormwater Quality and Phosphorus Control section under Article 9 - Section U, Lots in order to avoid duplication and inconsistencies. Cross references will be updated to refer to the standards in Article 9-Section X. Stormwater Quality and Phosphorus Control.*

*[Note: The use of the word "Article" within the ordinance does not indicate a separate warrant article.]*

ARTICLE 9 – MINIMUM STANDARDS

...

U. Lots

...

~~5. Stormwater Quality and Phosphorus Control~~

~~The direct discharge of stormwater from ditches, swales and developed sites to streams and lakes can contribute to water pollution as stormwater can contain sediment, nutrients, hydrocarbons and other harmful substances. Increased stormwater runoff can also damage roads, ditches, culverts and other drainage structures that are not designed to accommodate storm flows. These problems can worsen when an undeveloped woody site is cleared for development since stormwater that was previously intercepted by vegetation and absorbed into the ground is allowed to flow more freely across and ultimately off the site. The closer post project stormwater flows are kept to pre project conditions in terms of volume, rate, timing and pollutant load, the less likely that stormwater will damage the site, or public or private property, or cause harm to water bodies. The introduction of excessive amounts of phosphorus from developed areas into lakes and ponds has been identified as a significant threat to water quality. The introduction of stormwater quality treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs) can minimize impacts to receiving wetlands and water bodies. The preferred stormwater treatment BMP for residential lots is naturally vegetated buffers whenever site conditions are suitable. Alternative stormwater treatment BMPs for residential lots should be used when site conditions on the lot prevent the effective use of buffers.~~

~~The purpose of this standard is to maintain the water quality of the area's lakes, ponds and streams by preventing the introduction of excessive amounts of pollutants to water bodies.~~

~~a. Applicability~~

- ~~1. Section U.5 shall apply to all lots, except lots approved under the provisions of the Raymond Subdivision Ordinance, that are created so that any portion of the lot is within 600' of a great pond, as measured from the normal high water mark, or 100' of a perennial stream, as identified on a USGS map.~~

- ~~2. All such lots subject to Article 10 Site Plan Review shall conform to the requirements of Article 10 Sections D.14 and E.1.e in addition to the provisions of this section.~~

~~b. Application Review~~

~~The applicant shall submit a site plan that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Code Enforcement Officer that the project will comply with this standard. The Code Enforcement Officer shall review the Stormwater and Phosphorus Management Plan and approve a permit based on one of the following methods. If the Code Enforcement Officer determines, because of particular circumstances of the property, that a third party review of the stormwater and phosphorous management control plans would help achieve the purposes of this ordinance, the Code Enforcement Officer may require review and endorsement of such plans by the Cumberland County Soil & Water Conservation District, or some other third party qualified to conduct such review, the cost of which shall be borne by the Applicant.~~

~~1) Point System~~

~~a. Point Credits~~

~~The CEO shall issue a Stormwater and Phosphorus Management Control Permit if the applicant meets or exceeds fifty (50) points based on the following point schedule. The applicant shall submit a Sketch Plan of the lot showing how each of the following point credits, or deductions apply to the proposed development. The Sketch Plan shall show approximate locations and dimensions of each stormwater BMP, or other measure.~~

- ~~i. 10 Points for correcting an existing erosion problem on the project site, as approved by the CEO.~~
- ~~ii. 10 Points for a building footprint less than 1,500 square feet~~
- ~~iii. 10 Points for a clearing limitation of less than 20% of the lot, or 15,000 square feet, whichever is less; or 20 Points for a clearing limitation of less than 15% of the lot, or 10,000 square feet, whichever is less~~
- ~~iv. 15 Points for the installation of rock-lined drip edges or other infiltration system to serve no less than 50% of the new impervious area on the site. Test pit information certified by a Licensed Site Evaluator, or a Professional Engineer must show that three feet of separation exists between the Seasonal High Groundwater Table and the bottom of any proposed infiltration structure. Infiltration systems must be sized to accommodate one inch of runoff from contributing impervious areas within the structure (this will include an assumption of 30% void space in washed stone) and designed in accordance with the details provided in Appendix A; or~~

~~25 Points for the installation of rock-lined drip edges or other infiltration system to serve no less than 75% of the new impervious area on the site. Test pit information certified by a Licensed Site Evaluator, or a Professional Engineer must show that three feet of separation exists between the Seasonal High Groundwater Table and the bottom of any proposed infiltration structure. Infiltration systems must be sized to accommodate one inch of runoff from contributing impervious areas within the structure (this will include an assumption of 30% void space in washed stone) and designed in accordance with the details provided in Appendix A.~~
- ~~v. 20 Points for the installation of rain gardens to serve no less than 50% of the new impervious area on the site. Rain gardens shall be sized to accommodate~~

~~one inch of runoff from contributing impervious areas within the six-inch ponding area, and designed in accordance with the detail provided in Appendix A; or~~

~~30 Points for the installation of rain gardens to serve no less than 75% of the new impervious area on the site. Rain gardens shall be sized to accommodate one inch of runoff from contributing impervious areas within the six-inch ponding area, and designed in accordance with the detail provided in Appendix A.~~

~~vi. 30 Points for a 50 foot wide (no greater than 15% slope) wooded buffer strip, or a 75 foot wide vegetated buffer (no greater than 15% slope) strip located down gradient and adjacent to the developed area, provided there is no channelization within the buffer; or~~

~~35 Points for a 75 foot wide (no greater than 15% slope) wooded buffer strip, or a 100 foot wide vegetated buffer (no greater than 15% slope) strip located down gradient and adjacent to the developed area, provided there is no channelization within the buffer; or~~

~~40 Points for a 100 foot wide (no greater than 15% slope) wooded buffer strip, or a 150 foot wide vegetated buffer (no greater than 15% slope) strip located down gradient and adjacent to the developed area, provided there is no channelization within the buffer.~~

#### b. Point Deductions

The CEO will deduct points based on the following point schedule:

- ~~• 10 Points deducted for a new structure footprint exceeding 2000 square feet, and an additional 5 points deducted for each additional 500 square feet of structure footprint.~~
- ~~• 10 Points deducted for over 20,000 square feet of disturbance, and an additional 5 points deducted for each additional 5,000 square feet of disturbance.~~

#### 2) Alternate Means of Calculation

~~In those cases where the Code Enforcement Officer determines that use of the points system is inadequate to achieve the purposes of stormwater and phosphorous management control or is otherwise inappropriate because of particular circumstances of the property, the Code Enforcement Officer may assess conformance with this standard based on the following:~~

- ~~1. Phosphorus export calculations based on "Phosphorus Control in Lake Watersheds: A Technical Guide to Evaluating New Development (latest edition), issued by Maine DEP. Any such design must be certified by a Licensed Professional Engineer.~~
- ~~2. A Stormwater Management Plan designed in accordance with Section 4B of the State of Maine Chapter 500 Stormwater Regulations, General Standards (June 6, 2006, and as amended). Any such design must be certified by a Licensed Professional Engineer.~~

**ARTICLE 6:** Shall Article 10.D (Site Plan Review – Submission Requirements) of the Raymond Land Use Ordinance, as adopted May 21, 1994, and amended through June 7, 2016, be further amended by adding the underscored language and deleting the language in strikethrough type as shown below?

The Planning Board recommends Article 6  
The Selectmen recommend Article 6

**DESCRIPTION:**

*Town staff is recommending changes to the Site Plan submission requirements. The first change is to require the number of submitted full sized plans as well as requiring 11 x 17 copies. The second change ensures that Site Plan Review of back lots and back lot driveways follows minimum stormwater runoff standards specified in Article 9.*

*[Note: The use of the word “Article” within the ordinance does not indicate a separate warrant article.]*

**ARTICLE 10 – SITE PLAN REVIEW**

...

**D. Submission Requirements**

1. When the owner of the property or the owner’s authorized agent makes formal application for Site Plan Review, the application shall contain at least the following exhibits and information except to the extent any of these submission requirements are modified by the provisions of Section C.2.b pertaining to Staff Site Plan Review and Section C.3.b pertaining to Minor Site Plan Review above: *[Amended 06/02/09]*

a. A fully executed and signed application for Site Plan Review;

b. A narrative description explaining how the submissions and the proposed plans meet all submission requirements and ordinance provisions that pertain to the applicant’s project. *[Adopted 06/02/09]*

For any project located in the Commercial District, the applicant shall also submit a narrative which explains how the submissions and the proposed plans comport with the Raymond Design Guidelines, and where the submissions and the proposed plans do not comport with the Raymond Design Guidelines, the reasons why the applicant is proposing an alternative design. *[Adopted 06/02/09]*

c. Fifteen (15) copies of a Site Plan, to include eight (8) full sized scaled copies, including seven (7) half size/scaled copies or reduced plans to fit on an 11’ x 17’ sheet, and an electronic file in both PDF and GIS formats, drawn at a scale of not more than fifty (50) feet to the inch for that portion of the total tract of land subject to site plan review, and showing the following:

...

14. A stormwater management plan, prepared by a registered professional engineer, shall be designed so that the post-development stormwater runoff does not exceed the pre-development stormwater runoff for the 24-hour duration, 2-, 10-, and 25-year frequency storm events. The stormwater plan shall be prepared in accordance with “*Stormwater Management for Maine: Volume III BMP’s Technical Design Manual*”, latest edition, prepared by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, which is incorporated herein by reference and made a part thereof. The stormwater plan shall include the following information for the

pre- and post-development conditions: drainage area boundaries, hydrologic soils groups, ground cover type, time of concentration flow paths, modeling methodology, calculations, and background data. The Board may require review and endorsement of the stormwater plan and calculations by the Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District or some other third party qualified to conduct such review, the cost of which shall be borne by the Applicant. *[Amended 12/2/08]*

Projects subject to Site Plan Review shall include the following: *[Adopted 12/02/08]*

a. Phosphorus export calculations based on the "MAINE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT DESIGN MANUAL, Phosphorus Control Manual Volume II" (as published MARCH 2016 and as amended) "Phosphorus Control in Lake Watersheds: A Technical Guide to Evaluating New Development (latest edition), issued by Maine DEP. or,

b. Any project which requires a Stormwater Permit from the State of Maine DEP shall submit A Stormwater Management Plan designed in accordance with Section 4 of the State of Maine Chapter 500 Stormwater Regulations, Stormwater Standards (June 6, 2006, and as amended). *[Adopted 12/02/08]*

For Site Plan Review applications reviewed by staff ~~Minor Developments and Minor Modifications subject to CEO review only~~, the Stormwater Management Plan must demonstrate conformance with the Stormwater Quality and Phosphorus Control provisions (point system) described in Article 9, Section ~~U-5~~ X of this ordinance.

All Site Plan Review of back lots and back lot driveways shall ensure compliance with the minimum standards for stormwater runoff design and quality control in accordance with Article 9 – Minimum Standards, Section T Back Lots and Back Lot Driveways, 11, d, v and vi.

**END OF ORDINANCE CHANGES**

**ARTICLE 7:** To see if the Town will vote, pursuant to 23 M.R.S.A. §2953, that orders of the municipal officers with respect to the closing of roads to winter maintenance shall be a final determination.

The Selectmen recommend Article 7

\*\*\*\*\* **Budget Warrant Begins** \*\*\*\*\*

**ARTICLE 8:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen on behalf of the Town to sell and dispose of any property acquired by the Town for nonpayment of taxes pursuant to the policy adopted by the Selectmen, as may be amended from time to time, the policy to remain consistent with State statutes and laws. In all cases conveyance to be made by municipal quitclaim deed.

The Selectmen recommend Article 8.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 8.

**ARTICLE 9:** To see what date taxes will be due and to set an interest rate for unpaid amounts.

The Selectmen recommend 1<sup>st</sup> half to be due October 31, 2017 and 2<sup>nd</sup> half to be due April 30, 2018 with interest at seven percent (7%) on any unpaid balances.

The Selectmen recommend Article 9.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 9.

**ARTICLE 10:** To see if the Town will vote to set the interest rate to be paid by the Town on abated taxes at seven percent (7%) for the fiscal year.

The Selectmen recommend Article 10.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 10.

**ARTICLE 11:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to dispose of Town owned personal property with value not to exceed \$35,000.

The Selectmen recommend Article 11.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 11.

**ARTICLE 12:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to borrow from or appropriate from undesignated fund balance (surplus) as they deem advisable to meet the unanticipated needs of the community that occur during the fiscal year with amount not to exceed **\$75,000**.

The Selectmen recommend Article 12.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 12.

**ARTICLE 13:** To see if the Town will authorize the Selectmen, for the fiscal year 2017 - 2018, to transfer funds between appropriation accounts as long as the grand total of all appropriations is not exceeded. Any such transfers to be approved only at a properly called public meeting of the Selectmen.

The Selectmen recommend Article 13.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 13.

**ARTICLE 14:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the use of Town employees and/or Town owned equipment or independent contractor(s) hired by the Town for maintenance on private roads in special and certain circumstances where in the public's interest.

Note of explanation – Three examples of when the use of Town employees and equipment may be necessary:

- A. Tying in work done on a public road that intersects a private road;
- B. Plowing snow on a private road to clear the way for emergency response apparatus; and
- C. In rare or emergency situations, maintaining private roads for school bus access to special education students as deemed necessary.

The Selectmen recommend Article 14.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 14.

**ARTICLE 15:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Tax Collector or Treasurer to accept prepayments of taxes not yet committed pursuant to 36 M.R.S.A. §506, with no interest.

The Selectmen recommend Article 15.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 15.

**ARTICLE 16:** To see if the Town will vote to appropriate \$217,302 from the tax increment of the Pipeline/RT 302 Tax Increment Financing District for FY 2017 - 2018 projects proposed in the Tax Increment Financing District Development Program.

The Selectmen recommend Article 16.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 16.

**ARTICLE 17:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$488,998 for the Administration account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 17.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 17.

**ARTICLE 18:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$57,709 for the Assessing account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 18.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 18.

**ARTICLE 19:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$108,372 for the Code Enforcement Department account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 19.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 19.

**ARTICLE 20:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$23,615 for the Town Hall account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 20.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 20.

**ARTICLE 21:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$521,760 for the Insurance and Employee Benefits accounts.

The Selectmen recommend Article 21.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 21.

**ARTICLE 22:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$6,000 for the General Assistance account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 22.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 22.

**ARTICLE 23:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$184,271 for the Technology Department account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 23.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 23.

**ARTICLE 24:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$48,472 for the Community Development account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 24.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 24.

**ARTICLE 25:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$752,585 for the Fire/Rescue Department account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 25.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 25.

**ARTICLE 26:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$19,322 for the Animal Control account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 26.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 26.

**ARTICLE 27:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$684,112 for the Public Works account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 27.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 27.

**ARTICLE 28:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$323,762 for the Solid Waste account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 28.  
The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 28.

**ARTICLE 29:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$65,500** for the Employee Compensation and Training account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 29.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 29.

**ARTICLE 30:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$39,393** for the Cemeteries account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 30.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 30.

**ARTICLE 31:** To see if the Town will vote to appropriate all of the money received from the State for snowmobile registrations to the Raymond Rattlers Snowmobile Club for the maintenance of their network of snowmobile trails, on condition that those trails be open in snow season to the public for outdoor recreation purposes at no charge, and to authorize the municipal officers to enter into an agreement with the Club, under such terms and conditions as the municipal officers may deem advisable, for that purpose.

The Selectmen recommend Article 31.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 31.

**ARTICLE 32:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$16,921** for the Parks & Recreation account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 32.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 32.

**ARTICLE 33:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$60,500** for the Raymond Village Library.

The Selectmen recommend Article 33.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 33.

**ARTICLE 34:** To see whether the Town will vote to carry forward any existing fund balance in the Capital Improvement Program (C.I.P.) accounts and the Healthcare Reimbursement Accounts (H.R.A.).

The Selectmen recommend Article 34.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 34.

**ARTICLE 35:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$617,000** for the Capital Improvement Program.

Included are:

Public Works Equipment Reserve	\$ 90,000
Public Works Paving/Road Reserve	\$ 300,000
Municipal Facilities Improvements	\$ 35,000
Fire Department Equipment/Facilities	\$ 110,000
Technology Reserve	\$ 20,000
Sign	\$ 62,000

The Selectmen recommend Article 35.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 35.

**ARTICLE 36:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$441,881** for Debt Services.

Included are:

2013 Public Works Road Construction Bond Payment	\$ 232,000
2002 PSB Bond Payment	\$ 106,681
Fire Truck/Sand-Salt Shed Bond Payment	\$ 103,200

The Selectmen recommend Article 36.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 36.

**ARTICLE 37:** To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate **\$727,076** for the County Tax account.

The Selectmen recommend Article 37.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 37.

**ARTICLE 38:** To see if the Town will vote to appropriate the total sum of **\$1,697,284** from estimated non-property tax revenues to reduce the property tax commitment, together with all categories of funds, which may be available from the federal government, and any other sources.

The Selectmen recommend Article 38.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 38.

**ARTICLE 39:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to accept or reject grants, donations and/or gifts of money to the Town of Raymond and to expend monies donated for specific purposes.

The Selectmen recommend Article 39.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 39.

**ARTICLE 40:** To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to borrow from or appropriate from undesignated fund balance (surplus) as they deem advisable for matching grant monies for a federal-aid project with the State of Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT) to develop a new sidewalk and make roadway drainage improvements on Main Street.

Project description: beginning at US Route 302 and extending 0.60 of a mile to Meadow Road; to be included in MaineDOT's Work Plan for calendar years 2017-2019; and shall be a Locally Administered Project, subject to oversight by MaineDOT.

The anticipated total cost of the project is \$405,000 with a 20% local match, making the Town of Raymond's anticipated share \$81,000. There is \$33,000 in previously approved project reserve funds, leaving an anticipated \$48,000 for the remainder of the match.

The Selectmen recommend Article 40.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 40.

**ARTICLE 41:** To see if the Town will vote to accept certain State Funds as provided by the Maine State Legislature during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2017 and any other funds provided by any other entity included but not limited to:

- Municipal Revenue Sharing
- Local Road Assistance
- Emergency Management Assistance
- Snowmobile Registration Money
- Homestead Exemption
- Tree Growth Reimbursement
- General Assistance Reimbursement
- Veteran's Exemption Reimbursement
- Business Equipment Tax Exemption (BETE) Reimbursement
- State Grant or Other Funds

The Selectmen recommend Article 41.

The Budget-Finance Committee recommends Article 41.

**ARTICLE 42:** To elect two (2) Selectmen, for three-year terms; three (3) members for the Budget-Finance Committee, for three-year terms; and one (1) member for the RSU School Board of Directors, for a three-year term.

**ARTICLE 43:** Non-binding, Informational Only Question: Would the Town like to explore constructing a new Town Office building?

Given under our hands this 11<sup>th</sup> day of April AD 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Bruno, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teresa Sadak, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rolf Olsen, Parliamentarian

\_\_\_\_\_  
Samuel Gifford

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lawrence Taylor III

I attest that this is a true copy.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan L Look  
Town Clerk