SECTION 8
FIVE YEAR BUDGET PROJECTIONS

CONTEXT OF LONG TERM BUDGET PLANNING

The proposed budget reflects the fiscal realities of slow growth in town revenues, particularly State Aid, and an increasing dependence upon use of the property tax to fund the budget. It also recognizes the unique challenges that Montague faces – the problems, issues and needs – that drive spending. These provide the context in which the long term financial plan has been developed.

Revenue Constraints

The declining role of state aid in the funding of municipal budgets.

On the revenue side the most significant trend is the redefinition of the role that State Aid now plays in the funding of Montague's budget. This is due to several factors. These include the passage of the Education Reform Act in 1993, the advent of globalization and its impact upon State employment and economic growth, and the depth of the most recent recession, from which we still have not fully recovered. Following the adoption of Proposition 2 ½ in 1983, the State was aggressive in making up for the loss of local property tax revenue through generous increases in State Aid. This pattern of growth in municipal aid lasted for about a decade, with increases averaging 16.4% per year through the late 1980's

Education reform changed the state's priorities with respect to how new state aid would be allocated. In general, schools throughout the Commonwealth now receive the lion's share of growth in State Aid. This change in priorities benefitted Gill-Montague Regional School System during the 1990's when increases to that District averaged more than $300,000 per year. Once GMRSD reached foundation budget, however, and the District began experiencing declining enrollments, its State Aid stagnated significantly. Since that time GMRSD has experienced minimal increases in aid; and these increases have been more than offset by staggering losses of aid to School Choice and Charter. The fiscal pressures placed upon the District by declining State revenues have often translated into higher assessments to the town.

The Town (municipal side) has also seen its state aid levels decline significantly since the advent of Education Reform. Consider that as early as FY 1988 the town received $1,442,419 in state aid, which at that time constituted 21.3% of its annual revenues. In FY 2014, net state aid to Montague was $1,372,617 or about 8% or revenues. Perhaps more significant, FY 2014 state aid levels to Montague were still $326,675 less than the amount received in FY 2008. At its low point during the most recent "Great Recession", Montague lost more than $400,000 or 24% of its State Aid, but by FY 2014 had only recovered about a quarter of the amount lost.

There are many reasons for this fact. Due to globalization, the slow recovery of the economy and related job producing withholding income taxes, the State has not been able to restore State Aid to its previous levels as they had always done before. And, it appears that Montague will have to get used to living with State Aid levels that are lower than they were twenty years ago. Michael Widmer of the Massachusetts Taxpayer's Association recently predicted that with globalization and the aging demographics of our State, economic growth will be much lower than it once was. Typically, we could expect growth in the economy of 7or 8% per year during a period of recovery. The new norm is currently 5%, with future years likely to be even lower as the population ages. It should be pointed out that each 1% of growth in the state economy generates $250 million in new tax revenue – funds that can be distributed to municipalities in the form of increased state aid.

Greater dependence upon the Property Tax

As State Aid has declined and local receipts have continued to remain stagnant, property taxes have funded an increasingly larger part of the budget. In FY 2008, prior to the beginning of the Great Recession and the cuts that followed, property taxes accounted for 68% of all revenues. By 2014, that number had risen to 81%. It should be pointed out, however, that this was only possible because the town was fortunate enough to experience significant amounts of "new growth". Between 2008 and 2014, the town realized a total of $1,620,662 or an average of $231,523/year of new growth, significantly higher than the $120,000/year that we typically project. This resulted in an overall rate of growth in the property tax of 4%. It remains to be seen whether or not this rate of growth can be sustained going forward.

According to research performed by the Board of Assessors office, which included the period 2004 to 2014, (See Section 6) 50.4% of all new property value added was attributable to business personal property and even higher in recent years. In fact, in the four highest years of new growth (2004, 2009, 2011, and 2014), personal property registered the highest amount and accounted for 46.6%, 47.7%, 70.5%, and 91.7%) of all new value. The same study shows residential new growth declining significantly following the onset of the Great Recession declining in 2014 to a low of 6.6% of new growth value. This mirrors the decline in housing starts that has plagued the nation. It is doubtful that the town can continue to depend upon the level of contributions to value personal property that it has experienced from personal property. This means that to sustain the current level of property tax growth, without resorting to a Proposition 2 ½ override, the town will need to generate growth in other areas. One such area would be industrial growth associated with the expansion of existing industries or development of new ones. Another area would be in the residential growth, but this would be dependent upon an overall recovery of the housing sector in the national and state economy. It would also be dependent upon the availability of developable house lots. The Town Planner is currently determining the amount of remaining buildable land in the town which would enable such growth to occur.

Expenditure Constraints

The budget is also constrained by factors that affect the level of spending that the town must incur. These include the traditional budget busters (pensions, health insurance – both for active and retired employees, workers compensation and debt.) They also include the annual increases in wages and salaries that the town must pay to remain competitive in the job market, and big ticket expense items that typically exceed inflationary levels of increase (energy, solid waste, gasoline/diesel, veterans' benefits), and the cost of rising assessments from the School District which are not always affordable. Finally, the town must also pay the price of deferred maintenance of its capital infrastructure (buildings, roads/sidewalks, equipment).

Potential "Budget Busters"

In Montague's past, the most notable of the so-called budget busters have health insurance (for active and retired employees) and pensions. On closer examination, however, the town appears to have brought these costs under control. Between 2001 and 2007, health insurance costs grew from $427,447 to $819,887, a 92% increase. This is an annual increase of 15%. During the same period spending on health insurance as a percentage of total General Fund spending grew from 7.6% to 13.3%, with health insurance claiming 42% of all growth in the operating budget. Perhaps in response to health insurance reform at the state level, Montague has stabilized its health insurance costs. Between 2008 and 2015, health insurance grew less than 1% per year. During the same period, pensions grew an average of 4% year. It should be pointed out that Montague's pension system will be fully funded by 2026. This is in contrast to many communities which, out of desperation (due to the recession) choose to extend their pension payment schedule until 2040 when the state adopted legislation allowing it. This puts the town in excellent position to deal with its OPEB (other postemployment benefits plan) costs. Currently, the town pays for retiree health insurance on a "pay as you go" basis. According to the most recent audit, in 2012, the town's annual OPEB costs were $1.1 million per year, and it contributed $492,000. One alternative is to begin making an annual appropriation for OPEB now. Some communities are doing this, however it is difficult to make a dent in the overall liability doing it this way. Montague's current plan is to begin paying the unfunded portion of OPEB liability, in the same manner that we have addressed the town's unfunded pension liabilities. This will occur in 2026 when the town completes payment of its unfunded pension liability. At that time it will be possible to use the level of funding currently appropriated for unfunded pension liability and reallocate it to funding the unfunded OPEB liability.

Debt

Debt load is another constraint that will impact the FY 2015 budget and other budgets to come in future years. According to Standard & Poors (February 20, 2013), Montague has about $11.5 million in direct debt outstanding. After accounting for some water and sewer GO debt, Montague's overall debt burden is $8.7 million. The rating agency found this debt burden to be "low" at $1,032 per capita, or 1.2% of market value. The town's debt service carrying charge is also low at 3.5% of expenditures. Montague's debt amortization is average, with 51% of debt retired in 10 years and about 88% in 20 years.

One of the obvious potential constraints that the town faces is the need to take on new debt to address town space needs and to deal with deteriorating infrastructure. The capital improvements committee has identified several key capital projects that must be addressed in the next five years. These include in priority order the replacement of an obsolete Town DPW garage, and the construction of a Senior Center and a New Library. The latter two projects are currently in the feasibility study stage and costs have not as yet been determined. The town also plans to construct a new Industrial Park at an estimated cost of $1.4 million but expects to fund this project through state and federal grants.

Significant debt will also have to be incurred by the Sewer Enterprise Fund. In FY 2014, the town took on $1.7 million to pay for work associated with an unanticipated sewer emergency. In FY 2015, town meeting will be asked to approve $3.0 million in debt for the replacement of two sewer pump stations, and an additional $175,000 for sewer system rehabilitation work.

FY 2016 – FY 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN

Revenue Forecast

The revenue forecast assumes that General Fund revenues will grow by a total of $2,873,523 or 16.4% between FY 2015 and FY 2020. This is an average annual growth rate of 3.28%. The projected growth will be distributed as follows:

Property Taxes

Most of the forecasted growth in town revenues (95%) will be in the category of property taxes, reflecting the trend towards an increasing role of this revenue source in the funding of municipal budgets. The forecast assumes that net property tax revenues will increase by $2,740,501 or 19% during this period. The annual rate of growth varies from year and depends upon the amount of taxes set aside as an allowance for abatements and exemption. In FY 2016, $400,000 is allocated for this purpose, to account for an expected value challenge by a major taxpayer; while in subsequent years of the forecast (FY 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020) the amount allocated for this purpose is only $150,000. This affects the net property tax revenue and the annual rate of growth in property tax revenue from year to year. Thus in FY 2017, when less money is allocated for abatements and exemption, property taxes grow by $735,555 or 4.9%. In subsequent years of the forecast the annual rate of property tax growth is only 3.2%. This growth rate reflects the town levying to its maximum levy limit, realizing the allowable 2 1/2 % increase in property tax revenues plus an assumed new growth of $120,000 per year. This is a conservative new growth projection, about half of the average actually experienced during the past eight years. It assumes that the dramatic increases in new growth realized as a result of increased business/personal property values will not be repeated during the forecast period. It also assumes that new growth resulting from residential and commercial/industrial construction will not be a major contributor. This could change if the overall economy begins to grow in a meaningful manner, and the town succeeds in its own economic development efforts, including the development of a new industrial park and adaptive reuse of the Strathmore Mill Complex.

State Aid

Municipal state aid is projected to increase by a total of $133,022 or 8.8% between FY 2015 and FY 2020. This is an average annual increase of 1.8%. These projections reflect acceptance of the reality that the State will have increasingly less revenue available for discretionary purposes. This assumes that as the state population ages and the economy grows at a slower rate, growth in income tax revenues will also decline. At the same time, demands at the state level on the shrinking "revenue pie" by non-discretionary uses (Health Insurance and Other Post Retirement Benefits (OPEB), Medicaid, and debt; and Chapter 70 school aid will mean that increasingly less revenue is available for growth in municipal state aid. In fact, during the forecast period state aid as a percentage of total general fund revenues will decline from 8.6% of General Fund revenues to 8.0%. This is significantly less than the amount of municipal aid received by the town (21% of total revenues) in the late 1980's.

Local Receipts

Local receipts are assumed to remain stagnant during between FY 2015 and FY 2020. They are level funded at the FY 2015 level of $1,300,000 throughout this period. Although there is some flexibility in some local receipts categories, key sources are limited by factors outside of the town's control. Excise taxes, for example, were once a very reliable source of revenue growth. This revenue source currently comprises 50% of total local receipts. At one time it made up around 60% of this revenue source and could be counted on to grow at a significant rate (17% per year in the late 1980's and approximately 5% per year during the following decade. Unfortunately, current trends in car ownership and the method of calculating the value upon which excise taxes are levied does not favor the continuation of excise taxes as a reliable source of revenue growth. This is because excise tax values are based upon a percentage of the Manufacturer's Suggested Retail Price (MSRP). A car that is five or more years of age is taxed at only 10% of its MSRP. As vehicles improve in quality and owners retain them for a long period of time, there is a much higher percentage of vehicles that are taxed at the lowest value and very little year to year growth in total value.

Trash sticker fees which make up about 20-25% of local receipts are also very constant from year to year. It is not likely to increase during the forecast period because the sticker fee is already high ($3/bag); and any move to increase this rate would probably be met with political resistance.

Finally, the forecast does not project significant growth in any of the other local receipt categories, particularly those related to real estate growth and development. There is always the possibility that the nation will experience a housing recovery which would benefit the town through the generation of building permit and other fees.

Free Cash

It is assumed that the town will continue its present practice of using $250,000 per year in free cash towards the funding of the General Operating Budget and Gill-Montague Regional School District assessments.

Available Funds

The only category of available funds included in the forecast is the Franklin County Technical School Resource Officer reimbursement (($75,645). This amount will actually increase annually as the cost of the position (wages and benefits) increases. No attempt has been made to project annual changes.

Other available funds will obviously be used during the forecast period. These could include special article request balances, stabilization, overlay reserve and free cash to fund special article. It is impossible to predict what these would be without first knowing the capital or operating expenditures that are being financed by them.

Airport User Fees

This amount is assumed to increase by 2 ½ % per year.

Sewer User Fees

Sewer User Fees are projected to increase by $104,418 or 4.8% during the forecast period. This is a growth rate of less than 1% per year. The actual rate of growth will be much higher and will be driven by the addition of new, yet to be determined debt service requirements that are not included in this forecast, as they have not as yet been approved by town meeting. In fact the forecast assumes that the overall debt of the Sewer Enterprise Fund will decline by $146,681/year between 2015 and 2020. In actuality, there are major appropriations current pending, that will be voted upon at the May 2014 annual town meeting. These will more than absorb any new debt capacity created by the pay down of prior debt. Additional, significant indebtedness will also be required to address many other WPCF capital needs identified in the town's long term capital improvement program (Section Nine).

Expenditure Forecast

The expenditure forecast assumes that General Fund expenditures will increase between $2,508,670 and $2,858,156 during the forecast period. The lower end of the forecast assumes that increases in health insurance can be held to 3% per year (H1 alternative); and the upper end assumes an annual increase of 9% (H4 alternative). There are several assumptions that underlie these projections.

Personnel

Personnel costs are projected to rise by 3% per year under all of the options. This roughly approximates the spending that would be required to fund the implementation of the pay and classification study in the out years. This forecast doe not assume the addition of any new staffing.

Expenses

Expenses, not including debt or employee benefits, are projected to grow by 4% per year during the same period.

Debt

Debt projections do not include the addition of any new debt service during the forecast period. Amounts shown reflect the annual debt service owed for projects already financed.

Employee Benefits

There are four different spending scenarios proposed for the Employee Benefits line item. These include increases of health insurance of 3% per year (H1), 5% per year (H2), 7% per year (H3), and 9% per year (H4). Other assumptions included under the employee benefits category are as follows: Workers Compensation (+4 %/year), Unemployment Compensation (level funded at $10,000 per year), Life Insurance (+2.5%/year), Medicare (+5%/ year) and Pensions (+2 %/year) as per the Montague Retirement System projections.

Education

The education expenditure category includes assessments from the Franklin County Technical School and the Gill Montague Regional School District.

Franklin County Technical School assessments are projected to increase by 4% per year. This is an average and an attempt to smooth out and account for the actual variations in assessments that occur as a result of fluctuations in enrollments by Montague students. Actual enrollments may increase or decrease from one year to the next; and this is why the Finance Committee has chosen to establish a Franklin County Technical School stabilization fund.

Gill Montague Regional School assessments are projected to increase by 3% per year. It should be pointed out that the amount of projected spending on the GMRSD assessment is within a fraction of 1% of the affordable assessment in each of the five years of the forecast.

Sewer Enterprise

The same assumptions described above were used in forecasting spending by the Sewer Enterprise.

Special Articles/Capital Projects

This analysis purposely excluded a projection of capital spending, at least initially. The intent was, first, to identify the total amount of money that would be needed to fund the operating budget of the Town (General Fund), Educational assessments, Sewer Enterprise, Airport, and Colle; and then, knowing the revenues that would be available in any given year to project the amount of discretionary funds that would be available for "pay as you go" capital projects or new, non-excluded debt service for each year of the forecast.

Summary of Findings

The calculation of new capacity for "pay as you go" projects was determined as follows:

(1) Tax funded revenues were calculated for each of the years in the forecast period. These included net tax levy, net state aid, local receipts, and FCTS reimbursement.

(2) Tax funded expenditures were then determined. These are the tax funded portions of the following budgets: town operating budget, school assessments, airport and the annual tax surcharge that pays for a portion of the Water Pollution Control budget (assumed to remain at $200,000 per year).
(3) The difference between the two is available for other purposes including capital projects.

The study looked at four different expenditure scenarios. The only variable that was changed was health insurance. H1 – assumed an annual increase of 3%, H2 – 5%, H3 – 7% and H4 – 9%.

Revenues were constant in each year regardless of the difference in expenditures within the same year.

As expected, the effect on increasingly higher rates of health insurance increases results in proportionately less funds available for capital or other discretionary uses. In 2016, the town would spend $55,497 more on health insurance under the H4 scenario than the H1. Consequently, the amount available for discretionary purposes would be $87,344 instead of $142,841. In the out years of the forecast, however, the difference is much more significant. In 2020, for example, available discretionary funds decrease from $504,551 to $155,065, as we move from the H1 to H4 expenditure option. This is a loss of $349,486 in potential discretionary funding entirely as a result of more expensive health insurance.

The importance of stabilizing the growth of health insurance costs cannot be overemphasized. The impact of rising health insurance increases significantly over the course of the forecast period. In year 2 of the forecast, implementing the worst case scenario results in a loss 29.6% of discretionary funds that would be available under the best case scenario. By year 5, if the worse case scenario materialized, the town would spend 69.3% of the funds that would otherwise be available for discretionary purposes under the H1 scenario on health insurance. These are funds that would otherwise be available for capital or other purposes. If the town were able to keep increases in health insurance to 3% per year, it would have a total of $972,147 in additional capacity available for capital spending over the course of the forecast period, when compared with the H4 (9 %) option.

REVENUE FORECAST
FY 15 - FY 20

CATEGORY	FY15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20
PROPERTY TAX						
Prior Year	$13,690,149	$14,152,402	$14,626,212	$15,111,867	$15,609,664	$16,119,906
Plus 2-1/2	$342,254	$353,810	$365,655	$377,797	$390,242	$402,998
Plus New Growth	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000
New Levy Limit	$14,152,403	$14,626,212	$15,111,867	$15,609,664	$16,119,906	$16,642,904
Plus Overrides	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Plus Debt Exlusions	$688,783	$688,883	$688,783	$688,783	$688,783	$688,783
Max. Allowable Levy	$14,841,186	$15,315,095	$15,800,650	$16,298,447	$16,808,689	$17,331,687
Less Allow for Abatement	$400,000	$400,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000	$150,000
Sub-Total Net Levy	**$14,441,186**	**$14,915,095**	**$15,650,650**	**$16,148,447**	**$16,658,689**	**$17,181,687**
STATE AID						
Lottery	$1,278,067	$1,303,628	$1,329,701	$1,356,295	$1,383,421	$1,411,089
Other	$305,709	$305,709	$305,709	$305,709	$305,709	$305,709
Sub-Total Receipts	**$1,583,776**	**$1,609,337**	**$1,635,410**	**$1,662,004**	**$1,689,130**	**$1,716,798**
Less Charges	$74,473	$74,473	$74,473	$74,473	$74,473	$74,473
Sub-Total Net State Revenue	**$1,509,303**	**$1,534,864**	**$1,560,937**	**$1,587,531**	**$1,614,657**	**$1,642,325**
LOCAL RECEIPTS						
M.V. Excise	$650,000	$650,000	$650,000	$650,000	$650,000	$650,000
Other	$570,000	$570,000	$570,000	$570,000	$570,000	$570,000
Misc. Recurring	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000	$80,000
Sub-Total Local Receipts	**$1,300,000**	**$1,300,000**	**$1,300,000**	**$1,300,000**	**$1,300,000**	**$1,300,000**

CATEGORY	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20
FREE CASH						
Free Cash	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Sub-Total Free Cash	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**	**$250,000**
Available Funds						
FCTS SRO	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645
Sub-Total Available Funds	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645	$75,645
Grand Total (Net Gen. Fund)	**$17,576,134**	**$18,075,604**	**$18,837,232**	**$19,361,623**	**$19,898,991**	**$20,449,657**
Airport User Fees	$36,424	$37,517	$38,643	$39,802	$40,996	$42,136
Sub-Total Airport User Fees	**$36,424**	**$37,517**	**$38,643**	**$39,802**	**$40,996**	**$42,136**
SEWER USER FEES						
Under H1 expenditures (3%)	**$2,172,148**	**$2,204,194**	**$2,246,387**	**$2,202,258**	**$2,253,217**	**$2,276,566**

EXPENDITURE FORECAST
FY 15 - FY 20

CATEGORY	FY 15	FY16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20
Salaries/Wages	$3,668,785	$3,758,885	$3,849,525	$3,923,859	$3,992,285	$4,080,115
Expenses	$2,042,147	$2,103,411	$2,166,513	$2,231,508	$2,298,453	$2,367,407
Debt	$662,193	$660,285	$656,520	$628,928	$619,574	$579,898
Employee Benefits	$1,882,335	$1,931,803	$1,973,253	$2,026,563	$2,081,724	$2,153,930
Sub-Total Town	$8,255,460	$8,454,384	$8,645,811	$8,810,858	$8,992,036	$9,181,350
FCTS	$682,601	$709,905	$738,301	$767,833	$798,546	$830,488
GMRSD	$8,248,691	$8,454,908	$8,666,281	$8,882,938	$9,105,011	$9,332,736
Sub-Total Educ. Assmt.	$8,931,292	$9,164,813	$9,404,582	$9,650,771	$9,903,557	$10,163,224
WPCF Personnel	$363,441	$374,259	$382,808	$390,212	$398,050	$406,807
WPCF Expenses	$1,091,693	$1,124,444	$1,158,177	$1,192,922	$1,228,710	$1,265,571
HW Subs.	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959
Debt (actual)	$446,162	$428,541	$422,150	$329,356	$330,587	$299,481
Employee Benefits	$215,893	$221,991	$228,293	$234,809	$240,911	$249,748
Sub-Total WPCF	$2,172,148	$2,204,194	$2,246,387	$2,202,258	$2,253,217	$2,276,566
Airport	$45,924	$47,302	$48,721	$50,183	$51,688	$53,239

H1 SCENARIO

Health Insurance: 3%

Sub-Total Airport	$45,924	$47,302	$48,721	$50,183	$51,688	$53,239
Grand Total (Less Capital)	$19,404,824	$19,870,693	$20,345,501	$20,714,070	$21,200,498	$21,674,379

EXPENDITURE FORECAST
FY 15 - FY 20

CATEGORY	FY 15	FY16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20
Salaries/Wages	$3,668,785	$3,758,885	$3,849,525	$3,923,859	$3,992,285	$4,080,115
Expenses	$2,042,147	$2,103,411	$2,166,513	$2,231,508	$2,298,453	$2,367,407
Debt	$662,193	$660,285	$656,520	$628,928	$619,574	$579,898
Employee Benefits	$1,882,335	$1,950,229	$2,011,579	$2,086,354	$2,164,633	$2,272,865
Sub-Total Town	$8,255,460	$8,472,810	$8,684,137	$8,870,649	$9,074,945	$9,300,285
FCTS	$682,601	$709,905	$738,301	$767,833	$798,546	$830,488
GMRSD	$8,248,691	$8,454,908	$8,666,281	$8,882,938	$9,105,011	$9,332,736
Sub-Total Educ. Assmt.	$8,931,292	$9,164,813	$9,404,582	$9,650,771	$9,903,557	$10,163,224
WPCF Personnel	$363,441	$374,259	$382,808	$390,212	$398,050	$406,807
WPCF Expenses	$1,091,693	$1,124,444	$1,158,177	$1,192,922	$1,228,710	$1,265,571
HW Subs.	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959
Debt (actual)	$446,162	$428,541	$422,150	$329,356	$330,587	$299,481
Employee Benefits	$215,893	$224,671	$233,867	$243,505	$253,604	$265,426
Sub-Total WPCF	$2,172,148	$2,206,874	$2,251,961	$2,210,954	$2,265,910	$2,292,244
Airport	$45,924	$47,302	$48,721	$50,183	$51,688	$53,239

H2 Scenario

Health Insurance: 5%

Sub-Total Airport	$45,924	$47,302	$48,721	$50,183	$51,688	$53,239
Grand Total (Less Capital)	$19,404,824	$19,891,799	$20,389,401	$20,782,557	$21,296,100	$21,808,992

EXPENDITURE FORECAST
FY 15 - FY 20

CATEGORY	FY 15	FY16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20
Salaries/Wages	$3,668,785	$3,758,885	$3,849,525	$3,923,859	$3,992,285	$4,080,115
Expenses	$2,042,147	$2,103,411	$2,166,513	$2,231,508	$2,298,453	$2,367,407
Debt	$662,193	$660,285	$656,520	$628,928	$619,574	$579,898
Employee Benefits	$1,882,335	$1,987,081	$2,090,443	$2,212,945	$2,345,278	$2,556,353
Sub-Total Town	$8,255,460	$8,509,662	$8,763,001	$8,997,240	$9,255,590	$9,583,773
FCTS	$682,601	$709,905	$738,301	$767,833	$798,546	$830,488
GMRSD	$8,248,691	$8,454,908	$8,666,281	$8,882,938	$9,105,011	$9,332,736
Sub-Total Educ. Assmt.	$8,931,292	$9,164,813	$9,404,582	$9,650,771	$9,903,557	$10,163,224
WPCF Personnel	$363,441	$374,259	$382,808	$390,212	$398,050	$406,807
WPCF Expenses	$1,091,693	$1,124,444	$1,158,177	$1,192,922	$1,228,710	$1,265,571
HW Subs.	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959	$54,959
Debt (actual)	$446,162	$428,541	$422,150	$329,356	$330,587	$299,481
Employee Benefits	$215,893	$230,031	$245,337	$261,916	$279,877	$300,579
Sub-Total WPCF	$2,172,148	$2,212,234	$2,263,431	$2,229,365	$2,292,183	$2,327,397
Airport	$45,924	$47,302	$48,721	$50,183	$51,688	$53,239

H4 Scenario

Health Insurance=9%

Sub-Total Airport	$45,924	$47,302	$48,721	$50,183	$51,688	$53,239
Grand Total (Less Capital)	$19,404,824	$19,934,011	$20,479,735	$20,927,559	$21,503,018	$22,127,633