

Town of Gilmanton
Minutes of the 2017 Deliberative Session
Saturday, February 4, 2017

FIRST SESSION: (90 of 2,679 Voters = 3% Voter Turnout)

To the Inhabitants of the Town of Gilmanton in the County of Belknap, in said State, qualified to vote on Town Affairs:

You are hereby notified to meet at the Gilmanton School Gymnasium in the said Gilmanton, on Saturday, the 4th day of February 2017, at 10:00 a.m. This session shall consist of explanation, discussion and deliberation of the Warrant Articles numbered Two (2) through Twenty-Three (23).

The Warrant Articles may be amended subject to the following limitations:

- (a) Warrant Articles whose wording is prescribed by law shall not be amended, and
- (b) Warrant Articles that are amended shall be placed on the official ballot for a final vote on the main motion as amended.

Moderator Sisti called the First Deliberative Session for the Town of Gilmanton to order at 10:00 a.m. He asked all to stand and for Stan Bean to lead the pledge of allegiance, followed by a moment of silence to remember those who have passed over the year. Moderator Sisti explained the Articles will be addressed and moved in the order that they appear in the warrant; there will be a motion and a second followed by discussion. He implored the people to speak with respect and with politeness and encouraged residents to stand at the microphone, stating their names and stating their questions and/or concerns. He also noted that the Town's legal counsel was present for the meeting.

Mr. Sisti began with announcing, as a formality, that there were some scrivener errors to correct:

- *Warrant articles will be renumbered so that Zoning Amendment Article #6 will become Article #6-a and Article #7 becomes Article #6-b.*

- *Additionally, there was a scrivener's error with Article #6-b., Section A; it should read as follows: **A.** Amend Article IV, Table 1, by adding a new category **Accessory Dwelling Units** and allowing this use in all zoning districts as a **Permitted Use (P)** within the Village, Rural, Conservation, Lt. Business, Business and Residential Lake. **B.** Amend Article III, General Provisions Applicable to All Districts by adding a new Section **(R) Accessory Dwelling Units**. Add Purpose and Definition of an Accessory Dwelling Unity, along with requirements that must be adhered to.*
- *Additionally, Article #22, is a Petitioner scrivener's error; **\$100,00** should read: **\$100,000**. This article will also not have a recommendation by the Budget Committee or Board of Selectmen.*

- *Mr. Sisti stated that when we meet again, which will be the 14th of March, 2017, at the town hall for elections, there will be a slate of candidates that are running for the offices that will appear on the ballot as follows:*

Budget Committee, 2 – Three Year Term: Debra Fletcher, Brian Forst and Grace Sisti

Cemetery Trustee, 1 – Three Year Term: John Dickey

Library Trustee, 1 – Three Year Term: Martha Levesque

Selectman, 1 – Three Year Term: Marshall Bishop and Donald Guarino

Supervisor of the Checklist, 3 Positions: Michelle Descoteaux, Nancy MacArthur, Bambi Benton

Town Clerk/Tax Collector, 1 – Three Year Term: Debra Cornett

Town Treasurer, 1 – One Year Term: Joseph Haas and Glen Waring

Trustee of Trust Funds, 2 – Three Year Terms: John Dickey and Robert Richards

Mr. Sisti stated Article #1 will be the election of town officials and continued on to review the zoning articles two through six(b)

ZONING WARRANT ARTICLES

Article #2

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows?

Amend Article IX Board of Adjustment, B Special Exceptions 1, General Provisions to provide that Special Exceptions shall expire if the use or construction permitted is not substantially implemented within four (4) years of the date the Zoning Board of Adjustment approves the application.

Recommended by the Planning Board: **yes**

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #2 will appear on the ballot as written.

Article #3

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows?

Amend Article IV, Table One, Dwelling Two Family by making the use Permitted (P) in the Conservation Zone instead of by Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Recommended by the Planning Board: **yes**

Paula Gilman stated, "...She does not understand this."

Nate Abbott stated, "(he) was not representing the Board, only himself...there is a table of uses in our zoning ordinances which indicates what use may be done by a particular category of property and what permissions are required...so, one of the uses in that table is Dwelling Two Family, that's a building structure that two families reside in and as of now a Conditional Use Permit is required. A Conditional Use Permit is an approval granted by the Planning Board. So, anyone who wishes to build a two-family home in the conservation zone would have needed to go to the Planning Board and receive a Conditional Use Permit which involves application and review and approval by the Planning Board...It is permitted that this is not

required and the Building Inspector could issue a building permit without any application to the [Planning] Board.”

Paula Gilman stated that, “(she) was still confused it was (her) understanding that if it’s the conservation zone, it would be under a conservation easement and under a conservation easement, there is to be no development, you can do anything agricultural, farming, but in the conservation easement, you cannot develop and cannot mine; so, that’s where (her) confusion comes with this...”

No further discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #3 will appear on the ballot as written.

Article #4

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #3 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Amend Article IV, Table 1 by removing the size limit of office uses.

Recommended by the Planning Board: **yes**

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #4 will appear on the ballot as written.

Article #5

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Amend Article III, General Provisions Applicable to All Districts, A Sanitary Protection as follows:

Any Structure that is being improved, by adding a bedroom, or whenever a structure is being converted from a seasonal to a permanent use, shall have the existing septic system evaluated by a **NH Licensed Designer of Subsurface Disposal Systems** to determine the adequacy of the existing septic system for its current and /or proposed use.

Recommended by the Planning Board: **yes**

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #5 will appear on the ballot as written.

Article #6-a

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment # 5 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Amend Article IV Table 1 by amending the footnote for Accessory Building/Use as follows: In the Residential Lake District, **accessory** storage buildings are allowed when Accessory **to a principal use located** on an abutting lot, including a lot across the roadway.

Recommended by the Planning Board: **yes**

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #6-a will appear on the ballot as amended by scrivener's error.

Article #6-b

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #6 as proposed by the Gilmanton Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows?

- A. Amend Article IV, Table 1 by adding a new category **Accessory Dwelling Units** and allowing this use in all zoning districts **as a Permitted Use (P) within the** Village, Rural, Conservation, Lt. Business, Business and Residential Lake.
- B. Amend Article III, General Provisions Applicable to All Districts by adding a new Section R ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS. Add Purpose and Definition of an Accessory Dwelling Unit, along with requirements that must be adhered to.

Recommended by the Planning Board: **yes**

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #6-b will appear on the ballot as amended by scrivener's error.

Before reading the warrant articles where numbers are being moved, Mr. Sisti stated he will need a motion, and a second before discussion.

Moderator Sisti reminded the body of the process of RSA 40:4-a Secret Ballot vote: “At any meeting of a town with a population of more than 500, 5 voters who are present may make a request in writing prior to a vote by voice vote or division vote that the vote be taken by secret written ballot. Upon receiving such a request, the moderator shall conduct the vote by secret “yes-no” ballot.”

WARRANT ARTICLES

Article #7

Est. tax impact \$4.83

“Shall the Town of Gilmanton raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted within the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purpose set forth therein totaling three million six hundred fourteen thousand six hundred ninety-one dollars (\$3,614,691)? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be three million six hundred forty nine thousand three hundred ninety three dollars (\$3,649,393) which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting in accordance with RSA 40:13,X and XV1 to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.”

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #7 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$3,614,691; seconded by Betty Ann Abbott.

Chief Joseph Hempel moved to amend to increase Article #7 by \$5,000 to \$3,619,691; seconded by Michael Jean.

Chief Hempel explained that, “...the Budget Committee had removed \$5,000 from the fire department’s budget...from the part-time account...(he) was not present on Super Saturday...unfortunately, not able to make it that Saturday and first one he’s missed...current line in budget is salary line 120...last four or five years it’s been funded at \$29,000...requested that same amount of funding this year. The Budget Committee made a motion to cut that by

\$5,000 for a total of \$24,000.” He wanted to explain that, “The part-time funds are two per diem shifts per week; it also funds vacation time for staff replacement and funds sick time for staff replacement...not certain why the Budget Committee decided to cut it because he was not there...his inkling was that they underspent that line this year and maybe saw the opportunity to make that cut. The reason that that line was not expended fully was they have some new staff members; vacation time and sick time were not taken by those members, which created less of an expenditure. We would like to remain at that \$29,000, as we have for the past four or five years, so that they have that money available to move forward with our per diem employees. That’s our rationale for that and we appreciate your support on that.”

Paula Gilman states that her question is in regard to the \$4.83 tax impact. She wanted to know if the taxes go up by that much?

Brian Forst replied, “In answer to your question, that is estimated tax that impacts total. That would be the estimated total of your town portion on your tax bill for 2017.”

Moderator Sisti stated, “I think for clarification, that’s not an increase, that’s a flat total that would be set for the town portion, per thousand.”

Brian Forst states further, “...the estimated tax impact of \$4.83 is a calculation, done by the Budget Committee, that includes the expenditures in this budget, the estimated revenues for 2017, taken against these expenditures, is how we come up with that number. The \$4.83 is an estimate of your tax rate for 2017. It’s not anything other than that. But that is the total Town portion of your tax rate, estimated by the Budget Committee for 2017. The current tax rate, I believe, is a little bit less than that.”

Moderator Sisti stated, “For clarification, the current tax rate is \$4.23. We have a 60-cent bump up with this budget.”

Paula Gilman asks, “So if this article is less than what was budgeted last year, why would the tax rate go up?”

Mr. Forst wants to make sure he’s addressing the right thing. He asks Ms. Gilman if she’s, “...referring to the default budget verse the proposed budget and you do understand that the default budget also contains contractual agreements. It says right in there that the default budget is the prior year’s budget plus any contractual agreements. This year’s budget is the proposed budget, it also includes debt service, but it does not include contractual agreements and then there is the fact that we use an anticipated revenue number, which is where a lot of this contentiousness about the tax rate comes from is; if the wrong inputs are put into deriving your tax rate, then your tax rate winds up being either inflated or under-rated and this is an estimate done by the Budget Committee. This is not what your tax rate may end up being. This is an estimate that we gave with the best information put forth to us. Some of this information we really had to work to get numbers that we could put our teeth on. Does that make sense?”

Paula Gilman stated, “Yes.”

Duncan Geddes asks the Budget Committee for their explanation for the cut.

Brian Forst responds, "...In relation to this \$5,000 amount that the Budget Committee removed from this line in the part-time pay, we looked at history on this line, it's been budgeted at \$29,000 and the history was in 2015, the actual amount spent was \$22,487. Year to date in 2016, which understand, numbers have been added to these numbers since we got them, but the actual, when we got them was at \$18,705. All the Budget Committee was trying to do was, and we're not targeting any individual department head, but we're trying to give you the tightest budget we can give you. So, when we looked at these numbers and said we think there's room, we voted, we agreed to remove \$5,000, it's not a personal...it's a removal of \$5,000 from a \$3,649,000 budget. We were trying to trim any place we thought we could. I would like you all to understand that as you see what you have presented before you today, it says that it is recommended by the Board of Selectmen and it is recommended by the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee went through their process on the budget that was recommended, we removed \$23,895 in an eight and a half to nine-hour session. After we removed that money, the Selectmen looked at what we had done and said, 'We can live with that' and changed their recommendation to match ours, which is good for conducive government...what you don't see is the time we spent to remove this \$23,895, it's not a big amount of money; but it's what we felt, as a Budget Committee, that we could take out of this budget and still have a working budget..."

Mr. Geddes thanked Mr. Forst for the explanation and thanked them all for their time and efforts.

No further discussion.

Moderator Sisti called the amendment to a voice vote.

Amendment passes by voice vote; Article #7 is adopted as amended to \$3,619,691 and will appear on the ballot as amended.

Article #8

Est. tax impact \$0.00

To see if the Town will raise and appropriate the sum of forty-eight thousand seven hundred fifty dollars (\$48,750) to purchase and equip a new Forestry Truck vehicle and Fire Pump Skid Unit and further to fund this appropriation by withdrawing forty-eight thousand seven hundred fifty dollars (\$48,750) from the previously established Fire Department Forestry Vehicle Replacement Capital Reserve Fund.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #8 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$48,750; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #8 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$48,750, as written.

Article #9

Est. tax impact \$0.04

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of seventeen thousand five hundred dollars (\$17,500) to be deposited in the Self Contained Breathing Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund established in 2011.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #9 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$17,500; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #9 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$17,500, as written.

Article #10

Est. tax impact \$0.02

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of eight thousand dollars (\$8,000) to be deposited in the Fire Radio Capital Reserve Fund established in 2015.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #10 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$8,000; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #10 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$8,000, as written.

Article #11

Est. tax impact \$0.08

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of thirty-four thousand dollars (\$34,000) for the purchase of two (2) “Power Cots” for the Fire Rescue Ambulances.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #11 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$34,000; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #11 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$34,000, as written.

Article #12

Est. tax impact \$0.09

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of forty-two thousand five hundred dollars (\$42,500) to purchase and equip a new Police cruiser.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #12 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$42,500; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #12 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$42,500, as written.

Article #13

Est. tax impact \$0.13

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000) to be deposited in the Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund Established in 2006.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #13 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$60,000; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #13 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$60,000, as written.

Article #14

Est. tax impact \$0.04

To see if the Town will vote to establish a Capital Reserve Fund under the provisions of RSA 35:1 for the purpose of purchasing Computer Technology Upgrades and to raise and appropriate the sum of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) to be deposited in this fund and appoint the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend (Majority Vote Required)

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **no**

There was a motion to move Article #14 by Michael Jean in the amount of \$20,000; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

Richard de Seve asks the Budget Committee why they did not recommend this article.

Brian Forst responded, "...The Budget Committee did not recommend this article, it's a new capital reserve, we're seeing a huge increase in the budgetary numbers for computer related expenses in computer technology. We felt, as a Budget Committee, that we are supporting those budgetary increases. This is going to add another area where the Board of Selectmen are going to have \$20,000 more dollars available for the computer technology budget to be expended at their discretion, with no master plan on the expending of money for computer technology. I'd like you to understand that there's \$72,000 already in the budget being expended on computer technology. We, as a Budget Committee, didn't feel at this time we were comfortable with this move..."

No further Discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #14 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$20,000 as written.

Article #15

To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to establish or amend fees, as provided in RSA 41:9-a. In accordance with that statute the Board of Selectmen shall hold a public hearing with notice posted at least 7 days in advance, prior to amending or establishing any such fees.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #15 by Michael Jean, as written; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #15 will appear on the ballot, as written.

Article #16

Est. tax impact \$0.11

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) to be deposited in the Bridge Capital Reserve Fund established in 1995.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #16 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$50,000; seconded by Michael Jean.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #16 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$50,000, as written.

Article #17

Est. tax impact \$0.06

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of twenty-six thousand two hundred ten dollars (\$26,210) to remove, repair and replace the Playground at Crystal Lake Park in order to conform to safety and liability standards.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #17 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$26,210; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #17 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$26,210, as written.

Article #18

Est. tax impact \$0.01

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of five thousand four hundred twenty-two dollars (\$5,422) to install a Playground outside the Academy Building.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #18 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$5,422; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #18 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$5,422, as written.

Article #19

Est. tax impact \$0.05

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of twenty-four thousand dollars (\$24,000) for the Statistical Update of all properties to be deposited into the Revaluation Assessment Update Capital Reserve Fund.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #19 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$24,000; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #19 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$24,000, as written.

Article #20

Est. tax impact \$0.00

To see if the Town will raise and appropriate the sum of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) to fund Milfoil treatment for the lakes of Gilmanton.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

Recommended by the Budget Committee: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #20 by Brian Forst in the amount of \$1,000; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

There was no discussion.

Moderator Sisti states Article #20 will appear on the ballot in the amount of \$1,000, as written.

Article #21

To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Selectmen to sell the following properties in the Town of Gilmanton to be sold at public auction:

1. Map 119 Lot 110 - Peach Ave
2. Map 119 Lot 162 - Hemlock Dr
3. Map 120 Lot 004 - 25 Orange Ave
4. Map 122 Lot 035 - Fox Dr
5. Map 122 Lot 046 - 62 Fox Dr
6. Map 122 Lot 068 - Hemlock Dr
7. Map 130 Lot 063 - Cedar Dr

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: **yes**

There was a motion to move Article #21 by Michael Jean, as written; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

Richard de Seve states, "...I am also Vice-chair of the Conservation Commission...while we don't have any particular opposition to putting these lots up for auction, we're always concerned that some of these lots are so small, they are unbuildable. We're concerned that people are going to bid on them at auction thinking they can actually build on these lots...we would actually prefer to see them auctioned first to the abutters to make their non-compliant lots less non-conforming..."

Moderator Sisti states Article #21 will appear on the ballot, as written.

Article #22 (By Petition)

Shall we modify the elderly exemptions from property tax under the provisions of RSA 72:39-b in the Town of Gilmanton based on assessed value, for qualified taxpayers, to be as follows: For a person 65 years of age up to 75 years, Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$80,000.00); for a person 75 years of age up to 80 years, One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000); for a person 80 years of age or older One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000.00). To qualify, the person must have been a New Hampshire resident for at least three years; own the real estate individually or jointly, or if the real estate is owned by such person's spouse, they must have been married for at least five consecutive years. In addition the taxpayer

must have a net income of less than Twenty Seven Thousand Dollars (\$27,000) or, if married, a combined income of less than Forty Thousand Dollars (\$40,000) and own net assets not in excess of One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000) excluding the value of the person`s residence.

There was a motion to move Article #22 by Michael Jean, as written and amended by scrivener`s error (\$100,000), otherwise as written; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

Mr. Barlik, author of the petition gave his explanation for this petitioned article as follows: “I did this as a result of doing some investigative work as to what this town does as far as getting an exemption from taxes, not entirely, but a relief of some sort for seniors...I don`t want to see the seniors driven out with the tax burden so high that they have to sell...

In 1991, which was twenty-six years ago, the town adopted RSA 72:39 with a set of criteria for both eligibility and amount of tax relief by age bracket. I was unable to discover the source of the criteria. It passed by a five to one margin.

In 2004, thirteen years ago, the town passed a petition article to modify the various criteria. Again, I was also unable to find the basis for those changes, but was able to compare the increase of the modification by category. Maximum net income allowable, including Social Security, was changed for a single person by 100% to \$20,000 and for a couple by 150% to \$30,000. Maximum net assets, less residence, was changed by 50% to \$75,000. The amount of exemption was for 65-75 increased by 200% to \$60,000; 75-80 increased by 170% to 80,000; and 80 plus increased by 150% to \$100,000. This is the criteria currently in use by the town.

I think we can all agree that there have been considerable economic changes over the last thirteen years and I felt that an upgrade in the criteria should be made. For the basis of the modification I chose a comparison of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), for the Northeast Region, from March of 2004 to March of 2016. A comparison of the CPI is usually considered the amount of inflation for all goods and services. My calculation showed that there has been at least a 35% increase in the cost of living since the last time the modification was made. The cost of property, which is not included in the CPI, has definitely increased also but is not as easy to define. Therefore, I made some modest estimates for the increase in the criteria for net assets and amount of real estate exemptions. The changes are net income single, adjusted 35%; married, adjusted 33%; net assets adjusted 60%; exemptions 65-75 adjusted 33%; 75-80 adjusted 25%; 80 plus adjusted 20%. I believe these modifications are reasonable. I hope you concur...”

“...Given what we`ve gone through economically in this country, we are doing a lot to drive our seniors out and I would point out that in all of our ten-year plans, one of the things the community has always responded to is the open spaces. Well, a lot of grey-haired people own those open spaces and if they can`t pay the taxes on them, they`re going to have to sell and you know who`s going to buy them; people who will use them for developing...I urge you to give some help to the seniors and point out that the law, the RSA, says that once these newer

numbers are established, they cannot be changed for the next five years. So, there is a five-year moratorium on these numbers...”

Alec Bass is curious and maybe is state law but wants to know if there's known language that protects Gilmanton residents instead of the state residents...is there state law to support that...where you need to be a New Hampshire resident for three years to qualify...curious if that's something we created or is that something we created for a Gilmanton resident of three years?

Mr. Barlik replied that, “It's state law and actually, it used to be five years, but the state modified it to three years that you have to be a New Hampshire resident.”

Steve Bedard asks clarification as to why there was a recommendation in support of this article from the Budget Committee.

Brian Forst explained, “...when we held our Super Saturday we did attach our recommendations to the petitioned warrant articles and when the Moderator removed those, I wasn't sure whether that was something that had been investigated legally and we were not supposed to make recommendations, so I don't know. I do know that in our meeting we posted a recommendation and our concern with this particular article was not the nature of the article, or the numbers presented in the article. We, as a committee, were interested in the tax impact of this article, which was very hard to calculate...As a personal resident of this town, when I was a Selectman between 2005 and 2008, I was concerned with this issue. I was glad to see that someone has brought this issue forward to address it. I think the taxation of elderly is a very concerning issue as people age and they try to keep up with their taxes that we see diligently increase every year, this is an issue that we all need to address and I don't think is an unreasonable request.”

John Weston had question as to whether this was based on the total income on the household or on the husband and wife.

Mr. Barlik responded, “...basically the way the law is written and (he) understands it, it is the total income of the household. So, for instance, if you had a small business going on in there, that income would be in there, investments that you may have, that all has got to be in there. The one thing that makes this particular exemption different than the one that's used for school taxes is, that in this one, they must include when they calculate the income, they must include your social security income and if it's a couple, it's combined; if it's a single person, it's just what they get in total...that's just the way the law's written.”

Mr. Weston asked, “...if you had a child living in the household would have to include any income for that child as well?”

Mr. Barlik did not believe so.

Moderator Sisti states Article #22 will appear on the ballot, as written, by petition, with no recommendations by the Budget Committee or Board of Selectmen.

Article #23 (By Petition)

Est. tax impact \$0.11

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Forty-Eight Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$48,500) for partial funding of operating expenses of the Gilmanton Year-Round Library for 2017.

Recommendation BC: yes
Recommendation BOS yes

There was a motion to move Article #23, as petitioned, by Michael Jean in the amount of \$48,500; seconded by Stephen McWhinnie.

Brian Forst stated that on Super Saturday, the Budget Committee did make a recommendation on this Article.

Moderator Sisti withdrew what he said of having no recommendation and that there was a recommendation from the Budget Committee and Board of Selectmen on this article.

Moderator Sisti noted that there is a recommendation for this Article in the affirmative from the Budget Committee and the Board of Selectmen.

Cathy Austin wanted to know if there will be recommendations from the Budget Committee and the Board of Selectmen for this article on the ballot.

Moderator Sisti stated there will be.

Moderator Sisti states Article #23 will appear on the ballot, by petition, in the amount of \$48,500, as written.

Brian Forst asks, "...everyone to take a minute to recognize a man that has contributed a lot to this Town. He has spent many years on the Budget Committee as Chairman and invested a lot of time on the CIP. A few years ago, he stepped down to retire and we dragged him back. He is a great wealth of knowledge and helped to get us to where we are. His presence will be missed on the Board as Stan has decided he can no longer hold his position on the Committee, he's stepping down this year and we wish him well. It would be greatly appreciated to recognize Stan for all of his efforts."

Richard de Seve asks if we would indulge him as he thought he was on time for the meeting and when he came we were discussing Article #5 and he had a question.

Mr. Sisti said we've already gone through that Article, but if the body will indulge, we will let him ask his question. The people responded in the affirmative.

Mr. de Seve stated that Article # 5 states, "The article talks about adding a bedroom, or whenever a structure is being converted from a seasonal to a permanent use, having the existing septic system evaluated by a NH Licensed Designer of Subsurface Disposal Systems to determine the adequacy of the existing septic system for its current and/or proposed use. (He) thinks that it creates some confusion because the fact is that that's not all that somebody has to do when they add a bedroom or expand for permanent use, which would increase the loading on the septic system. (He's) concerned, because they would still have to go to the State of New Hampshire and submit a new plan for the septic when they do that...concerned that this might lead someone to believe that all they have to do is get a NH Licensed Designer to see if the current system is working and that's all they'd have to do. If there's some kind of explanation from someone on the Planning Board, if not, it's just going to make it more complicated, there is more to do..."

No further discussion on Article #5.

Moderator Sisti reminded everyone that this was "Round One" and "Round Two" was coming up on Tuesday, March 14, 2017, voting at the Academy from 7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m.

He stated he hoped to see everyone next week on Saturday February 11th for the School Deliberative Session.

Mr. Sisti recessed the meeting until March 14, 2017 at 7:00 a.m. and adjourned the First Deliberative Session at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Debra A. Cornett
Town Clerk/Tax Collector

A True Copy Attest