The inhabitants of the Town of Gilmanton in the County of Belknap in the state of New Hampshire qualified to vote in Town affairs are hereby notified that the two phases of the Annual Town Meeting will be held as follows:

**First Session of Annual Meeting (Deliberative Session):**

- **Date:** Wednesday, February 5, 2020 (and Thursday, February 6, 2020 if needed)
- **Time:** 5:00 PM (6:00 PM on February 6, 2020 if needed)
- **Location:** Gilmanton Elementary School – 1386 NH Rt 140, Gilmanton, NH
- **Details:** School deliberative Session first, then Town

**Second Session of Annual Meeting (Official Ballot Voting)**

- **Date:** Tuesday, March 10, 2020
- **Time:** 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM
- **Location:** Academy Building – 503 Province Rd, Gilmanton NH
- **Details:** Voting is upstairs in the Auditorium

**GOVERNING BODY CERTIFICATION**

We certify and attest that on or before January 27, 2020, a true and attested copy of this document was posted at the place of meeting and at the Gilmanton Academy Town Office, the Gilmanton Corners Post Office and the Gilmanton Iron Works Post Office and that an original was delivered to the Town Clerk/Tax Collector.

MARSHALL E. BISHOP  CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF SELECTMEN

MICHAEL J. WILSON  SELECTMAN

MARK E. WARREN  SELECTMAN
Deliberative Session opens at 5:35 pm following the School Session. Moderator Mark Sisti begins by reading the filing positions and who filed for what.

Article 01  Election of Town Offices

**BUDGET COMMITTEE**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **TWO:**

- BRIAN FORST
- GRACE SISTI

**CEMETERY TRUSTEE**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- JOHN L. DICKEY

**LIBRARY TRUSTEE**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- BARBARA E. SWANSON

**MODERATOR**

TWO YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- MARK L. SISTI

**PLANNING BOARD**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **TWO:**

- WILLIAM “BILL” MAHONEY III
- GARETH “MARTY” MARTINDALE
- VINCENZO SISTI
- ISRAEL WILLARD

**SELECTMAN**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- VINCENT “VINNIE” BAIOCCHETTI
- MARSHALL BISHOP
- EVAN COLLINS

**SUPERVISOR OF THE CHECKLIST**

SIX YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

(VACANT)

**SUPERVISOR OF THE CHECKLIST**

TWO YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- KELLY G. MCADAM

**TOWN CLERK / TAX COLLECTOR**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- Maura Thomas

**TRUSTEE OF TRUST FUNDS**

THREE YEARS  VOTE FOR **ONE:**

- TIMOTHY PEASE

The Moderator states he will go over each warrant article, and also states warrant articles for zoning are unable to be amended and will hit the ballot the way they are written tonight. Asks the public if they would prefer them read out loud, and it is decided that the public will be given time to read them and then allow for questions or clarifications. Regular warrant articles will be read in full.
Article 02  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #1

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 as proposed by the Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: To see if the town will amend Article IV, Table 1 by allowing, by Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Housing for Older Persons in the Village, Rural, Conservation, Lt. Business, Business zoning districts. In addition, by adding a new Article XVIII Housing for Older Persons. This article is adopted pursuant to the authority and provisions of RSA 674:21 Innovative Land Use Controls. In administering this Innovative Land Use Control ordinance, the Planning Board shall enjoy the authority to grant conditional use permits and waivers from specific requirements of this Article if and when an applicant is able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board that granting of such waiver(s) would not compromise achievement of the stated purpose and intent of this Ordinance. The requirements in this Section have been established for the purpose of encouraging the construction of Housing for Older Persons in the Town of Gilmanton. The intent is to provide for such housing by the provision of a Conditional Use Permit to allow for relief from the otherwise applicable density requirements while complying with all applicable state and federal laws with respect to such housing, and at the same time, ensuring compliance with local planning standards, land use policies, good building design, and the requirements for the health, safety, and general welfare of all the inhabitants of the Town. Such housing shall be limited to household with at least one person age 55 or older. All sites shall have at least 30% open space.

Recommended by the Planning Board: Yes

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 03  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #2

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 as proposed by the Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: to see if the town will amend Article IV, Table 1: The Table of Uses? The amendments are indicated with a strikethrough with the additions in italics.

Note: CUP= Conditional Use Permit, E= Special Exception, N= Not Permitted, P= Permitted

Recommended by the Planning Board: Yes

Discussion:

Nancy Mitchell Durrell Mountain Rd – stated that she was disappointed that planning has removed decision making from zoning to planning – instead of special exceptions it is now a current use permit
Stephen Hopkins Province Rd – asks to explain why articles are being loosened - what is impetus and why do we feel we need to loosen the restrictions and why was it introduced.

Bre Daigneault, Planning Administrator – planning board loosened to allow for light business as well as to help keep the area rural

Zannah Richards- States she serves on zoning board - adds that through process of making changes to the permit use table felt along the way blindsided and had no chance or opportunity to talk about the changes, other than most recent meeting. States she is not happy with change of conditional use permits which occur on changes and that there are 10 changes to light business district (rt 106), but that the district from corners to dump would also fall under light business district. States again that she is not thrilled on behalf of zoning and is not in support of this.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 04  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #4

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4 as proposed by the Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: to see if the town will amend Article VI.D:1 (Manufactured Housing Continued: Storage and Use of Recreational Vehicles) to allow up to two (2) recreational vehicles owned by the resident on his/her primary residential property or abutting property?

Recommended by the Planning Board: Yes

Discussion:

Stephen Hopkins – requests information on more than one, is there some kind of cap?

Bre Daigneault, Planning Administrator – currently allows for only one – this change would allow up to two recreational vehicles

Johnna McKenna – states that she has a printout from the town website that says we allow up to three recreational vehicles, but the handout today says two

Patrick Boré – The revised guide was posted yesterday to website, and that the current version in hand is correct

Article will appear on ballot as written.
Article 05  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #5

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #5 as proposed by the Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: to see if the town will amend Article VI.D:2, regulating the permitting period of recreational vehicles, from 120 days annually to commencing from May 15th through November 1st of each year?

Recommended by the Planning Board: Yes

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 06  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #6

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #6 as proposed by the Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: to see if the town will amend Article XVI the definition of "Storage Building- Non Commercial" to include a lessee as user for private storage or agricultural use?

Recommended by the Planning Board: Yes

Discussion:

Robert Carpenter, High St – Is there any size limitation on this non-commercial storage building, I don't see anything listed here, I didn't know if there was something that would permit someone from building a 50,000 sq ft barn and using that as a warehouse.

Bre Daigneault – I don't have the full ordinances in front of me right now, but there is a definition for a commercial warehouse that would differ from a non-commercial structure.

Robert Carpenter - Is there a size limitation?

Bre Daigneault - I don't know offhand, to be honest with you, if there is a size limitation, I would have to review the ordinances again and I don't have them with me.

Robert Carpenter - Thank you.

Zannah Richards - Not a question, but just a kind of informational – this storage building is also a change in the permitted use – we had a good discussion about this at the meeting open to the public reviewing these, and as it currently stands right now, if you own a piece of land and you want to put a storage building on it, you can’t do it. You can’t put a barn up without a septic and a well; we don’t allow it as far as zoning. So, not only is this allowing us to put a building on a piece of land, but it is changing now the use of land that we will be able to put storage units, barns, etc. that people can
store things. The question that I think I ask was, OK I have a piece of land and I want
to put a barn up so I can now rent it to somebody else to use it, and that was a twofold
change. Just want to bring that up.

Robert Carpenter – Similar to article one - which gives an area of where we can put an
everly living / 55 +, are there any limitations on where buildings can be placed (village,
light industrial, etc. in other articles) any limitation on where we can put these storage
building

Bre Daigneault – Storage buildings, yes. If you look on the table of uses on page
six, hard to tell with in black and white but in italics closer to the bottom, about
three quarters down, it does add storage building, non-commercial, and shows
where they are allowed. Special exception, village zone, permitted in rural, light
business, business zone, not permitted in conservation, residential, light zones.

Brian Forst Province Rd – Just wants to pose a question- if article three does not pass
and article six was to pass, how are you going to regulate this article.

Bre Daigneault – So that is part of the problem. Currently there is a definition for
storage building non-commercial in our ordinances. There is nothing on the table
of uses for it, so the definition is there and the intent of amendment 6 was to add
that lease could be a user of such a storage building. If you had a garage on your
vacant land, you could rent it for someone to put a car in there. That was one of
the examples given. That definition already exists, that an owner is already
allowed to have it, but when you go to the table of uses it it’s not there, so it’s no
you can’t have it.

Brian Forst - So this brings the second part of my question: having grown up a
farm boy here in Gilmanton, I think I understood Ms. Richards to say that a
farmer can’t build a barn on his property under our current zoning?

Bre Daigneault - The way it is currently stated is that if they have a vacant parcel
of land, not contiguous with their residential property, they cannot build a barn it.

Brian Forst - Non-contiguous with their residence, so if their residence is their
farm, they can build a barn

Bre Daigneault - Sure. If they own a vacant parcel of land next door to their
home, the property lines are touching, they can build on that vacant parcel. If the
primary residence does not touch that vacant parcel, they cannot build on it.

Brian Forst - Thank you.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 07  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #7

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #7 as proposed by the Planning
Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: to see if the town will amend Article
XVI by adding a definition of "Camp for Children" as a supervised program for children or teenagers conducted for the purpose of educational, athletic, or cultural development for overnight campers. Housing shall consist of tents, cabins or the like.

**No discussion**

Article will appear on ballot as written.

---

### Article 08  Zoning Ordinance Amendment #8

Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment #8 as proposed by the Planning Board for the town Zoning Ordinance as follows: to see if the town will amend Article XVI by replacing the definition of "Excavation" (the digging of any type) with "Earth Excavation" to mean the commercial taking of sand, gravel, rock, soil or construction aggregate produced by quarrying, crushing or any other mining activity?

Recommended by the Planning Board: Yes

**No discussion**

Article will appear on ballot as written.

---

### Article 10  Operating Budget

**Article 10: Operating Budget**

Est. tax impact $4.05

Shall the Town 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 Four Million, Two Hundred and Sixty-Six Thousand, Eight-hundred and Ninety-One Dollars ($4,266,891)? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be Four Million, Eleven Thousand, One Hundred and Sixteen Dollars ($4,011,116) 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 XVI to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

**Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion to accept as read, article ten**

**Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds**
**Article 11** Amend purpose of Replace Ambulance Vehicles CRF

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town will vote to change the purpose of the existing Replace Ambulance Vehicles Capital Reserve Fund established in 2001 as the Replace Ambulance 9A1 Capital Reserve Fund, and modified in 2003, to allow for the refurbishment, repair, replacement, and purchase of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Vehicles. This Article 11 requires a two-thirds (2/3) majority vote to pass.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

**Discussion:**

Brian Forst - States that the budget committee feels this is an important article, but they do not recommend on non-monetary articles, however due to some verbiage we have to change the name of our capital reserve so that this year in an article we are asking for monies to refurbish by putting a new chassis on the existing ambulance. This will save the town in the area of 150,000 dollars. We can't use the money in the fund under the current verbiage. It is very important that this article passes because otherwise we have to raise by taxation the money to refurbish the ambulance with a new power chassis which is a move that the fire chief has made that instead of buying a brand new ambulance every time, we take the box off the back and put it on a new chassis and we save tax dollars. However, the way this was established, we can't currently use the money in this account. Very important that we let everybody know they need to vote yes.

**Article will appear on ballot as written.**

**Article 12** Refurbish/Remount Ambulance A1

Est. tax impact $0.035

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One-Hundred and Twenty-Nine Thousand Dollars ($129,000) to refurbish and remount the Fire
Department A1 ambulance with a new chassis. Further, if the Town Meeting votes “Yes” on Article 11, to vote to partially fund this appropriation by withdrawing One Hundred and Ten Thousand Dollars ($110,000) from the Replacement Ambulance Vehicles Capital Reserve Fund with the remaining balance of Nineteen Thousand Dollars ($19,000) to come from taxation. If the Town Meeting votes “No” on Article 11, to vote to fund the entirety of this appropriation ($129,000) through taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

Discussion:

Moderator states discussion was heard previously

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 13  Add to ETF and CRF

Est. tax impact $ 0.413

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Two-hundred and Eighty-Five Thousand Dollars ($285,000) to be deposited in the previously established Non-Capital Expendable Trust Fund (ETF) and Capital Reserve (CRF) Funds identified below. This sum to come from taxation.

CRF Recycling Equipment $10,000
ETF Court Cases $70,000
CRF Revaluation $15,000
CRF Refurbish/Replace Fire Truck $100,000
CRF Highway Equipment $70,000
ETF Welfare $20,000

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

Discussion:

Patrick Boré, Town Administrator – I would like to propose a wording amendment to the article 13, it is a clarifying wording. It would be to ADD before “ETF” the wording “expendable trust fund”.

Moderator – For clarification purposes, before ETF unambiguously to add expendable trust fund, to mean exactly what it says, is that correct?

Patrick Boré – Yes, that is correct.

Moderator – is there a second?

Michael Wilson seconds

No further discussion, Moderator calls for all those in favor of amendment to please indicate by stating “aye” - none spoke opposed, Moderator states “ayes” have it.

The motion for amendment passed and the article will appear on ballot as amended.

Article 14  Purchase Police Cruiser

Est. tax impact $ 0.044

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Forty-Eight Thousand and Twenty-Two Dollars ($48,022) to purchase, equip and prepare for service a new PD cruiser and further to partially fund this appropriation by withdrawing Twenty-Four Thousand, Three Hundred and Eighty-Seven Dollars ($24,387) from the Police Outside Detail Revolving Fund established in 2015 and modified in 2018, the remaining sum of Twenty-Three Thousand, Six Hundred and Thirty-Five Dollars (23,635) to come from taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.
Article 15  Purchase Highway Pickup Truck & Trailer

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Thirty Seven Thousand Dollars ($37,000) to purchase a new pickup truck, equipped with a plow and an enclosed trailer for the Highway Department, and to fund this appropriation by withdrawing Thirty Seven Thousand Dollars ($37,000) from the Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund established in 2006. This Article is contingent upon the Town Meeting approving the Operating Budget under Article 10; if the Town Meeting votes for the Default Budget under Article 10, this Article shall be null and void.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 16  Academy Building, Paving

Est. tax impact $0.067

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Ninety Eight Thousand, Three Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($98,350) to have the Academy Building driveway and parking lot repaved and to fund this appropriation by authorizing the Board of Selectmen to withdraw Nineteen Thousand Dollars ($19,000) from the Paving Town Parking Lots and Driveways Capital Reserve Fund established in 2006, and to further authorize the Board of Selectmen to expend Forty-Three Thousand, One Hundred and Ninety-Seven Dollars ($43,197) anticipated to be received by the State of NH Payment - Municipal Aid, with the remaining balance of Thirty Six Thousand, One Hundred and Fifty-Three Dollars ($36,153) to come from taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 17  Establish Contingency Fund

Est. tax impact $0.08

To see if the town will vote to establish a contingency fund for the current year for unanticipated expenses that may arise and further to raise and appropriate Forty-Three Thousand, One-Hundred and Ninety-Seven Dollars ($43,197) to put in the fund. This sum to come from the State Municipal Aid. Any appropriation left in the fund at the end of the year will lapse to the general fund. If the Town Meeting votes “Yes” on Article 16, this Article shall be null and void.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Michael Wilson motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 18  Academy Building Roof Replace

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Thirty-Three Thousand, Six Hundred and Thirty Dollars ($33,630) to have the Academy Building roof replaced and to fund this appropriation by authorizing the Board of Selectmen to withdraw Thirty-Three Thousand, Six Hundred and Thirty Dollars ($33,630) from the Town Roofs Capital Reserve Fund established in 2006.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 19  Iron Works Fire Department Lease Agreement

Est. tax impact $ 0.00

To see if the Town will authorize the Board of Selectmen to enter into a 10-year Lease Agreement extension with the Gilmanton Fire Association for the continued use and occupancy of the Iron Works Fire Station located at 1824 NH Route 140, Gilmanton IW, NH 03837 (Tax Map 115, Lot 23) by the Gilmanton Fire Department or such other Departments as authorized by the Board of Selectmen, for rent in the amount of $1 for the 10-year term of the lease.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Michael Wilson motions to accept, Marshall Bishop seconds

Discussion:

Robert Carpenter, High St. – Just a clarifying question: in the event the town votes no, it talks about the Fire Department’s search relocation, don’t we already have a second location for the Fire Department in the event that they vote no?

Patrick Boré – So this is clearly an option, although we probably all know that the building is not big enough to hold all vehicles that we have.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 20  IW Fire Roof Replacement

Est. tax impact $0.041

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Thirty Thousand Dollars ($30,000) to replace the roof of the Gilmanton Iron Works Fire Station and further to partially fund this appropriation by withdrawing Seven Thousand Nine Hundred Dollars ($7,900) from the Fire Dept. Plant Maintenance Non-Capital Reserve Fund established in 2008, with the remaining balance of Twenty-Two Thousand and
One Hundred Dollars ($22,100) to come from taxation. This Article is contingent upon
the Town Meeting voting “Yes” on Article 19 voted; if the Town Meeting votes “No” on
Article 19, this Article shall be null and void.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion
Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 21 Extrication Tool Set

Est. tax impact $0.032

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Nineteen Thousand
Dollars ($19,000) to purchase a new battery-powered extrication tool set for
ambulance, with Two Thousand Dollars ($2,000) coming from the Tools and
Equipment Non-Capital Reserve Fund established in 2001, the remaining balance of
Seventeen Thousand Dollars ($17,000) to come from taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion
Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 22 Purchase Highway Sander

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Fourteen Thousand,
Five Hundred Dollars ($14,500) to purchase a new sander for the Highway Department
and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to fund this appropriation from the Highway
Equipment Capital Reserve Fund established in 2006.
Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

Discussion:

Robert Carpenter - In the public hearing they said this was purchased for our vendors I guess, to use our equipment purchased by the town, is there any further explanation on if this is a cost effective measure and what the liability was for us allowing vendors to use our equipment?

Patrick Boré – So, actually, what you’re talking about is the next article, this article is to equip a town owned truck.

Robert Carpenter – I thought the two went together – I thought that in the public hearing the article 22 the sander and article 23, the two new plows were both purchased for vendors to use.

Patrick Boré – No. Not the sander.

Robert Carpenter – Thank you.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 23  Purchase 2 Highway Plows

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of ZERO Eleven Thousand, One Hundred and Two Dollars ($11,102) to purchase two new plows for the Highway Department, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to fund this appropriation from the Highway Equipment Capital Reserve Fund established in 2006.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: No
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Brian Forst motions to move this article for discussion purposes, Joanne Melle seconds

Moderator opens for discussion
Discussion:

Robert Carpenter – So I guess my question for this one is, is this a cost-effective measure, for the town to purchase plows for vendors to use and what is the liability that we incur on that?

Brian Forst – OK, so because I opened this discussion, I wish to bring a couple points up. When the Budget committee looked over these warrant articles, I asked the question – “who was using this equipment?” and it opened a whole new docket of conversation. We were told that the new sander is going in the six-wheeler that town owns; that is why we supported article 22. On Article 23, when we voted, the Selectmen were in support of this article. They brought it forward. Earlier this evening I went over and had a discussion, and they’ve changed their recommendation, due to the fact of information they received after conversations that we had, so now we are left holding the bag that we are supporting this article. I am pretty sure I am going to call a meeting and there will be a revote on this article. This article is purchased plows that are not pushed by town equipment. They are pushed by subcontractor equipment, which has been a practice that has gone on in this town for a long time, and again this year I brought it up. There is a gentleman in this room that has heard me bring it up for many years, that I don’t feel it is appropriate and I think now we are going to see a change come about because the board of selectmen we currently have is taking a stand on it.

Adam Mini Ridgewood Drive – I would like to amend this article to be zero (0) dollars.

Moderator clarifies, motion to amend amount to (0) zero, asks for second

Mark Warren seconds.

No further discussion, Moderator states he was advised that zero dollars is an appropriate amendment, calls for all those in favor of amendment to please indicate by stating “aye” - none spoke opposed, Moderator states “ayes” have it.

The motion for amendment passed and the article will appear on ballot as amended.

Article 24  Purchase Zero-Turn Mower

Est. tax impact $ 0.00

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Thousand, Five Hundred Dollars ($5,500) to purchase a new Zero-Turn Mower and to fund this appropriation by withdrawing $5,500 from the established Parks & Recreation Equipment Capital Reserve Fund established in 2019. This article is contingent upon
the Town Meeting approving the Operating Budget under Article 10. If the Town Meeting votes for the Default Budget under Article 10, this Article is null and void.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 25  Roads Condition Assessment

Est. tax impact $0.0.019

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000) to have a Condition Assessment of Town-owned roads conducted under the Lakes Region Planning Commission Road Surface Management System program, and further to fund this appropriation from taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

Discussion:

Stanley Bean, Leavitt Rd – I’m assuming that this only is going to apply to the paved roads and not to any of our other roads?

Patrick Boré – Actually, the Lakes Region Planning Committee has tools in terms of software and methodology, to assess paved roads, but they have also offered to do more basic assessment of unpaved roads, which we thought was of interest to the town considering the percentage of unpaved roads in town and the continuing number of complaints on those roads

Stanley Bean – Thank you.

Ernie Hudziec – Will the report be available to public

Patrick Boré - Absolutely
Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 26  Culverts & Streams Condition Assessment

Est. tax impact $0.028

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Fifteen Thousand Dollars ($15,000) to have an assessment of Town-owned culverts and streams conducted by the Lakes Region Planning Commission and further to fund this appropriation from taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Michael Wilson motions to accept, Marshall Bishop seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 27  Pay Scale Survey

Est. tax impact $0.022

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of twelve thousand dollars ($12,000) to conduct a survey of the Town’s Pay Scale. Such survey will include an assessment of the current job classification and related job descriptions, as well as a competitive analysis of current wages of Town employees as compared to local and regional markets.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.
Article 28  Establish EMS Revolving Fund

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town of Gilmanton will vote to establish an Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Revolving Fund pursuant to NH RSA 31:95-h (b) for the purpose of funding and enhancing Emergency Medical Services? Fifty percent (50%) of all revenues, up to a yearly maximum of Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000), received by the Gilmanton Fire Department’s ambulance operations, including but not limited to revenues earned for ambulance transports and the provision of Emergency Medical Services, shall be deposited into this fund, and the money shall be allowed to accumulate from year to year, and shall not be considered part of the Town's general surplus. The Board of Selectmen shall be the board designated to expend monies from this fund. The Town Treasurer shall have custody of all moneys in the fund, and shall pay out the same only upon order of the Board of Selectmen, and no further approval of the Town Meeting shall be required to expend from this fund, except as otherwise provided in this Article. Any single expenditure out of this fund over $50,000 shall require a separate warrant article and shall require a majority vote of the legislative body. Expenditures out of the Gilmanton EMS Revolving Fund shall be limited to the purchase, refurbishment, repair and/or maintenance of EMS vehicles and equipment. The EMS revolving fund shall go into effect on April 1, 2020.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Mark Warren motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 29  Add to CRF Replace Ambulance Vehicles

Est. tax impact $0.0.046

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty-Five thousand dollars ($25,000) to be deposited in the Replace Ambulance Vehicles Capital Reserve Fund, established in 2001 and modified in 2003. If the Town votes “Yes” on Article 28, this Article shall be null and void.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes
Article 30  Establish Non Cap Res Fund Police Vehicles Repair

Est. tax impact $0.009

To see if the Town will vote to establish a new Non-Capital Reserve Fund called the Police Department Vehicle Repairs Non-Capital Reserve Fund for the purpose of repairing, refurbishing, and maintaining Police Department Vehicles and to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000) to be deposited in this fund, and to appoint the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from said fund.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 31  Old Town Hall Restoration

Est. tax impact $0.18

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Hundred and Ninety-Four Thousand Dollars ($194,000) to plan, design, and conduct the restoration of the Iron Works Old Town Hall pursuant to the First Phase recommendations set forth in the Iron Works Old Town Hall Condition Assessment and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to apply for partial funding from the State of New Hampshire’s L-CHIP grant program, other grant programs and accept donations to cover 50% of the First Phase costs, the remaining 50% of the costs ($97,000) to come from taxation. This special warrant article will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32:7, VI and will not lapse until the First Phase recommendations set forth in the Iron Works Old
Town Hall Condition Assessment are fully implemented or December 31, 2022, whichever occurs first.

This Article will be null and void in the event the Town does not receive 50% of the funding through grants and donations.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Mark Warren motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 32 Disposition of the Old Town Hall

Est. tax impact $ 0.00

To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to sell, transfer, or otherwise convey ownership of the Old Town Hall (Tax Map 114, Lot 42) in the event that either Article 31 is defeated or the Town does not receive 50% of the funding through grants and donations for the First Phase recommendations set forth in the Iron Works Old Town Hall Condition Assessment, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to enter into such contracts and take such other actions as is reasonable and necessary to sell, transfer, or otherwise convey the Old Town Hall.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

Discussion:

Nancy Mitchell, Durrell Mountain Rd– First I have a question, if after you hear from people here tonight, and most people do not support this article, is it possible for BOS to change their recommendation?

Moderator – I am not going to comment on hypothetical changes. We are here for amendments and discussions right now

Nancy Mitchell – OK, my discussion point is, is that something they can do legally? The recommendation on the voters’ guide says they recommend article 32 – I
wondered if it’s possible for them to decide to change that recommendation to not recommending, such as the budget committee was talking about doing.

Bishop – Yes, we can.

Moderator – Bishop answers “yes”.

Nancy Mitchell- In that case, I hope that you might consider it. I think the article is premature and you don’t give article 31 enough time. L-Chip often will not grant something in the first year, the second year you apply you are much more likely to get it. I just think the town needs more time before you go and sell the building.

Mike Wilson – I’d like to speak to that. It doesn’t mean the Board will get rid of the building in the first year, it gives us authorization to do different things with the building, which is what we’re looking for, and if you guys come back and this passes, I can’t speak for whole board, but I personally don’t see us getting rid of the building if we don’t get 50% in the first year. It’s not saying it’s a guarantee that we’re going to sell the building if we don’t get 50%.

Nancy Mitchell- I guess my concern is: it is not a guarantee that you won’t do that either, the way the article is worded. You won’t come back to town and say “oh, we’ve decided to sell it, is it ok again?” You have that granted in that article.

Adam Mini – I don’t want this to turn into a thing, but I tend to agree with what you (Nancy Mitchell) had said, I think it is premature, I think concern. I appreciate your sentiment, but the problem is you can’t guarantee that, it does grant you the authority to do so. We hope you wouldn’t, but it doesn’t prevent you from doing so. That’s the problem. I think that’s where the concern comes in. I think I’m personally, for us, a lot of us that were at the public hearing, raised concerns about this warrant article at that meeting and we were hoping to see some changes, but it is what it is.

Rob Carpenter – In the Old Town Hall conditions assessment and recommendations, it says that this is something that has been ongoing since 2010. Does this article 32 allow the Board of Selectmen to give, maybe to a non-profit who is establish that can probably have access to more funds other than taxpayer funds, to allow them ownership to building?

Patrick Boré – Yes. There are two copies in the room, only two copies because it is a 70 page document, this is a draft report which is posted on website, so I would encourage you to go through it, it has additional information and pictures about the Town Hall and the condition it is right now. We are trying to deal with asking for that funding.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 33  Repair Loon Pond Dam
Est. tax impact $ 0.014

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Seven Thousand, Seven Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($7,750) to complete the replacement of the stoplogs and build a secure enclosure at the Loon Pond Dam and to fund this appropriation from taxation.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

**Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion**

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

**No discussion**

**Article will appear on ballot as written.**

Article 34 Change elected Road Agent to appointed PWD

Est. tax impact $0.00

To see if the Town will vote, pursuant to RSA 231:62, to change the position of elected Road Agent to a position appointed by the Board of Selectmen, and to change the title of Road Agent to “Public Works Director,” (PWD) said position to have all duties of a Road Agent under RSA 231:62 and any one or more of the following additional duties pursuant to RSA 231:63: the care and maintenance collection of waste, refuse and garbage; care of public dumps; care of public parks and cemeteries; public beaches; public forests; public playgrounds; shade and ornamental trees. If approved, this Article 34 shall be effective as of the date of the 2021 Town Meeting when the term of the current elected Road Agent expires.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

**Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion**

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

**Discussion:**

Paula Gilman, lower Gilmanton – Nancy and I were just talking; you have in here “public forests”. Does this encompass the town forests, which are open to public? It’s conservation land.

Marshall Bishop – yes Ma’am, yes, it is.

Patrick Boré – so the wording is just a copy and paste from the statutes. As you can read in the article, it says “one or more of the following additional duties”, what is presented to the town, at least this year, is related to the Crystal Lake
Park, so that would be potentially beyond the park itself, potentially the beach. But that is if you read the Statutes, you will find the duties under Director of Public works, and that would include any of those in addition to what a typical road agent does.

Dodie Smithers – My question is, is this down the line going to cost us more money because now we’re changing the job to be a public works director. We know how that goes because you’re not going to be able to get money in here or get somebody in here for the money that you’re offering currently for a Director.

Mark Warren – Dodie, thanks for your question. We don’t know that for sure. I think the thought behind it is to try and create a level of efficiencies, and hopefully with efficiencies that saves money. To your point, somebody with more responsibility would get more pay. However, if there is efficiency in the oversight, hopefully that would keep costs down. That’s at least where my perspective as a select board member, looking at why this recommendation would have been favorable. It is because of how it would actually better serve the people of the town, but to your point, we understand what you’re saying.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 35 Petition GYR Private Library
(By Petition) GYR Library funds
Est. tax impact $0.087
To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Forty-Six Thousand and Seven Hundred Dollars ($46,700) for partial funding of operating expenses of the Gilmanton Year-Round Library for Fiscal Year 2020
Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Michael Wilson motions to accept, Fred Buccholz seconds
No discussion
Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 36 Gilmanton snowmobile club
Est. tax impact $0.005

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($2,500) for the purpose of supporting the Gilmanton Snowmobile Association, for the purpose of maintaining trails that are open to the public in a safe condition for used by snowmobilers, hikers, cross-country skiers and equestrians in the Town of Gilmanton.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

*Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion*

*Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds*

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 37  Gilmanton Youth Organization

Est. tax impact $0.010

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Thousand, Five Hundred Dollars ($5,500) for the purpose of supporting the Gilmanton Youth Organization (GYO), a recognized 501(c)(3) charitable organization that is operated for the express purpose of organizing and administering high quality sports programs for the school aged children of the Town of Gilmanton, as well as the continued operation, maintenance, and development of GYO Park.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

*Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion*

*Michael Wilson motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds*

Discussion:

*Adam Mini – Just wanted to clarify. There were two warrant articles that I know I raised concern with at the public hearing, this was one and the other one is coming up. I serve on the board of GYO, Jay Reed is actually our president who is here in the audience. The potential impact if this were not to be funded, I just want to be clear, is insanely detrimental to this group. There’s a lot of hot dogs and hamburgers that make
up five thousand dollars, which would be a huge detriment and I think the concern I raised and I'll say it again, I get that MRI recommended moving these outside agencies into warrant articles, there are a couple, this being one of them, that were explicitly created specific to the benefit of our community. They are funded and staffed by volunteers that are taxpayers, 100%. So, I think, I really implore that in future years you consider that impact, I get the MRI perspective, but I think we need to consider the impact on some of these organizations as well.

Patrick Boré – Just two comments. One, it’s not MRI, it is NHMA, New Hampshire Municipal Association, legal that recommended that we move all those requests for funding’s from the operating budget. The second comment is that: Yes, board clearly recommends this article.

Adam Mini – Thank you for that, my apologies for the misunderstanding.

Heather Carpenter, 52 High St – So just in reference to all these outside agencies that we are bringing forward outside of the regular operating budget, which is normally done in the operating budget and the town decided to take them out. I am here as a private resident, speaking right now, what I want to just mention, all these outside resources that do help our community, such as GYO, but also the CAP Program, American Red Cross, CASA, anything that supports our community’s residents is vitally important, they come to these forums to basically ask for funding and be supported by the town because they already give to the town, so I just ask for support on all these articles that are represented as outside organizations.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 38  Gilmanton Iron Works Private Library

Est. tax impact $0.002

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Thousand Dollars ($1,000) for the purpose of supporting the Gilmanton Iron Works Library, a recognized 501(c)(3) charitable organization.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion
Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 39  Central NH VNA & Hospice

Est. tax impact $0.014

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Seven Thousand Six Hundred Dollars ($7,600) for the purpose of supporting the Central NH Visiting Nurse Association (VNA) & Hospice which is a non-profit agency that provides health care, hospice care and maternal child health services.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Mark Warren motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 40  Rocky Pond Association Milfoil

Est. tax impact $0.006

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Three Thousand Dollars ($3,000) for the purpose of supporting the Rocky Pond Association in controlling the presence and proliferation of milfoil at Rocky Pond.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: No

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

Discussion:

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Linda Hamilton, Stony Point on Rocky Pond (not a registered voter) For fourteen years we have been given help from Gilmanton, along with Louden and Canterbury to help fight Milfoil, which overtakes the vegetation that is natural to the pond, and without that vegetation it would kill off the water life that’s been there. It’s also now spreading down the brook down towards Concord from rocky pond, it’s also flowed into rocky pond
because it’s in our Northern end. It’s a big problem, and as a resident we’ve been paying $175.00 dollars a year in association fees, we pay high taxes to be on the waterfront, and we are having trouble now having enough money because in 2005 it only cost $8000 dollars a year whenever the state said it was necessary to treat the pond again. And now it’s $24000 dollars a year, we’ve never asked for more money, we’re asking $3000 dollars this time around, just because we’re having a hard time affording this treatment to be done. It’s a small pond, and the people that live on it have been on these committees for a long time doing this work, getting grants, going to the state, and it’s no fun, most of the people would like to give up their positions and have other people take over, but there is nobody that wants that job. So, I really hope that Gilmanton can back us on this and help us out with this extra money that we need to try and keep the pond as clean as we can. It’s an ongoing problem, it’s never totally going to go away, but its going to spread further if we don’t stop it, so hopefully you’ll help us.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 41  American Red Cross

Est. tax impact $0.002

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Thousand Dollars ($1,000) for the purpose of supporting the American Red Cross Association of New Hampshire and Vermont which provides emergency support for victims of fire, flood and other disasters as well as instruction in health, safety and aquatics courses.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 42  New Beginnings

Est. tax impact $0.0.002

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of ONE THOUSAND Dollars ($1000) for the purpose of supporting New Beginnings Without Violence & Abuse which provides 24-hour crisis support, operates a shelter, and provides counseling for domestic/sexual assault victims.
Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Mark Warren motions to accept, Marshall Bishop seconds

Discussion:

Paula Gilman - I’m wondering where the total of $902.00 dollars came from? I used to work, for seven years I’ve worked with victims of domestic violence and sexual assault, and would send daily, send mothers and children to crisis centers. $902 dollars? Is that what they asked for? Is that all they asked for? Can we give them more? Can I at least amend it and round it off to $1000.00 Dollars?

Heather Carpenter – They’re requested based on what they’ve actually given to the town. They only ask for what they’ve given and no more.

Paula Gilman - That is very kind of them, but I know these people that they’re helping.

Heather Carpenter – I understand, but it is appropriate to only ask for what they’ve given back into the town. If they’re asking for more it could potentially be a problem.

Paula Gilman – Thank you. Once again, I would like to make an amendment to have it to be $1000.00 dollars

Ernie Hudziec seconded

Moderator asks for further discussion on the amendment to increase from $902 to $1000

No further discussion, Moderator calls for all those in favor of that amendment in that language to please indicate by stating “aye” – minimal spoke opposed, Moderator states “ayes” have it.

The motion for amendment passed and the article will appear on ballot as amended.

Article 43 Community Action Program

Est. tax impact $0.009

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000) for the continuation of services to the low-income residents of Gilmanton
through the Laconia Area Center of Community Action Program Belknap-Merrimack Counties, Inc..

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

**Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion**

**Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds**

**Discussion:**

Beth Hayward – I work for the community action program in Belknap and Merrimac Counties.

Moderator asks if she is a resident of Gilmanton and she states she is not. Moderator suggests that she be allowed to speak and asks if there is any opposition. There is no response from the public; Moderator allows her to speak.

Beth Hayward – First, I just want to say thank you. I am making rounds in all towns in the two counties that we serve because of all support that the town has given us over the years, and Gilmanton has been very supportive. We are able to offer five days a week services to your residents, so first and foremost thank you. This is our first time doing deliberative session, which is very interesting and exciting for us, and gives us a chance to talk to all of you and really just say thank you, and to give you a little information on the residents and what services they received this past year. So, fuel assistance, there was 63 applications, 133 people, $65,205 in fuel assistance. For electric assistance, 64 households, $33,673. Emergency food pantries, 279 meals, 31 people, 17 households, for $1,395. Weatherization was 5 people, 2 households, $9,649. So, a total of $109,992 for services. We have asked for $5000, that’s the same ask as last year, and that really is to help fund all the things that aren’t funded by the federal government and the state. So it’s the operating costs, its having the people in the seats to give the food out, to do the applications, and so that we’re here year-round and so we don’t have to close the office and have people fend for themselves, because these are the services they received, but we do so many more referrals, we connect people, and we make sure that when they walk in the door they’re not leaving without some form of information on what they can do. So, thank you again, very much, for your support.

**Town Clerk – asks for handout with numbers on it**

Beth Hayward hands it to the Clerk and the Clerk thanks her.

**Article will appear on ballot as written.**
Article 44  LRMHC

Est. tax impact $0.014

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Seven Thousand, Five Hundred Dollars ($7,500) to support the Lakes Region Mental Health Center (LRMHC), formerly known as Genesis, which provides integrated mental and physical health care to area residents with mental illness.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Michael Wilson motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 45  CASA

Est. tax impact $0.002

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Thousand Dollars ($1,000) to the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) of NH which provides, recruits, trains and supervises volunteers to serve as advocates for abused and neglected children in the New Hampshire court system.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion
Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

No discussion

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 46  Gilmanton July 4th Association
To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Four Thousand, Five Hundred Dollars ($4,500) to support the Gilmanton 4th of July Association, a Community organization, for the continuation of Gilmanton’s 4th of July Parade, Fireworks and other events.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes
Recommended by the Budget Committee: Yes

**Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion**

**Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds**

**Discussion:**

*Jane Sisti –* I just have a question, so in the article it will give a dollar amount like 4500 then below it says you’re requesting the town raise 5000; the other one said 1000 in the article but below it says 5000 or whatever. Why aren’t they matching up?

*Patrick Boré –* Those are typos, and I apologize. We have to go with the wording in the article, including the number, so the 5000 in the note is wrong.

*Jane Sisti –* OK, so just ignore the note. OK. I have another question, that just all of these listed out separately now, and they’re all nonprofit organizations, does that sort of mean now that any nonprofit organization can come to the town and ask for money? Or has it always been that way?

*Patrick Boré –* I guess they could by petition.

*Jane Sisti –* Why would it have the be by petition? Because you said these people just came to you and asked for money.

*Patrick Boré –* Well because that’s the first year that we do this. So, we had to pull the out of the budget, and so we, the board, presented those in the warrant based on their request for funding. Ideally, the organizations would come by themselves directly and petition an article to get funding. I know there is a little bit of unease about this because this is new, this is the first time we do it, but I think it gives an opportunity for the associations to talk about their services and what they’ve done to help the town residents. It also gives the opportunity for the residents to learn more about it, until this year it was just lumped into budget and there wasn’t as much openness to it. So maybe next year, yes, the list will be different.

*Jane Sisti –* OK, thank you.

*Adam Mini –* Just to clarify the question – you said by petition? You don’t mean an actual petition warrant article? You’re saying just approach the board of Selectmen?
You said the word petition, that’s why I am asking, because to me, petition means petition warrant article.

Patrick Boré – It can be either one, so you can have residents who believe that such associations are doing a great job for the Town of Gilmanton, and they will bring a petition article to support a request for funding.

Adam Mini – You mean petition the Board of Selectmen to add it to their warrant article, like you did here? In the future? Just want to make sure next year we’re not having to petition the taxpayer to get a signed petition as a petition warrant article, that’s all I was just clarifying.

Patrick Boré – It can be either/or.

Adam Mini – OK, just clarifying. Thank you.

Mark Warren – Moderator Sisti, Adam, I’m going to make a note of that though, because we definitely want to make sure that going forward we understand, like GYO, I’m sure you’re running that through your head, of what is going to be necessary for you next year. We want to make sure we address that and have clarity for you going into next year.

Adam Mini – Thank you Mark for saying that. This is actually the other article that I was concerned about because as a town, my understanding of how this kind of came to be and I don’t know the history of this, but the Town needed someone, most towns have fireworks, money was given to someone to do the fireworks, now if this gets voted down we don’t have fireworks, for the town and this community, so this is another area for me of concern where this is actually like a town function where someone stepped up and my understanding is, stepped up and offered to do it on behalf of the town or however this came to be, I wasn’t here then, but this is one of those areas where if the taxpayer voted it down we as a community don’t have parts of what we’ve always had. That was the other one of concern for me, this one.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 47  Accept Willowgrass Ln to class V Rd

Est. tax impact $ 0.00

To see if the Town will vote to authorize the acceptance of Willowgrass Lane, currently a privately owned right-of-way, as a Class V road to be owned and maintained by the Town, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to take such other actions as is reasonable and necessary associated with the acceptance of the private right-of-way. Willowgrass Lane is reflected in a plan titled, “Subdivision Plat of the land of David R. & Patricia Burl” prepared by Richard D. Bartlett & Associates, Inc. on July 25, 2003, and
recorded at the Belknap County Registry of Deeds at Drawer L46, Plans 55 and 56.
Willowgrass Lane commences at Howard Road and terminates at a cul-de-sac, traversing a distance of approximately 1,100 feet.
Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Michael Wilson seconds

Discussion:

Nancy Mitchell, Durrell Mountain Rd – A long time ago I chaired the conservation commission when this was subdivided, and part of the subdivision became part of what is now the Smithers town forest which is our largest town forest, so therefore the town forest has frontage in that cul-de-sac, so that it makes it more clear that the public has an access to that town forest. I think this is a great thing to have.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 48  Convey interest to 1st Congregational Society

Est. tax impact $ 0.00

To see if the Town will vote to provide the Board of Selectmen the authority to execute a Release Deed to the First Congregational Society in Gilmanton (the “Society”) releasing whatever interest, if any, the Town has in Tax Map 414, Lot 044 and Tax Map 414, Lot 045, which lots are the northwesterly half of Lot 24 in the 2nd Range of Masonian Lots, which property was originally established as a “School lot” and on which the Smith Meeting House, a former schoolhouse, and the Smith Meeting House Cemetery are all located, and further, to authorize the Board of Selectmen to complete an investigatory due diligence process, including but not limited to, engaging a Surveyor to prepare an appropriate Plan, and negotiate the terms of such release deed with the Society, to include the review of the issue raised by the Society regarding the common boundary between the above referenced property and abutting property owned by the Town, and to resolve the same in the best interests of the Town of Gilmanton.
Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: Yes

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

Marshall Bishop motions to accept, Mark Warren seconds

Discussion:
Paula Gilman – This is the last time I’m coming up. Why is this happening? Why is this requested? How is it going to benefit either the town or the Society?

Patrick Boré – So the Society is trying to get a mortgage to fund repairs to the roof on the Meeting House. During that process, the bank has asked them to provide certain documents including a deed that would confirm that they do own the place. And that is the source of this article. Nothing in writing right now, nobody incessantly arguing about who owns what there. So, the Society came to the board with this request to try to clarify situation so that is what we are trying to do, but we obviously have to take into account the interest of the town and potential rights of town if there are any. This article is to allow us to do some due diligence to make sure that everything is OK, and we are talking about a release deed which would potentially allow the town to request some limitations in terms of what happens in the future to that property.

Jane Sisti – Sorry, I am kind of confused by this one and I don’t understand your explanation. So, this is Smith Meeting House, so we don’t really know who owns it now, is that what you’re saying?

Patrick Boré – So the story is, remember when the state and church separated? (Jane Sisti says she doesn’t, jokes about looking old and is met with laughter in the room) In the early 1800 that separation happened. It happened de facto, which apparently didn’t necessarily get materialized on paper, and that is all that we are trying to do. There is, just to be clear, there are two pieces actually, because there is first congregational society and the old smith meeting house, but there is also the cemetery next to it which is run by the association, and so we are trying to address both together through this article.

Jane Sisti – It says now that the town owns it??

Patrick Boré – No. We, the town, as far as we can tell, the town doesn’t believe today that we have any right, but we want to make sure that is correct before we provide that release deed to the Society.

Brian Forst – Chairman of the Budget Committee. I’d like to ask the Selectmen, it has been brought to my attention by the board as we sit here listening to the conversation on this, that your warrant article says “to authorize the Board of Selectmen to complete an investigatory due diligence process, including but not limited to, engaging a Surveyor to prepare an appropriate Plan.” We have a question; how much is that going to cost and where it is shown in the budget.

Patrick Boré – This would be legal fees under the town council, as you know we have a budget line for it. I don’t have a number. The only thing I can add to this is that we do expect this to be a very minimal due diligence at this point.

Fred Buccholz, Meeting House Rd – I happen to be a sexton of smith meetinghouse cemetery. I have nothing to do with any of the warrant article per se, except that the cemetery last year did pay for survey at George Robert’s request, and George
happens to be the chair of the Smith Meeting House Association, and the Cemetery Association is a separate entity. So, I guess my question would be, the survey that we paid for, what exactly does that encompass because it seems to me that it would have been all the properties since it’s pretty much looked at as one unit.

Patrick Boré – So my understanding, and I’m going to turn to Planning Board very quickly here, there are two things we are trying to confirm, the boundaries and the fact that the town has no right at all to any of that.

Fred Buccholz – I understand that, but have you seen survey paid for just a year ago?

Bre Daigneault – We did receive a copy of a survey boundary line plan First Congregational Society between lots Map 414 Lots 44/45, we don’t know who paid for us, it was provided to us by the Society. With this survey there were some boundaries that were undetermined, it was pretty much this is our best estimation of where the boundaries are, so the town is leaving it open that if they want to further pursue the exact boundaries it’s something that they would like to pursue, not saying that we’re going to, but it’s leaving an option open because there was some clouded title.

Fred Buccholz, - I guess I would suggest contacting the surveyor because what little I do know about it, was the fact that there was no documentation that proved those boundaries and there were a couple in contention that probably need to be negotiated with you.

Bre Daigneault – yes, and that is why the town put that in there, to leave our options open if we did want to pursue an additional surveyor or engaging with this surveyor to look further into it.

Brian Forst – So I guess I want to ask, if hearing I’m hearing this right, this gentleman just said there’s a survey has some cloudy areas in it, and we understand that. First Congregational Society is asking to define who owns the land, is that what we’re doing here? We’re giving them a deed to the land?

Patrick Boré- They want a paper to confirm that they own the land. (repeats for resident in the back of the room)

Brian Forst – OK, and Mr. Buccholz just said a survey was done with some grey areas, we understand all that? OK.

Patrick Boré – The society has done some research that they have shared with us.

Brian Forst – So they’re the ones that are going to end up, they technically already own Smith Meeting House, but we’re defining the process, so wouldn’t it, my concern as a taxpayer and there is also concern as chair of the budget committee, is that town isn’t spending money on this process. Is there any way
we can we give them this deed and then they make sure it’s clean instead of us giving them a clean the deed?

Bre Daigneault– So essentially, the intent is, of course the town does have to do their due diligence to make sure what we’re handing over or deeding over to the Society does in fact belong to the Society. Based on the information handed from their attorneys, they’re saying it is. I think the most money that is going to be spent is just to say, yes, the information they presented is correct and accurate. Second part of the article does state to clarify any boundary lines, coincidentally, the Society does boundary a parcel of town owned land. Part of that is just to agree with the current survey that is stated, that was handed to us, saying that yes the Town does agree that we would go for a boundary line adjustment or that we agree that this is the correct boundary between the town land and the Society’s land.

Brain Forst- OK, I guess my question is in land accusation deals, are there not deals made where the buyer is responsible for defining these things, and proving it, and that is a contingency of the sale?

Bre Daigneault– I guess that would be up to the board, if they wish to charge the Society for any attorney fees on our side, but again as the seller you’re going to do your due diligence to make sure that the buyer is giving you accurate information.

Patrick Boré – Brian, let me just add this. So, I wish someone from the Society were here tonight, but from their standpoint it’s very clear: they’ve done their research and it’s theirs. We just want to make sure that it’s true. It’s the fiduciary duty of the board to make sure that we aren’t relinquishing rights to something that the town owns, or if we do, we do it purposefully.

Brian Forst – OK, and it’s my concern that there is a warrant article on the table with no dollar figure attached to it, it is in essence asking the taxpayers to raise and appropriate money to be expended, and it’s not spelled out that way, so I am asking if there is a way to get this done without expending taxpayer dollars on it, because the warrant article doesn’t clearly state that we’re going to spend money, but I think what I am hearing is that we’re going to spend money. So, I am just asking if there is a way to do it without spending taxpayer money.

Marshall Bishop – Brian, as far as I am concerned, we were asked to help them out. Now if they want our help, and if they want to get the deed, they will have to pay for it. Now, that’s how I stand on it.

Brian Forst- That’s all I’ve got to say about it.

Article will appear on ballot as written.
Article 49  Petition: Amend Elderly Exemption

(By Petition): Amend the Elderly Exemption for the Town of Gilmanton

Are you in favor of the proposed amendment as follows:

Shall we modify the elderly exemptions from property tax in the Town of Gilmanton, NH based on the assessed value, for qualified taxpayers, to be as follows:

- for a person 65 years of age up to 75 years, $100,000
- for a person 75 years of age up to 80 years, $175,000
- for a person 80 years of age or older, $250,000.

To qualify, the person must have been a New Hampshire resident for at least 3 consecutive 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 not more than $40,000 or, if married, a combined net income of not more than $80,000; and own net assets not in excess of $750,000, excluding the value of the person’s residence (RSA 72:39-b)

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen: No

**Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion**

*Ernie Hudziec motions to accept, Patrick Boré seconds*

**Discussion:**

Robert Carpenter – So I know this is a petition warrant article; is there any understanding of what the financial impact to the town will be by giving the exception after it was increased just a couple years ago?

Mike Wilson – I believe the number, but I’m not 100%, would be about 1.3 million dollars added to taxpayer

P Boré – Let me be a little more precise: the latest number we have calls for 715 people over 65 in Gilmanton. Our estimate for the exemption would be anywhere between $1,823 - $22,750. If we take 50% of those people, assuming that they are still married and living together, you are talking about anywhere between $650,000 - $1 million dollar tax impact for the town.

Ernie Hudziec – That’s the reduction in the town’s valuation?

Bre Daigneault – That would be the tax impact to the town – so that would be how much tax revenue from 65 years of age and older would no longer be paying, which would fall on the rest of the town.
Ernie Hudziec – How many people from the age of 65 take that exemption today?

Bre Daigneault – I don’t have those numbers in front of me.

Ernie Hudziec – If you don’t have those numbers, you don’t know what it certainly is costing the town today, then. So this is speculation on what it will cost the town in the future, because there is still rigorous eligibility standards.

Mark Warren – I am biased, I have a mother in law who fits this category who would benefit from it, and as much as I’d like to see that benefit for my mother in law, so personally, I am also looking at what would be the tax impact for the town. I don’t have those numbers, but I do know what it is that when we look at all the surrounding towns, and where Gilmanton lies and how we care for our elderly, which I think we should, we are one of highest towns of what we do to contribute to our elderly. This proposal would actually supersede significantly, and if the voters felt like we wanted to set an example for other towns, the voters can speak to that, but again, without us knowing full tax impact, and when this warrant article came in, from my perspective as a selectmen I couldn’t be in favor of it, only because we didn’t have all those numbers today to be able to say what would be the full tax impact to the residents.

Ernie Hudziec – Gilmanton wouldn’t be the first, Gilmanton would be the second. Brookline NH passed something very close to this last year. Anybody looking at the figures, even the recommendation from the state, which is ludicrous, can understanding that the figures, income limits, and assets, are unrealistic. An example of that, is that if you have a defined pension benefit, of $1000 a month, that assets behind that payment is not considered an asset because it comes from a pension fund, whereas if you got $1000 a month from an IRA or a 401K, those assets are counted. That is not fair. As to the salary, the income: two signers of the petition, one is trying to get the exemption increased for a neighbor, she missed by $200. Another person, her income was $30,000 a year and she missed by $3000 dollars, figuring that her property taxes are approximately $5000, that would probably be close to an average in Gilmanton, 1/6 of her income is going to the town. So when people look at these figures, please take into consideration that they’re not necessarily realistic. The old ones weren’t. As far as the state is concerned, because they’re the ones that put the barriers up with this, they are protecting property taxes for the towns because they don’t want to see any other kind of taxation. You want people over the age of 55 to move into this town, but you don’t want anybody over the age of 65 or 75 to live in town. So, I am just going to vote yes and encourage everybody else to vote yes, and we will let the chips fall where they may.

Bre Daigneault – Commenting as a resident here in Gilmanton. The intent of the elderly exemption is not for everybody over 65 years of age and older. It is intended for those who are low to moderate income, those who are receiving social security, which is why the income levels are as they are. Doubling the income levels is not going to
keep it to those who are in need of the help and assistance, as well as the asset levels. Three quarters of a million dollars in assets seems pretty astronomical to me, to say you can’t afford taxes here in Gilmanton. Those are my comments.

Rob Carpenter, High St. – In zoning article 2 they want to allow for 55+ community living for older person development, and in this petition article it looks for exemptions for people over 65. So are we encouraging people to come here with such high proposed assets and incomes, and not have to pay for taxes if they’re over a certain limit? I think that this is encouraging people to live here who may not have to contribute to the community as a whole financially, which is our biggest concern. Thank you.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Article 50 Petition: ZBA from appointed to elected

(By Petition): Change Zoning Board of Adjustment from appointed to elected

Are you in favor of changing the Zoning Board Membership to be “elected” as per the prescribed process in RSA 673:3 (I), RSA 673:3 (II) and RSA 669 in place of the current method of membership being appointed?”

As current Board member’s term expire, their positions shall be placed on the ballot and be filled by a candidate voted on by the Legislative body on Town Meeting Election Day

Recommended by The Board of Selectmen: No

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks for motion

No motion – no support or opposition

Moderator asks if the proponent of that particular warrant article is in the room, or anybody that signed it?

No response.

Article will appear on ballot as written.

Moderator Mark Sisti - Asks if there is any other business to bring before this body tonight? Reminds the public that this is only the first half, and the second half is voting.

Closes deliberative session at