

Get out and **VOTE** Tuesday, March 10 at IHG Middle School



ECRWSS
PRSRT STD
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT #130
Portsmouth, NH
POSTAL CUSTOMER

RESIDENT
Town of
Raymond

Read this guide *before you vote!* • Updates available at RaymondVIP.org

RAYMOND

Voter Information

PROJECT

*“A well informed
voter has the greatest
freedom of choice.”*

~ Raymond VIP Bylaws

2020

RAYMOND

Voter Information

PROJECT

2019-2021 Officers:

President

Kathy Pouliot

Vice President

Joyce Wood

Secretary

Dana Zulager

Treasurer

John Beauvilliers

Members-at-Large

Yvonne D'Iorio

Susan Hilchey

Editorial Board 2020

Susan Hilchey

Debra Doda

Stephen Mather-Lees

Kirsten Rundquist Corbett

Bias Checker

Kathy Bailey

Advisor

Leslie O'Donnell

IT Consultant

Kathy Pouliot

Page Layout

Sharon Holt

Raymond VIP is a grassroots, all-volunteer nonprofit organization. We work to enable community members to prepare to exercise their civil right to vote with the greatest freedom of choice.

If you've found this guide useful, please consider sending a contribution **TODAY** to Raymond VIP at PO Box 813 Raymond, NH 03077. Thank you if you've donated in the past, and please remember to thank our generous Business Donors, listed on the back page.

This guide is provided as a tool for RAYMOND VOTERS for use during the 2020 Town and School District Election Cycle. Please see our website at www.raymondvip.org for updates and new information as it becomes available.

We do our best to be comprehensive and objective. The Raymond Voter Information Project neither supports nor opposes any political party, candidate, or warrant article. We provide tax information but make no value judgment on it. Our editorial policy and our bylaws may be found at www.raymondvip.org.

We offer our thanks and our appreciation to the many Raymond citizens, staff, and elected and appointed Town and School District officials who contributed information to our reporters. A special thanks to our citizen readers. Every year, new reporters and readers join our team, experience our method of analysis, and deepen their engagement in the election process. Sign up **NOW** to help with the guide next year!

To comment or to provide additional information for Editorial Committee review on any warrant article, you may contact us at info@raymondvip.org or PO Box 813, Raymond NH 03077. To speak to the Administrator of the Editorial Committee, call 895-4030. We value your feedback and are always striving to improve.

For the latest information on any article, check our website at www.raymondvip.org

*See you at the polls at Iber Holmes Gove Middle School.
Tuesday, March 10, 2020 7AM to 7PM*

Members of the Raymond Voter Information Project come from a broad range of careers and municipal experience, and have many personal viewpoints. However, within Raymond VIP, they are committed to neither support nor oppose any political party, candidate or warrant article and to focus on providing objective voter information. Raymond VIP is registered with the State of New Hampshire and with the Town of Raymond as a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit corporation and a charitable trust.

SCHOOL WARRANT

School Article 1: 2020 School District Candidates

The following Candidate names are in the order that will appear on the ballot that is determined by a random selection process in accordance with RSA 656:5-a:

One (1) School Board Member for a 3-year term:

(No Candidates)

One (1) School Board Member for a 1-year term:

Melissa Sytek

School Article 2 – School District Operating Budget

This article will raise \$25,902,672 to fund the School District Operating Budget, or, if the article fails, will raise \$25,674,781 to fund the School District Default Budget. The amounts above do not include other money warrant articles on this year’s ballot. If the Operating Budget fails and the Default Budget is in place, the School Board may revisit the Operating Budget and call one special meeting so voters can vote on the revision. (1)

The proposed budget is an increase of \$526,174 (2.1%) over the current year’s Operating Budget and is \$227,891 more than the Default Budget. The proposed budget includes funds for program initiatives for implementation of the first phase of a schoolwide STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) program focusing on computer science; Part-time Human Resources Assistant to strengthen and support the workforce and in particular induction of new employees; and a new Technology Integration/Data Manager position to support the Strategic Plan (e.g. competency based grading, use of data to inform improvements, teacher access to improve instruction/learning). (2) Also, in support of the Strategic Plan, there is an increase of \$5,560 for school software to reinforce a safe and secure school environment for students and staff for all schools.

The proposed budget includes decreases through staffing adjustments (eliminating one IHGMS Music Teacher), property/liability insurance (as a member of the Primex risk pool), equipment/furniture, and supplies.

Tax cost for the School Operating Budget is estimated at \$17.06 per thousand of valuation or \$3,412 for a house valued at \$200,000. Tax cost for the School Default Operating Budget is estimated at \$16.37 per thousand of valuation or \$3,274 on a house valued at \$200,000.

A YES vote raises \$25,902,672 to fund the School District Operating Budget.

A NO vote raises \$25,674,781 to fund the School District Default Budget and gives the School Board the option of revising the Operating Budget and calling a special meeting for voter action.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To fund the School District’s Operating Budget.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To fund the School District’s Default Budget.
- To allow the School Board the option of revising its Operating Budget and calling a special meeting for voter action.

References:

- As defined by state law, the School District’s Default Budget is the current year’s budget plus or minus any contractual

obligations or required increases and less one-time expenditures. Eliminated positions shall not include vacant positions under recruitment or positions redefined in the proposed operating budget, as per RSA 40:14-b, if adopted. The Default Budget is automatically in place if the proposed Operating Budget fails (RSA 40:13 1Xb) and if the School Board opts not to revise its proposed budget and call a special meeting (RSA 40:13 X and XVI).

- Raymond School District Proposed Operating Budget and Other Warrant Articles Fiscal Year 2020-2021. Presented at the Budget Committee Public Hearing, 1/9/20. <https://www.sau33.com/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=2539&dataid=8689&FileName=1.9.20%20Public%20Hearing%20Presentation.pdf>

School Article 3 – Capital Reserve Funds

This article will raise \$333,076 to be deposited in three School Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) to support the School District’s Capital 2020-2021 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). (1) The amount requested is the same as last year. Estimated tax impact: \$0.35 per thousand of valuation or \$70.00 on a house valued at \$200.000.

School District Equipment, Facilities Maintenance and Replacement CRF (est. 2006): \$265,951 to complete the upgrades for bathrooms at the Lamprey River Elementary School (LRES); replace the fire pump at Raymond High School (RHS); place 5 energy recovery units in the main building at LRES; and build up this fund as approved by the School Board for future projects such as safety & security upgrade, bathroom upgrades at Iber Holmes Gove Middle School (IHGMS) and RHS, upgrade flooring at RHS and IHGMS, pave the entire lot at IHGMS, and repair roofing at IHGMS. The balance in this CRF is \$544,947.96. (2)

Technology CRF (est. 2001): \$55,000 to rewire for technology needs at RHS and build up this fund as approved by the School Board for future projects such as upgrading camera servers and replacing firewalls. The balance of this CRF is \$59,379.47. (2)

Food Service Equipment CRF (est. 2006): \$12,125 to purchase a food warmer for RHS and replace point of service terminals in all schools. The balance in this CRF is \$48,791.49. (2)

A YES vote raises \$333,076 to fund three School District CRFs in the 2020-2021 CIP.

A NO vote raises no money to fund the CRFs in the School District CIP this year.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To address priority needs identified through the CIP. (3)
- Saving gradually can help avoid spikes in the tax rate and interest on borrowed monies (bonded) that could occur if the total cost of a necessary purchase or repair must be paid in one year.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To finance high cost items through voter-approved bonds.
- Disagreement with some or all of the items to be funded.

References:

- A CRF is a savings account for scheduled School CIP purchases that cost more than \$10,000 and have a life expectancy of at least five years.
- SAU 33 Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore, in an email 1/27/20.
- Raymond School District Capital Improvement Plan Needs Assessment and Bond Needs Assessment, 2019.

School Article 4 – Equipment/Facilities Capital Reserve Fund from Surplus

This article will allow the School Board to place unspent money at the end of the fiscal year, not to exceed \$75,000, into the existing Equipment, Facilities Maintenance, and Replacement Capital Reserve Fund (CRF). (1) The funds would be used to build up the CRF, which is stated to be underfunded, (2) (3) in order to save for long-term projects. For example, the Lamprey River Elementary School (LRES) Building Committee recommendations are anticipated for the fall and may require action. The Raymond School Board must approve any request to spend money from the CRF. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote allows the School Board to transfer up to \$75,000 from the year-end fund balance into the Equipment, Facilities Maintenance, and Replacement CRF.

A NO vote will not allow the School Board to transfer any year-end fund balance into this CRF.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To better fund this CRF for projected needs amounting to \$1,371,433. (2)
- To plan ahead for repairs and replacements while avoiding tax spikes and bonding.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Objections to funding this CRF with the year-end fund balance.

References:

1. This CRF was established in 2006 as a means to save for items costing over \$10,000 that have a useful life of 5+ years.
2. SAU 33 presentation to the Capital Improvement Committee, 1/21/20, including Powerpoint illustration comparing current CRF funds and anticipated needs.
3. “If you look at our Capital Improvement Plan, you’ll see that there are many more projects needed in the District than are funded annually. We are trying to move away from an ‘in and out’ method (we put funds in to use for projects in the near term) to a longer term savings strategy. In order to do that, we need to put more funds aside in our CRFs over time.” Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Tina McCoy in an email 1/22/20.

School Article 5 – Energy Efficiency

The purpose of this article is to allow the School District to authorize the School Board to enter into an agreement for the installation of up to \$1,743,064 of energy saving equipment, and to raise and appropriate \$125,216 for an annual lease payment partially offset by energy savings and a resulting reduction in energy costs. This lease agreement is for a term of 16 years, contains a finance interest rate of 3% (2), and a non-appropriation clause (escape clause). The annual lease payment of \$125,216 is to be partially funded from guaranteed annual energy savings of \$65,738. Annual budget impact is estimated to be \$59,478. (1)

A few examples of the projects included are:

At the Raymond High School: LED lighting with Spacewise controls, HVAC controls upgrade, new valves, HVAC retro commission, 2 new gas boilers, oil tank removal/disposal, walk-in-cooler controls, and transformers. (3)

At the Iber Holmes Gove Middle School (IHGMS): LED lighting with Spacewise controls, HVAC controls upgrade (valve replacement not

required), 2 new gas boilers, oil tank removal/disposal, walk-in-cooler controls, building envelope, and transformers. (4)

As stated previously, the energy savings could be utilized to offset the associated costs of the projects by capturing current energy savings rebates, providing measurement/verification documentation of actual energy savings, and guaranteeing the estimated energy savings. (5) Estimated 2020 tax impact: \$0.13 per thousand of tax valuation or \$26.00 on a \$200,000 home. (6)

A YES vote gives the School Board authorization to enter into a lease purchase agreement to raise and appropriate \$125,216 for a down payment with partial offsets

A NO vote prohibits the School Board from entering into a lease purchase agreement from funding the project.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Prefer the projects to be done now rather than later. Both the Raymond High School and Iber Holmes Gove Middle School have their original systems and are considered beyond their end of life. (7)
- Prefer the energy savings to be realized now rather than later.
- Prefer these projects to be part of a more streamlined process by having one company oversee the entire process.
- Concern that the cost associated with these projects will fluctuate and could be more expensive in the future.
- Concern that the energy efficiency rebates could be discontinued or offered at a reduced rate in the future.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer that the projects be done individually, to spread out the expense over a longer period of time.
- Prefer for each project to be bid out separately. (8)
- To avoid a 16-year lease purchase agreement with 3% finance interest rate.
- Disagreement with some or all of the items under this agreement.
- Prefer to fund these projects another way.
- To allow more time to investigate the different types of energy efficient equipment, as well as the life expectancy and maintenance requirements for them.

References:

1. Public Hearing Slideshow presentation, page 40, given during the public hearing portion of the Budget Committee meeting on 01/09/2020.
2. Information taken from page 3 of the “EEI Investment Grade Audit” dated October 29, 2019. This information is provided in PDF format (named: EEI Raymond Audit.pdf). This PDF was attached to the School Board meeting minutes of 11/6/2019.
3. Same as reference 2.
4. Same as reference 2.
5. Information provided in a letter attached to the minutes of the School Board meeting on 11/6/2019. This letter was provided in a PDF format named: “Letter re EEI.pdf.”
6. With expected savings, the expected tax impact of this article would be \$0.06-\$0.07 per thousand. SAU 33 Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore, at IHGMS Principal’s Coffee on 1/29/20.
7. The Raymond High School has its original system that is over 30 years’ old and controls that have failed. The system is “at life.” Reference the School Board meeting of 9/18/2019. At the IHGMS, the oil storage tanks are original, 30 years old, and “at life.” It has more recent boiler and controls (around 13 years old), but there have been “more issues with those boilers than we’ve had with any other boilers in the district.” Conversation with the

Safety and Facilities Director Todd Ledoux and Mike Davey with the School Board. School Board meeting, 09/18/2019.

8. The Raymond School District has a policy in regards to bidding processes. It is detailed in the Raymond School District Policy DJE, titled Bidding Requirements.

School Article 6 – Energy Efficiency Funds to Equipment/Facilities Capital Reserve Fund from Surplus

This article would allow the School Board to place unspent money at the end of the fiscal year, not to exceed \$150,000, into the existing Equipment, Facilities Maintenance, and Replacement Capital Reserve Fund (CRF). (1) The funds would be designated for energy-saving equipment and building improvements. More specifically, the intention is to save funds until the energy efficiency project lease could be paid off in full, thus saving on interest payments. (2) Alternatively, the funds could be used for other energy efficiency projects. (3) The Raymond School Board must approve any request to spend money from the CRF. This warrant article is contingent upon the passing of Warrant Article 5, entering into a lease purchase agreement for energy saving equipment and associated improvements. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote means the School Board may transfer up to \$150,000 of the year-end fund balance into the CRF.

A NO vote means that the School Board may not transfer up to \$150,000 of the year-end fund balance into the CRF.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To better fund the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), as the SAU Administration and CIP Committee have indicated that the School District CRFs are underfunded. (4)
- To plan ahead for higher cost repairs for such items and avoid tax spikes.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To return to the taxpayers the year-end surplus money that is in excess of any amount retained as required by State statute.
- To bond (borrow) for the expenses as they become needed.

References:

1. This Capital Reserve Fund was established in 2006 as a means to save for items costing over \$10,000 that have a useful life of 5+ years.
2. There is a one-time 2% penalty charge for prepayment. Discussion of the warrant article at School Deliberative Session 2/8/20
3. SAU Superintendent Dr. Tina McCoy in an email 1/22/20.
4. SAU 33 presentation to the CIP Committee, 1/21/20.

VOTE
MARCH 10

School Article 7 – Equipment/Facilities Capital Reserve Funds from Water Well Funds

The purpose of this article is to allow the School District to place \$55,997 received in repayment for the water easement to Town of Raymond, into the Raymond School District Equipment, Facilities Maintenance and Replacement Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) (established in 2006). An easement between the School District and the Town allowed the Town to use School property to drill Well #4 and to install pipes connecting with the existing Town water supply. The District used funds from this CRF, and the Town had agreed to repay that \$110,000 over a period of 5 years (1) at \$22,000 per year. This year, it was agreed that the Town could contribute more than that amount. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote will allow this Town repayment of \$55,997 to be placed into the School District's CRF for Equipment, Facilities Maintenance and Replacement.

A NO vote will not allow any of this repayment to be placed in the CRF for Equipment, Facilities Maintenance and Replacement.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To return funds to the place from which they were borrowed.
- Think that a designated use for these funds would be appropriate.
- To better fund this CRF which is underfunded for projected needs.
- To plan ahead for higher cost repairs and avoid tax spikes.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To spend the funds in other ways.
- To return the funds to the taxpayer.

References:

1. "Declaration of Well Water System Permanent Licenses, Rights, & Easements" 5/1/2018
2. Presentation by School Administration to the Capital Improvement Plan Committee, 1/21/20.

School Article 8 - Appropriation of One-Time Funds

This article was amended at School Deliberative Session on 2/8/20. The \$320,669 to be raised and appropriated in the original article for infrastructure projects was already included in estimated revenues. The State of NH provided revenue projections for the usual projections plus a one-time grant, listing figures in two separate budget lines. However, it was discovered that the grant money was included in the Adequacy Aid normally received. Consequently, to avoid counting the same funds twice, the amount to be raised and appropriated had to be changed to zero. The School District will still receive the one-time grant of fiscal disparity in the amount of \$320,669. (1) There is no tax impact.

A YES vote would raise zero dollars, as they are already included in the budget.

A NO vote would not raise any funds as described.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Want to correct the bookkeeping error.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not want to correct the bookkeeping error.

References:

1. Discussion by School Board, Budget Committee and Raymond Citizens at School Deliberative Session, 2/8/20.

School Article 9 Citizen Petition: Tax Impact Notation

This Citizen Petition states, “Shall the Raymond School District, SAU 33 vote to require that the annual budget and all special warrant articles having a tax impact, as determined by the governing body shall contain the notation stating the estimated tax impact of the article pursuant to RSA 32:5 V-b.”

A **YES vote** would require the School Board to put the estimated tax cost of each School warrant article on the School warrant and on the ballot.

A **NO vote** would not make this change.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To have information as to the anticipated tax impact of each School warrant article.
- To present School warrant articles in the same manner as Town warrant articles.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To maintain the current amount of information on the School warrant articles and ballot.
- Consider current information to be adequate.

References:

1. RSA 32:5 V-b states “Any town may vote to require that the annual budget and all special warrant articles having a tax impact, as determined by the governing body, shall contain a notation stating the estimated tax impact of the article. The determination of the estimated tax impact shall be subject to approval by the governing body.”

SEE YOU AT THE POLLS!
Tuesday March 10, 2020
7 AM to 7 PM
Iber Holmes Gove
Middle School
1 Stephen Batchelder Parkway



“Photo Courtesy of Raymond Area News”

TOWN WARRANT

Town Article 1: 2020 Town of Raymond Candidates

The following Candidate names are in the order that will appear on the ballot that is determined by a random selection process in accordance with RSA 656:5-a:

Two (2) Selectmen for a 3-year terms:

John S. “Jack” Barnes, Jr.

George H. Plante

One (1) Budget Committee Member for a 3-year term:

Richard T. Mulryan

One (1) Planning Board Member for 1-year term:

(no candidates)

Two (2) Planning Board Members for 3-year terms:

John Beauvilliers

Brad Reed

Two (2) Ethics Committee Member for 3-year terms:

Joyce M. D. Wood

One (1) Trustee of Trust Funds for a 3-year term:

Kevin S. Woods

One (1) Library Trustee for a 3-year term:

Sabrina Maltby

One (1) Supervisor of the Checklist Member for a 6-year term

Aimee Hayes

One (1) Town Moderator for a 2-year term:

Wayne Welch

One (1) Treasurer for a 3-year term:

Edward F. French

One (1) Town Clerk for a 3-year term:

Alyssa C. Richard



Town Article 2 – Zoning Amendment- Section 2.1 Pre-Existing, Non-Conforming Lots

This amendment will require that any property smaller than or different from the current Town Zoning Ordinance for its District (e.g. residential or commercial+; and grandfathered in. cannot be made any more non-conforming from those Ordinances. A preexisting, non-conforming lot is one that does not meet current Zoning standards by such qualities as height, area, frontage, setbacks, or other dimensional requirements. (1) By formal definition, it is a lot, the area, dimensions, or location of which was lawful prior to the adoption, revision, or amendment of the zoning ordinance but that fails by reason of such adoption, revision, or amendment to conform to the present requirements of the zoning district. (2) For example, if a residence in Zone B is situated on less than the required 2-acre lot or with less than 200 feet of frontage and grandfathered in, it could not be further subdivided without evidence of hardship and a variance. (3) (4)

A YES vote will approve the amendment to prevent further nonconformity of property to Zoning Ordinance without a variance.

A NO vote will not approve this Zoning amendment.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To keep current restrictions in place with Raymond’s Zoning Ordinances.
- To help maintain the Town’s rural character.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To allow further development density and greater freedom from Raymond Zoning Ordinances.
- To allow the Town of Raymond to develop without new restrictions.

References:

1. <https://www.ecode360.com/33894364>.
2. *The Complete Illustrated Book of Development Definitions*, definition of a nonconforming lot.
3. Town Planning Assistant Christina McCarthy, in an interview on 1/13/20.
4. Planning Board Chair, Jonathan Wood, in an email 1/16/20.

Town Article 3 – Zoning Amendment- Section Sections 13.1 Definitions and 14.1 Allowed Uses Table

This article will add two new definitions, “Dump” and “Landfill,” to the Town Zoning Code and prohibit all landfills/dumps/sanitary landfills in any zone in the Town of Raymond. The article is the result of work done by the Solid Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee and the Planning Board. There are 3 landfills in the State of NH and one is projected to reach capacity and close within the next 5 years. (1)

A YES vote will define “Dump” and “Landfill” in the Zoning Ordinance as well as prevent the creation of such in the Town.

A NO vote will not approve these Zoning changes and possibly allow a “Dump” or “Landfill” to be established in the town of Raymond.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To clarify the terms “dump” and “landfill”
- Want to prevent the creation of a dump or landfill within the Town of Raymond. (2) (3)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To leave the current Zoning definitions as is, without those terms. (4)
- To allow the potential for establishing a dump or landfill site in Raymond.

References:

1. Town Planning Assistant, Christina McCarthy, interviewed 1/14/20.
2. “Applications for landfill expansions constitute the vast majority of requests for new permitted solid waste management capacity received by NHDES [NH Department of Environmental Services]. New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services 2019 Biennial Solid Waste Report, page 9.
3. “NHDES predicts a limited shortfall in disposal capacity between 2025 and 2034, ranging between about 20,000 and 120,000 tons per year.” NHDES 2019 Biennial Solid Waste Report, page 9.
4. <https://www.ecode360.com/33894364>

Town Article 4 - Zoning Amendment - Section 6.1 Sign Regulations

This article will apply current Zoning regulations for signage in Town to the C3 East and West Zones. C3 relates to Mixed Use Commercial development along the highest volume non-restricted traffic corridors within the Town of Raymond. This area primarily affects Route 102. Currently, there are no regulations for signs in the C3 zone. (1)

A YES vote will approve the Zoning amendment to apply the Town’s current signage regulations to the C3 zone.

A NO vote will leave the C3 zone without signage regulations.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To have current sign regulations apply to the C3 zones where signage is currently unregulated.
- To establish consistent sign regulations in Raymond.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not want to have any signage regulations for the C3 zone.

References:

1. Town Planning Assistant, Christina McCarthy, in an interview 1/14/20.

Town Article 5 – Operating Budget/Default Budget

This article will raise \$8,687,412.00 to fund the Town’s Operating Budget, or if the article fails, will raise \$8,801,633.00 to fund the Default Budget. (1) If the Operating Budget fails, and the Default Budget is in place, the Town may revisit the Operating Budget and call one special meeting so that voters can vote on the revision. The amounts above do not include other money warrant articles on this year’s ballot. These amounts do include the Water Department Budget, which is self-funded by water users and has no tax impact. (2)

The proposed Town Operating Budget (without Water Department) is \$7,780,265.00. This figure represents an increase of 0.85% (3) from last year’s Operating Budget of \$7,714,563. It is less than the Default Budget for reasons such as energy savings, staffing changes, fewer Workers’ Compensation claims, insurance changed to an HMO, and moving some categories out of the budget and into other funds (such as moving the budgeted funds for Culverts & Bridges into Capital Reserve Funds).

The proposed Water Department Operating Budget is \$907,147.00 whereas last year it was \$1,046,387. The 2020 proposed water budget was created by combining the Water Department budget with water funds from the Department of Public Works and is a decrease of 13% or \$139,240 due to debt forgiveness by the State of NH.

The annual tax cost of the proposed 2020 Operating Budget is \$5.468 per thousand of tax valuation or \$1,093.60 for a \$200,000 house. The annual tax cost of the Default Operating Budget is \$5.589 per thousand of tax valuation or \$1,117.80 for a \$200,000 house.

A YES vote raises \$8,687,412.00 to fund the Town’s Operating Budget and the Town’s Water Budget.

A NO vote raises \$8,801,633.00 to fund the Town’s Default Budget and the Town’s Water Budget.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To fund the proposed Town’s Operating Budget.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to fund the Town’s Default Operating Budget.
- To allow the Town the option of revising its Operating Budget and calling a special meeting for voter action.

References:

1. The Town’s default budget is defined by state law. RSA 40:13, IX (b): “Default budget” as used in this subdivision means the amount of the same appropriations as contained in the Operating Budget authorized for the previous year, reduced and increased, as the case may be, by debt service, contracts, and other obligations previously incurred or mandated by law, and reduced by one-time expenditures contained in the Operating Budget. According to RSA 40:13 X and XVI: The Default Budget is automatically in place if the proposed Operating Budget fails and if the Town opts not to revise its proposed budget and call a special meeting.
2. The Water Budget is self-funded by all users of Town water according to a rate schedule set by the Selectmen. The Water Rate Schedule can be found at Town Hall.
3. Town Manager Joe Ilsley speaking at the Budget Committee meeting, 1/7/20.
4. See the proposed 2020 budget on the Town website and click on Voter Information or go <https://www.raymondnh.gov/voter-information>

Town Article 6 – Capital Improvements

This article will raise and appropriate \$345,000 for the purpose of funding the Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) for the Town of Raymond. The CRFs are established in a variety of areas to purchase, repair, or maintain Town equipment and buildings that cost over \$20,000 or have a lifespan of at least 5 years.

The amount requested is the same as last year but distributed differently to address what are considered to be the Town’s most urgent capital needs. General Government Buildings Maintenance & Improvements is increased to \$120,000.00, to be used primarily for renovations at Torrent Hose Company (old fire station next to Town Hall) to create additional Town administrative office space. Bridges and Culverts is increased to \$82,000 because the fund was “drastically depleted” (1) in 2019 to fix failed culverts and because replacement of bridges will be “a high cost liability that will require increased funding over the long-term.” (1) The Parks Equipment and Facilities CRF is increased to better maintain cemeteries and other Town parks.

Decreases are in the Highway Department, as purchases for a plow truck and heavy equipment were made in 2019 using Unassigned Fund Balance at no new tax cost. (1) The decrease in the Police Department CRF relates to the Police Chief’s recommendation to use the department’s Detail Fund (2) to pay for law enforcement vehicles. The Recreation CRF is zero funded as there is no defined need for equipment or vehicles that is not covered in the operational budget. (1) The Fire Department Equipment and Vehicle CRF is decreased to \$30,000 as immediate needs will be met with the existing balance in the CRF (1).

Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.363 per thousand of tax valuation or \$72.60 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote raises \$345,000 to fund the CRFs in the Town Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

A NO vote raises no money to fund any CRFs in the Town CIP.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide long-term funding for major expenditures.
- To avoid potential bonding and increase tax rates.
- To remain current in price predictions due to rising costs.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Preference to bond major purchases.
- Disagree with any of the purposes of this fund.
- Consider this CRF to be adequately funded as is.

References:

1. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email, 1/16/20.
2. Extra Duty Details provide law enforcement services at construction sites, escort oversized loads, and other designated commercial assignments that are not related to the regular duties. <https://www.nh.gov/safety/divisions/nhsp/fob/details-faq.html#A1>

Town Article 7 – Capital Reserve Funds (Water Revenues)

This article will raise and appropriate \$200,000 for the purpose of funding the Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) for the Raymond Water Department to maintain and repair the water treatment plant, water storage facilities, and water infrastructure. This amount is the same as last year, but includes funds historically included in the Water Department’s operating budget as well as debt forgiveness on loans from the State of New Hampshire (related to income and state of the equipment). Despite this request for an increase in Capital Funding, the Water Department’s total requested appropriation for 2020 (from the Water Department Operational Budget plus the Capital Investment), is \$9,240 less than the amount sought in 2019. (1) There is no tax impact, as funds are to be paid with revenues from Town water users.

A YES vote will put \$200,000 into the Water Department Capital Reserve Funds.

A NO vote will not add any funding to any Water Department CRF.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide long-term funding for major expenditures.
- To avoid potential bonding and increase in water rates.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Preference to bond major purchases as required.
- Disagreement with any of the items to be funded.

References:

1. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email, 1/29/20.

Town Article 8 – Mosquito Control

This article will raise \$40,000 to fund the mosquito control program in Raymond. The mosquito program monitors and controls mosquitoes carrying West Nile Virus, Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE), and Zika Virus primarily by spraying bacterial insecticide into stagnant water for larvae control, spraying of public assembly areas including playgrounds and the Common (on request), and emergency spraying. (1) The funds requested are the same as the last two years and include the cost of lab testing. Estimated tax cost: \$.043 per thousand of tax valuation or \$8.60 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote approves funding of the mosquito control program in Raymond.

A NO vote does not approve of funding the mosquito control program in Raymond.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To reduce the risk of exposure to West Nile Virus, EEE, and/or Zika virus.
- Raymond mosquitoes tested positive for West Nile Virus in 2018. (2)
- NH Department of Health and Human Services raised Raymond's risk of EEE to a moderate level as Candia and Fremont mosquitoes tested positive. (3)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not want a mosquito control program in Raymond.
- Concern about possible chemical exposure.
- Does not guarantee prevention of any mosquito-borne disease.

References:

1. See Public Notice from Dragon Mosquito Control. <http://www.dragonmosquito.com/sites/default/files/pdf/publicnotices/Raymondpublicnotice2019.pdf>
2. The State Lab in Concord confirmed that a batch of mosquitoes collected in Raymond tested positive for West Nile Virus (WNV). Email from Town Office 9/21/18.
3. Town Manager Joe Ilsley to Board of Selectmen, 10/21/19.

Town Article 9 – Town of Raymond Scholarship Fund

This article will raise \$2,000 for the Town of Raymond Scholarship Fund for Raymond High School (RHS) graduating seniors and Raymond residents attending their first year of college. Recipients are chosen by the Board of Selectmen, which also determines the amount of each scholarship. (1) Estimated Tax Impact: \$0.003 per thousand of tax valuation, or \$0.60 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote will add \$2,000 to the Scholarship Fund.

A NO vote will not add to the Scholarship Fund this year.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To add to the Scholarship fund.
- To allow the fund to grow.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To spend down the Scholarship Fund balance. (2)
- Would prefer students fund their education without such taxpayer assistance.

References:

1. Raymond awarded two \$1,000 scholarships in 2019.
2. The fund contains \$7,218.97 as of 12/31/19, "Town of Raymond, NH 2020 Warrant Article Overview - Deliberative Version.

Town Article 10 – 4th of July 2020 Community Event

This article will raise and appropriate \$3,000 to help pay for the expenses associated with the free 4th of July community event. Expenses could include holiday and overtime pay for police, fire, public works employees and other town employees, food, and/or entertainment. This event has been taking place for over 20 years through support from local businesses, community organizations, and private individuals. Estimated tax impact: \$.003 per thousand of tax valuation, or \$0.60 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote raises \$3,000 toward the costs of the public July 4th celebration.

A NO vote would not raise funds to defray the costs of the July 4th celebration.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To have the Town contribute to event costs.
- To support the July 4 activities and events.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not want to help pay for this event through taxation.
- Believe the event should be supported by other means.

Town Article 11 – Social Services Agencies

This article will raise \$40,000 for twelve (12) Social Service agencies that provide services to Raymond residents. (1) This year, Town Manager recommended capping the amount awarded to \$50,000, which the Board of Selectmen subsequently capped at \$40,000. (2) This is a decrease as compared to last year. Three Social Services agencies came forward for the first time, two of which are proposed to be funded. (3) Estimated Tax impact: \$.042 per thousand of tax valuation, or \$8.40 for a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote will provide funding to the listed Social Service agencies serving Raymond residents.

A NO vote will not provide any funding from Raymond to any of these Social Service agencies.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- All the Social Service agencies contribute more in services and financial support to Raymond residents than they receive from the town.
- Some Social Service agencies provide assistance which might otherwise be requested of the Town Welfare Department, according to RSA 165:1 "Aid to Assisted Persons."

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Personal objections to any or all of the agencies.
- Personal objections to town funding any or all Social Services agencies.

References:

1. The following agencies are proposed to be funded at the same amount as in 2019: HAVEN \$4,175; Area Homecare and Family Services \$4,000; Child Advocacy Center \$2,000; Waypoint (formerly Child and Family Services) \$6,000; Retired Seniors Volunteer Program \$600; Chamber Children's Fund \$3,000; and Rockingham County Nutrition Program \$3,747. The following agency is proposed to be funded at an increase: Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) \$1,500 (up \$500). One agency is proposed to be funded at a lesser amount as compared to 2019: Southern NH Services/Rockingham Community Action \$3,978 (down \$32,022). Raymond Coalition for Youth is proposed to be funded in the amount of \$10,000. Home Health & Hospice Care is proposed to be funded in the amount of \$1,000.
2. Requests from Social Services agencies increased 11%, amounting to about \$90,322. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email 1/29/20.
3. The Board of Selectmen reduced funding to Social Services as a broader effort to help relieve the stress of taxation on those they serve. Regarding the basis on how the Board came to their decision on funding distribution they looked at the following: ensure funding approvals stayed within the \$40,000.00 cap; evaluate what agencies conducted the most direct support to the people of Raymond; evaluate other external funding sources available to the requesting agencies and the potential impacts if not funded; the proportion of the request with regards to the direct service to Raymond Residents; the impact on at risk members of the community if a specific agency did not receive Raymond funding; evaluate what other support these agencies were receiving that equated to a monetary value from the people of Raymond. Town Manager Joe Ilsley, in an email 1/30/20.

Town Article 12 – Waste Disposal Special Revenue Fund (Fund 18)

This article asks voters to use \$849,000.00 from an already funded (via sales of yellow bags and recycling bins, and through transfer station fees) Special Revenue Fund (SRF) to pay for residential curbside trash & recycling removal (Pay As You Throw Program/PAYT). Voter approval of this article gives permission to spend those funds generated, and does not raise taxes. Without access to the money in this fund, residential curbside trash & recycling removal will not operate as it has, and funds from the Operational Budget will be taken from other Town programs to cover some type of waste disposal program. (1) This fund was created by voters in 2006 with Warrant Article 33 and requires annual voter approval to gain access to these funds. A “Special Revenue Fund” restricts any portion of revenues from a specific source to expenditures for specific purposes and has to be on the warrant every year. (2) The Town has accessed these funds since the inception of the program and must obtain approval from the legislative body (the voters) to legally access these funds. This article does not change any aspect of the current program; it just allows the Town to legally continue to access the funds raised in Fund 18. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote gives the Town permission to use the funds already in the Waste Disposal SRF (Fund 18) to pay for curbside trash & recycling removal, so those services would continue.

A NO vote means the Town is unable to use these funds and would have no legal way to access them and so they would remain in the SRF; residential curbside trash & recycling removal would be significantly impacted.

- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To continue residential curbside trash & recycling removal.
 - To allow officials to access the funds to continue to pay for residential curbside trash & recycling removal.
 - To avoid having to siphon funding from other Town departments or programs.

- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- To eliminate the residential curbside trash & recycling removal program (PAYT).
 - To prevent officials from using the money in the Special Revenue Fund.

References:

1. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email 1/29/20.
2. RSA 31-95c gencourt.state.nh.us/rsa/html/III/31/31-95-c.htm. An example of an SRF is the Shim & Overlay Fund, which requires voter approval each year; these funds must go only to the purpose the voters approved them for.

Town Article 13 – Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund

This Special Revenue Fund (SRF) was created to hold funds that can be saved year to year and used as needed when Raymond town roads need to be rehabilitated with gravel shim and asphalt overlay. This article authorizes funding and withdrawal of \$253,702.41 from the Department of Public Works Shim and Overlay SRF. (1) There is no net impact to the Town’s Operating Budget because NH State Highway Block Grant revenue funds this SRF. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote authorizes the Department of Public Works to withdraw \$253,702.41 from its Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund and requires the use of the money prior to December 31, 2022.

A NO vote means that the Department of Public Works will not be able

to withdraw and use Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund money this year.

- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To reduce the number of roads in need of rehabilitation in Raymond.

- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- Disagreement with the project(s) on which the money will be spent.

References:

1. Since Raymond’s annual Operating Budget cannot accumulate funds year to year, Special Revenue Funds (SRF) must be used when the Town needs to complete a project over several years. Voters must approve all withdrawals.

Town Article 14 – Road Reconstruction Projects

This article raises and appropriates \$350,000 for road reconstruction projects, as determined by the Director of Public Works. This appropriation can be held for two years, or until the road reconstruction work has been completed, whichever comes sooner. (1)

In the summer of 2016, STREETSCAN scanned all 70+ miles of Town-owned paved roads to collect pavement condition data and it was determined that 16 miles (22%) of the paved roads have deteriorated and require reconstruction. (2) The Town’s focus is to address the heavily traveled roads first and then attend to the lesser used adjacent side streets. (3)

The State will contribute \$253,702.41 this year towards the town’s road maintenance as stated in Warrant Article 13. (4). Prior to 2016, the town provided \$149,000 each year for the previous ten years. Returning the road reconstruction fund to the \$149,000 level would not meet the requirements for making the most necessary repairs. (5) Estimated tax impact: \$0.369 per thousand of tax valuation, or \$73.80 for a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote allows the Town to continue some of the most needed road reconstruction projects.

A NO vote will not raise these funds to be used for road reconstruction.

- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To enable the Public Works Department to reconstruct some roads rather than continue to make more temporary repairs to those roads. (2)
 - To try to decrease the percentage of road miles in need of reconstruction. (3)

- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- Disagree with using funds for road projects.
 - Wish to fund road repairs with State money only.

References:

1. RSA 32:7: VI gives towns the authority to create non-lapsing funds.
2. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer, Board of Selectmen (BOS) Meeting 11/21/16.
3. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer, 01/17/2018.
4. Annual State-provided Highway Block Grant funds as stipulated by RSA 235:23
5. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer BOS Meeting 11/21/16.

Town Article 15 – Establish Contingency Fund

This article will establish a contingency fund in the amount of \$101,182 as allowed by State law (1) from the fund balance (2) which will be used for unexpected expenses. Any appropriated money left over after paying for an unexpected event will be returned to the general fund at the end of the year. If contingency funds are not needed at all, the money stays in the Unassigned Fund Balance. The Board of Selectmen will be required to prepare a detailed report of expenditures. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote would create a contingency fund and set aside \$101,182.00 for unanticipated, catastrophic events.

A NO vote would not create a contingency fund.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To arrange contingency funds for an unexpected event without additional tax impact.
- To use part of the Unassigned Fund Balance for a contingency fund.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Uncertainty about what a contingency fund might be used for.
- Prefer that contingency monies come from another source such as the Operating Budget, Unassigned Fund Balance or disaster relief.

References:

1. RSA 31:98-a Contingency Fund. “Such fund shall not exceed one per cent of the amount appropriated by the town for town purposes during the preceding year excluding capital expenditures and the amortization of debt.”
2. “A fund balance is intended to serve as a measure of the financial resources available in a governmental fund.... The adequacy of unrestricted fund balance in the general fund should take into account each government’s own unique circumstances...” (e.g. risks of natural disasters, use of state aid or federal grants subject to cuts). “Nevertheless, GFOA recommends, at a minimum, that general-purpose governments, regardless of size, maintain unrestricted budgetary fund balance in their general fund of no less than two months of regular general fund operating revenues or regular general fund operating expenditures”. New Hampshire Town and City, March/April 2017; By Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) <https://www.nhmunicipal.org/town-city-article/best-practice-appropriate-level-unrestricted-fund-balance-general-fund>

Town Article 16 – Sick and Vacation Non-Union Expendable Trust Fund

This article asks voters to authorize spending \$20,000 from the Unassigned Fund Balance and depositing it into the Vacation and Sick Leave Non-Union Expendable Trust Fund (1), which was established at the 2004 Town Meeting (Warrant Article 25) to ensure that the Town would have the money to pay for accrued sick and vacation leave when non-union employees retire. These funds are deposited into a Trust Fund and only used if the total cost of the buyouts exceeds the amount in the 2020 Operating Budget (\$55,000). (2) There are 2 non-union employees with more than 25 years tenure projected to retire this year with a projected liability of over \$44,000. (3) The Sick and Vacation Leave Non-Union Expendable Trust fund contains \$41,035.39. (4) There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote moves \$20,000 from the Town’s unassigned fund balance to the Vacation and Sick Leave Non-Union Expendable Fund.

A NO vote does not add any money to the Vacation and Sick Leave Non-Union Expendable Fund.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To set aside funds to help meet the obligation to Town employees.
- To avoid incurring unfunded liabilities.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to fund by some other means.
- Prefer to fund only in the Operating Budget.
- Prefer that employees use all of their sick and vacation leave annually.

References:

1. “Unassigned fund balance is the residual classification for the general fund. This classification represents fund balance that has not been assigned to other funds and that has not been restricted, committed, or assigned to specific purposes within the general fund.” per *Statement No. 54 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, 2009*. An “expendable” fund is a municipal trust fund created for maintenance and operation purposes. Per RSA 31:19-a, the purpose of such funds is for “maintenance and operation of the town.”
2. Because of the Buy-Out Strategy, through attrition, our liabilities will decrease over time and these accounts (overtime), will be sufficiently funded to cover the liabilities and we can reduce the amount from the operational budget. Town Manager Joe Ilsley, in an email 1/6/20.
3. Town Manager Joe Ilsley, in an email 1/29/20.
4. Same as Reference 3.

Town Article 17 – Sick and Vacation Union Expendable Trust Fund

This article appropriates \$20,000 to be deposited into the Sick and Vacation Union Expendable Trust Fund (1) for union employees. This fund was established by voters in 2002 to ensure that the Town would have the money to pay for accrued sick and vacation leave when union employees retire. These funds are deposited into a Trust Fund and can only be used if the total cost of the “buy-outs” exceeds the amount in the 2020 Operating Budget (\$55,000). (2) There are 34 union employees in the Town of Raymond, 16 in AFSCME and 19 in Teamsters. (3) Funds will be used from the Unassigned Fund Balance which currently contains \$66,666.43. (4) There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote approves using up to \$20,000 from the Unassigned Fund Balance for the Vacation and Sick Leave Union Expendable Trust Fund.

A NO vote adds no funds for this Expendable Trust.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To set aside funds to help meet the obligation to retiring Town employees.
- To avoid incurring unfunded liabilities.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to fund by some other means.
- Prefer to fund only in the Operating Budget.
- Prefer that employees use all of their sick and vacation leave annually.

References:

1. “Unassigned fund balance is the residual classification for the general fund. This classification represents fund balance that has not been assigned to other funds and that has not been restricted, committed, or assigned to specific purposes within the general fund.” per *Statement No. 54 of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board, 2009*. An “expendable” fund is a municipal trust fund created for maintenance and operation of the town, per RSA 31:19-a.

2. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email, 1/29/20.

3. There are 3 union employees with tenure between 20-24 years, so there is an estimated liability of up to \$7,600. “Because of the Buy-Out Strategy, through attrition, our liabilities will decrease over time and these accounts (over time), will be sufficiently funded to cover the liabilities...” Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email 1/6/20.

4. “2020 Warrant Article Overview - Version 3.”

Town Article 18 – Elderly Exemption Increase

This article will increase the property tax exemption for people over 65 who have been NH residents for at least 3 years and who meet specific income and asset requirements. (1) Until last year, the Town had not adjusted the exemption amount since 2007. (2) The limits would increase 3% from \$30,350.00 to \$31,260.00 (single) and from \$41,150.00 to \$42,385.00 (couple). The current average for these exemptions across Rockingham County is \$36,000.00 (single) and \$49,000.00 (couple). (3) Estimated tax impact: \$0.016 per thousand of tax valuation or \$3.20 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote would increase the amount of property tax relief to the elderly who qualify by income and assets.

A NO vote would keep the elderly exemption as it currently exists.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To increase the property tax exemption for qualifying senior residents to keep up with the cost of living.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To keep the elderly exemption at the current level.

References:

1. Other requirements are listed in the Warrant Article: if the senior’s property is owned by a spouse, they must have been married for 5 years and have a joint income under \$42,385, or single income of not more than \$31,260, and not own net assets in excess of \$72,100 excluding the value of the person’s residence.

2. The intent of this Warrant Article is “to bring the economic thresholds up to the current economic levels and allow the program to provide relief to our elderly, which was the original intent when the Warrant Article passed in 2007. In addition, it is our intent to bring a Warrant Article forward each year to adjust the limits with the cost of living index, so we do not have this situation in the future.” Town Manager Joe Ilsley, “Talk of the Town,” December 2018 edition.

3. These figures are the most recent available

Town Article 19 – Disabled Veterans Credit Increase

This article will provide a \$500 increase to the current property tax credit of \$2,000 for Veterans who are 100% Permanently and Totally Disabled, as determined by the Department of Veteran Affairs, and for their surviving spouses. In 2004, the Town adopted Warrant Article 41 (amended by Warrant Article 33 in 2005) providing for a tax credit of \$2,000 on residential property for Veterans with a service-connected total disability, replacing the standard tax credit per RSA 72:35. (1) Last year, the State of NH increased this tax credit to a maximum of \$4,000. (2) Estimated tax impact: \$0.011 per thousand of tax valuation or \$2.20 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote will increase the residential tax credit to \$2,500 for Veterans determined to be 100% Permanently and Totally Disabled and for their surviving spouses.

A NO vote would not increase that tax credit, maintaining it at \$2,000.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Wish to provide a \$500 tax credit increase to qualifying Veterans and surviving spouses, to a total of \$2,500.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Want to maintain the current tax credit of \$2,000 for qualifying Veterans and their surviving spouses.

References:

1. RSA 72:35 I-a. The optional tax credit for service-connected total disability, upon adoption by a city or town pursuant to RSA 72:27-a, shall be an amount from \$701 up to \$4,000. The optional tax credit for service-connected total disability shall replace the standard tax credit [of \$700] in its entirety and shall not be in addition thereto.

2. Town Manager Joe Ilsley speaking at the Budget Committee Public Hearing, 1/7/20.

Town Article 20 – Establish a 2020 One-Time or Cyclic Procurement Capital Reserve Fund

This warrant article is to establish a Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) for one-time or cyclical operational budget needs and to set aside and appropriate \$154,400 from the Unassigned Fund Balance for that CRF. (1) For example, Presidential elections are an expense incurred every four years. Setting aside money to cover this periodic, foreseeable expense avoids including these costs in the Operational Budget every fourth year. In addition to the Presidential election costs this year, other 2020 one-time or cyclic operational budget needs have been identified: replacing the Town telecommunication system; updating property assessment software; Town re-evaluation; Town energy efficiency (building energy conversion); and legal expenses/settlements.

The funds used to cover these items will be from the unexpended funds from the previous year’s Operational Budget that would have gone into the Unassigned Fund Balance Excess Revenues, and no part of the funding is coming from future taxation. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote creates a One-Time or Cyclic Procurement CRF and sets aside \$154,400 to cover specific cyclical costs in 2020.

A NO vote means that the cyclical or one-time costs identified would have to come from the Operational Budget in the year of the expense instead of from fund balance. (2)

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To plan ahead for one-time or cyclical expenses by setting aside money in a CRF.

To fund a new CRF from the Unassigned Fund Balance.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to pay for these one-time or cyclic expenses through the Operational Budget.

Do not support some of the one-time or cyclic expenses offered as examples.

References:

1. The stated intention for this new CRF is designed to stabilize the Town’s budget and offset the tax impact of the Operational Budget. “2020 Warrant Article Overview, Deliberative Version.”

2. As a result of a NO vote, the 2020 budget would be underfunded by \$154,400, which would have to be taken out of other budget line items. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email, 1/29/20.

Town Article 21 – Establish Road Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund

This article will establish a Road Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) to support the Town’s five-year strategic initiative to upgrade and render safe the Town’s road infrastructure systems and to place \$300,000.00 into this new fund. These funds are to be combined with the funds received from the Road Reconstruction fund to return the Town Roads to a maintainable condition. This sum is to come from the Unassigned Fund Balance (1) and no amount will be raised through new taxation. Expenditures from this fund must be approved by the Board of Selectmen. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote would allow the town to apply more funds toward road maintenance.

A NO vote will keep the road funding as it currently is, raised by yearly warrant articles and state funding.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Wish to increase the yearly road maintenance to expedite work completion.
- Believe that current annual budgetary funding for road maintenance is inadequate.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Disagreement with establishing a new CRF using funds for road projects.
- Prefer to fund road maintenance through the annual budget.

References:

1. The New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration Tax Rate Breakdown is \$4,348,747, which equals 14.86% total retained of all (Town and School) appropriations. Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email 1/17/20.

Town Article 22 – Establish Facility Revitalization Fund

The proposed Facility Revitalization Fund will provide funding to address infrastructure issues regarding town-owned properties. Some town properties currently do not have adequate access as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (1), and others need to be brought up to code with respect to energy and safety requirements. Funding for this article will be derived from a two-year State Capital grant in the amount of \$290,000. The majority of this funding will be used to restore and refurbish the Torrent Hose Company building, which is the old fire house adjacent to the town’s administrative offices. Upon completion of this restoration, the building will provide much needed office and storage space for town administrative purposes. The building will be designed to comply with ADA accessibility requirements and applicable safety and energy standards. (2) Because of grant funding, there is no tax impact.

A YES vote approves establishing and using grant monies to fund a Facility Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund, and approves proceeding with the proposed restoration of the old fire house, and potential other infrastructure renovation projects.

A NO vote means that the proposed Facility Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund will not be created, and that restoration of the old fire house, and potential other infrastructure renovation projects, will not proceed as described.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide needed office and administrative space at no cost to taxpayers.
- Belief that restoring the old fire house would be cheaper than

buying land and erecting a new building.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- The funds from the State grant could be put to different use.
- Prefer to fund the restoration in a different way.

References:

1. “About the ADA Standards” <https://www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/buildings-and-sites/about-the-ada-standards>
2. Conversation with Town Manager Joe Ilsley, January 9, 2020.

Town Article 23 – Fire Department Utility Vehicle Special Revenue Fund (Fund 17)

The current Fire Department utility vehicle is a 10-year-old Chevy Tahoe with over 100,000 miles. The utility vehicle is used to provide transportation for Fire Department personnel as they answer calls, perform inspections, etc. The purpose of this warrant article is to replace this vehicle with a new Ford Expedition and to outfit it to the Fire Department needs. The Tahoe will then be transferred to the Building Department. (1) The Town established this fund in 2005 (Warrant Article #27). The current amount in this fund is \$74,133.56. (2) The money for this purchase will be withdrawn from the Special Revenue Fund. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote will allow the appropriation of \$45,215 from the Fire Department Utility Vehicle Special Revenue Fund.

A NO vote will not allow an appropriation of \$45,215 from this fund.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide the Fire Department with an updated vehicle.
- To provide the Building Department with a vehicle in reasonably good condition at no cost.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Consider that this is an unnecessary purchase.

References:

1. Raymond Fire Department Chief Paul Hammond.
2. Finance Manager Julie Jenks.

Town Article 24 – Citizen Petition: Lamprey Health Care Senior Transportation Program

This Citizen Petition is intended to raise and appropriate the sum of \$6,500 for Lamprey Health Care to support the Senior Transportation Program. Lamprey Health Care’s Senior Transportation Program provides seniors (aged 60+) and adults with disabilities transportation to and from medical appointments and pharmacies, to the grocery store, and to physical and social activities. The program claims to contribute to riders’ health and independence, to promote a healthy diet and exercise to decrease the prevalence of obesity, diabetes, heart disease and stroke, and to encourage socialization for its elderly and disabled clients. Lamprey Health Care has had a long-standing relationship with the town of Raymond. Regardless of zero funding from the Town in 2019, Lamprey Health Care continued to provide transportation services for residents of Raymond.

In 2018, Lamprey Health Care provided transportation services to 305 Raymond residents, with 1,385 patient visits, and provided \$9,586.20 in free or reduced-cost care. At its Raymond site, as a whole, a total of 5,304 patients received services over 20,914 visits. (1) Estimated 2020 tax impact is \$0.007 per thousand, or \$1.40 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote will provide funding for the Senior Transportation Program, which will aid Lamprey Health Care in providing accessible, individualized transportation to Raymond residents in need.

A NO vote will not provide funding to the Senior Transportation Program, which will impact Lamprey Health Care's ability to continue the same level of services.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide seniors or disabled individuals with transportation for qualified visits.
- To support a program of the comprehensive community health care center in Raymond.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Personal objection to this agency and/or its services.
- Personal objection to the Town funding social service agencies.

References:

1. Debbie Bartley, Director of Transportation Services and Lauren Garza, Grants & Development Coordinator, Lamprey Health Care, in an email 1/21/20.

Town Article 25 - Citizen Petition: Ban of Plastic Bags by all Retail Businesses

This Citizen Petition states, "To see if the Town will vote to ban the use of plastic bags by all retail businesses in town that sell products and bags them in plastic by January 1, 2021." The intent is to determine if the voters will agree to ban plastic bags from being distributed by Raymond vendors.

A YES vote means that starting January 1, 2021, Raymond vendors may no longer provide plastic bags for their products, food, or goodwill.

A NO vote means that the current bagging process will continue.

Reasons why some voters might vote YES:

- Plastic bags are made from non-renewable fossil fuels. (1)
- Concern for environmental impacts of plastic bags. (2)
- Plastic bags take years to degrade in landfills. (3)
- Landfills in NH are nearing capacity, and one is expected to close within 5 years. (4)

Reasons why some voters might vote NO:

- Preference to keep the current bagging system.
- Prefer that this decision be made by the State Legislature so that plastic bag use is consistent across the State.
- Currently unenforceable by any NH town. (5)

References:

1. <https://plastics.americanchemistry.com/How-Plastics-Are-Made/>
2. <https://ntepa.nt.gov.au/waste-pollution/plastic-bag-ban/environmental-impacts>
3. <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2007/06/do-plastic-bags-really-take-500-years-to-break-down-in-a-landfill.html>
4. "NH Department of Environmental Services predicts a limited shortfall in disposal capacity between 2025 and 2034, ranging between about 20,000 and 120,000 tons per year." NHDES 2019 Biennial Solid Waste Report, page 9.
5. Town Council Keriann Roman, Deliberative Session 2/1/20.

The 2020 Guide is brought to the Raymond Community free of charge by the Raymond Voter Information Project, donations from Raymond citizens, in-kind considerations, and our Business Donors:

Town Article 26 - Citizen Petition: Designation of Scenic Road

This Citizen Petition states, "To see if the Town of Raymond shall vote to designate as a scenic road Old Fremont Road and Extension, pursuant to RSA 231:157?" The intent is to designate Old Fremont Road and Old Fremont Road Extension as a scenic road. The scenic road recognition has been allowed by state law since 1971 on any town road that voters believe is worthy of the recognition. (1) Scenic Road designation provides some extra protection for historic stone walls and healthy big trees along the road. (2) Dangerous trees may still be removed, and landowners still have rights over trees and stone walls on their property. (3) The purpose of a scenic road is to "encourage the tourist attractiveness of our scenic roads in our towns and... permit retention of trees and stone walls so characteristic of our New England scenery." (4) The Town of Raymond may place "Raymond Scenic Road" signs on Old Fremont Road, as has been done on Long Hill Road, Raymond's other official scenic road. (5) Old Fremont Road is the location of Raymond's first neighborhood and oldest home (Bean Tavern, depicted on the Town Seal) and has numerous other historic features. (6)

A YES vote will designate and recognize Old Fremont Road and Old Fremont Road Extension as an official scenic road (under RSA 231:157).

A NO vote will not designate Old Fremont Road and Old Fremont Road Extension as a scenic road.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To officially recognize Old Fremont Road and Old Fremont Road Ext. as an official scenic road.
- To provide healthy big trees (with trunks at least 15 inches in diameter, 4 feet off the ground) and historic stone walls along the road with some protection. (2) (3)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- So that Old Fremont Road and Old Fremont Road Extension are not designated as a scenic road.

References:

1. NH Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) 231:157 Scenic Roads; Designation.
2. NH Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) 231:158 Effect of Designation as Scenic Roads.
3. NH Municipal Assoc. (NHMA) publication: *A Hard Road to Travel - New Hampshire Law of Local Highways, Streets and Trails*, edited by Susan Slack, Legal Services Counsel, Local Government Center, 2004; "Chapter 5: Special Categories of Layouts and Roads: Scenic Roads," pages 80-83.
4. *Webster v. Town of Candia* (146 N.H. 430 (2001)).
5. Anthony Dickerson, primary petitioner.
6. *History of Raymond, NH*.

The 2020 Guide is brought to the Raymond Community free of charge by the Raymond Voter Information Project, donations from Raymond citizens, and our Business Donors:

Ace Ben Franklin Hardware

15 Freetown Road
at the Raymond Shopping Center
603-895-2370

Edward Jones Investments

Dustin R. Ramey
Dustin.Ramey@EdwardJones.com
www.edwardjones.com/dustin-ramey
603-895-4942

Inspired Yoga and Health

61 Route 27, Cozy Corner Plaza in Raymond
www.inspiredyogaandhealth.com
603-548-9873

Jambs Jewelry

Jewelry, Repairs, Watch Service, Design-Your-Own & More
17 Freetown Road, #8, at the Raymond Shopping Center
www.jambsjewelry.com
603-244-3680

Madore Electric

Sid Madore
Residential & small-scale commercial wiring
Sidmadore@gmail.com
603-895-9286

Northeast Woodworking Products

Custom Cabinetry & Millwork
24 Old Manchester Road, Raymond
603-895-4271

Raymond Area Chamber of Commerce

P.O. Box 425, 64 Freetown Road, Raymond
www.raymondareachamberofcommerce.com
603-895-2254

Raymond Area News

Cheryl Killam, Owner
www.raymondareanews.com
603-679-8656

Raymond Coalition for Youth

4 Epping Street, Raymond
www.rcfy.org
603-895-7061/7062

Regional Economic Development Center (REDC)

57 Main Street, Raymond
www.redc.com
603-772-2655

Riverbend Realty Group

Residential/Commercial: David P. Turcotte, Broker Owner
64 Freetown Road, Raymond
davidturcotte@comcast.net
603-303-7044 (cell)
603-895-4500 x 206 (office)

Universal Electric

P.O. Box 151, 64 Deerfield Road, Raymond
603-895-6512

Please remember to thank our business donors!

**To support continuation of the Guide, citizens may donate by
PayPal at www.raymondvip.org or by mail to
Raymond VIP, P.O. Box 813, Raymond, NH 03077
All donations are tax deductible. Thank you!**

WATCH CANDIDATES NIGHT ON RCTV ON DEMAND

**<https://www.raymondnh.gov/rctv>
Click on the On Demand Video Site**

Make your selections and bring your list to the polls

Town Warrant

- 1. Candidate Choices.....
- 2. Zoning: Section 2.1 Pre-Existing, Non-Conforming Lots Y ☐ N ☐
- 3. Zoning: Section 13.1 Definitions and 14.1 Allowed Uses Table..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 4. Zoning: Section 6.1 Sign Regulations..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 5. Town Operating Budget / Default Budget..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 6. Capital Improvements Y ☐ N ☐
- 7. Capital Reserve Funds (Water Revenues)..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 8. Mosquito Control Y ☐ N ☐
- 9. Town of Raymond Scholarship Fund..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 10. 4th of July 2020 Community Event Y ☐ N ☐
- 11. Social Services Agencies..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 12. Waste Disposal Special Revenue Fund (Fund 18) Y ☐ N ☐
- 13. Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 14. Road Reconstruction Projects Y ☐ N ☐
- 15. Establish Contingency Fund..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 16. Sick and Vacation Non-Union Expendable Trust Fund Y ☐ N ☐
- 17. Sick and Vacation Union Expendable Trust Fund..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 18. Elderly Exemption Increase Y ☐ N ☐
- 19. Disabled Veterans Credit Increase..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 20. Establish a 2020 One-Time or Cyclic Procurement Capital Reserve Fund Y ☐ N ☐
- 21. Establish Road Revitalization Special Revenue Fund Y ☐ N ☐
- 22. Establish Facility Revitalization Fund Y ☐ N ☐
- 23. Fire Department Utility Vehicle Special Revenue Fund (Fund 17) Y ☐ N ☐
- 24. Citizen Petition: Lamprey Health Care Senior Transportation Program..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 25. Citizen Petition: Ban of Plastic Bags by all Retail Businesses Y ☐ N ☐
- 26. Citizen Petition: Designate a Scenic Road..... Y ☐ N ☐

School Warrant

- 1. Candidate Choices.....
- 2. School Operating/Default Budget Y ☐ N ☐
- 3. School Capital Reserve Funds..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 4. Equipment/Facilities Capital Reserve Fund from Surplus Y ☐ N ☐
- 5. Energy Efficiency Y ☐ N ☐
- 6. Energy Efficiency Funds to Equipment/Facilities
Capital Reserve Fund from Surplus Y ☐ N ☐
- 7. Equipment/Facilities Capital Reserve Fund from Water Well Funds..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 8. Appropriation of One-Time Funds..... Y ☐ N ☐
- 9. Citizen Petition: Add Estimated Tax Impact Y ☐ N ☐

SEE YOU AT THE POLLS!

For the latest on any article,
Check www.raymondvip.org