

Get out and **VOTE** Tuesday, March 9 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

2021

RAYMOND *Voter Information* PROJECT

2020-2021 Officers:

President

Kathy Pouliot

Vice President

Joyce Wood

Secretary

Dana Zulager

Treasurer

John Beauvilliers

Member-at-Large

Yvonne D'Iorio

Editorial Board 2020

Susan Hilchey

Debra Doda

Kathy Pouliot

Kirsten Rundquist Corbett

Bias Checker

Kathy Bailey

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 2021 Town and School District Election Cycle. To preserve space in this year's guide, and to improve the ease of looking up information, we have used www.tinyurl.com, a service to shorten web links. 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 VIP President, please call 706-0538. We value your feedback and are always striving to improve.

*See you at the polls at Iber Holmes Gove Middle School.
Tuesday, March 9, 2021 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: 2021 School District Candidates

The following Candidates 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) School Board Members for 3 year terms:

Ada Vadeboncoeur
Derek Haddad
John Harmon
Melissa Sytek

One (1) School District Moderator for a 3 year term:

Jonathan Wood

One (1) School District Clerk for a 3 year term:

Linda Hoelzel

One (1) School District Treasurer for a 3 year term:

Timothy Auclair

School Article 2 - Operating Budget

This article will raise and appropriate \$26,386,721 for the School District Operating Budget, or, if the article fails, will raise \$26,237,757, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Raymond School District or by law. 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 according to State statute. (1)

The proposed budget is an increase of \$484,050 (1.87%) over the current year’s Operating Budget and is \$148,964 more than the Default Budget. The main increases relate to salaries and benefits for contractual obligations and advancements, as well as for other purchased professional services. More specifically, retirement contributions increased, as did contracted student services (e.g. Psychology, Speech/Language, Occupational & Physical Therapies for students with special needs), transportation, and some tuitions (e.g. Seacoast School of Technology), all of which are areas where costs cannot be adjusted downward. (2)

Decreases in the budget include removal of some teaching and support positions and supplies. (3) Related to those staffing changes, health, worker’s compensation, and unemployment insurance contributions will decrease. Repair and service contracts decreased due, in large part, to the removal of the portable buildings at the elementary school. The K-12 STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) program initiative for Computer Science, voter-approved in 2020, has been delayed to save funds.

The student enrollment as of 10/1/20 is 1,182. There are 248 regular positions, not including Substitutes. There are 107 support workers including paraeducators, custodians, food service workers, and LPNs. The 37 in the “wage pool” include 19 Admin, School Nurses, Tech, and Maintenance.

The estimated tax impact for the School Operating Budget is \$17.90 per thousand of valuation, or \$3,580 on a \$200,000 home. The estimated tax increase of the Operating Budget is an additional \$1.26 per thousand of valuation or \$252 on a \$200,000 home.

The estimated tax impact for the Default Budget is \$17.74 per thousand of valuation, or \$3,548 on a \$200,000 home. The estimated tax increase of the Default Budget is an additional \$1.10 per thousand or \$220 on a \$200,000 home.

A **YES vote** raises \$26,386,721 to fund the School District Operating Budget. A **NO vote** raises \$26,237,757 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 support the proposed School Operating Budget.
- Agree with the staffing changes proposed by the Operating Budget.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To support 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:

1. RSA 40:13 X. and XVI.
2. Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Tina McCoy speaking at the Public Hearing for the Budget Committee, 1/7/21.
3. Specific proposed changes are to eliminate 50% Word Language Teacher and one Special Education Teacher at Raymond High School; two Paraeducators and one 5th grade Teacher at IHG Middle School; one paraeducator at Lamprey River Elementary School; two contracted YESS Workers; and to reduce expenses for supplies. Supplies that have been cut include periodicals, books, and software. Total anticipated savings is \$515,486. - Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Tina McCoy speaking at the Public Hearing with the Budget Committee, 1/7/21.

School Article 3 - REA Collective Bargaining Agreement

This article will approve a three-year Collective bargaining agreement reached between the Raymond School Board and the Raymond Education Association (REA), and it will approve raising and appropriating funds for increases in salaries and benefits for the upcoming fiscal year. There are currently 119 Teachers and other professional members of REA who would be affected by this new contract.

A new pay scale will be implemented by the School District. Salaries will be adjusted accordingly: Year 1: \$500 flat increase with no step increases; Year 2: Advance one step if not already on the top step; Year 3; Advance one step if not already on the top step. Longevity pay will be available for REA members who have reached the top step.

District contributions toward health insurance premiums will continue to decrease for the current Yellow No Choice Fund plan: Year 1: 91% plus increase of premium; Year 2: 89%; Year 3: 87%. Contributions by employees will increase proportionally to the District’s decrease.

In addition to salary and benefit changes, there are non-monetary changes in this contract. (1) Some staff positions will be added to the REA while contracted staff will be removed. Notification dates for track changes and final retirement notices will be moved up for better financial planning. Reimbursement for an individual workshop is increased but the total amount available to staff is unchanged. Pay for long-term substitutes will be changed. Standard times for the workday, absences, planning, and attendance at faculty meetings after hours will be introduced for all schools. Open houses and Parent Teacher conferences will have more scheduling flexibility.

In 2021-2022 - Cost increases are: salaries: \$67,159; benefits: \$24,127; for a total of \$91,286. Cost decreases: District contributions toward health insurance premiums will reduce over time for the current Yellow No Choice Fund plan: 91% plus increase of premium.

In 2022-2023 - Estimated Cost increases are: salaries: \$377,383; benefits: \$81,933; for a total of \$459,316. Cost decreases: District contributions toward health insurance premiums will decrease to 89%.

In 2023-2024 - Estimated Cost increases are: salaries: \$325,269; benefits: \$66,992; for a total of \$392,262. Cost decreases: District contributions toward health insurance premiums will decrease to 87%.

The estimated tax impact for the first year of this Warrant Article is \$0.10 per thousand of valuation, or \$20.00 on a \$200,000 home. The estimated tax increase for the second year is \$0.48, and for the third year is \$0.41 per thousand of valuation.

A **YES vote** approves a 3-year contract for members of the Raymond Education Association and funds the 1st year of the agreement

A **NO vote** means that professional staff continue to work under the current contract.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Agree with the changes in cost items and language.
- To increase pay for professional members of REA, per the new pay scale. (3) (4)
- Want to include Math Specialist and Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO) Coordinator in the REA.
- To continue to decrease the District’s contribution to health care costs.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Objection to any or all terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
- Prefer to have a special meeting to address a revised agreement.
- Want to maintain the District’s current health insurance contribution level.
- Uncertain tax rates for Years 2 and 3 of the contract.

References:

1. Speech & Language Pathologists/Therapists are removed from REA while the Math Specialist and ELO Coordinator are included; notification dates are earlier for track changes (Oct. 1) and final retirement notice (Dec. 1 for timing of severance payments); individual amount for workshop reimbursement is increased (from \$250 to \$500 while collective allotment remains the same); long term substitutes will be paid according to their education and experience upon contract; increased flexibility with Open Houses and Parent Teacher Conferences; absences will be taken in one hour increments (at minimum). Also, there will be increased consistency with: workday (7 hours 30 minutes at each school); planning time (250 minutes per week for all members); and faculty meeting attendance after work hours (30 minutes per month). - PowerPoint presentation by Superintendent Dr. Tina McCoy and Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore to the Budget Committee, 1/7/21.
2. Raymond schools are 151st out of 162 school districts in starting pay, making it hard to hire and keep teachers - School Board Chair Joe Saulnier to Budget Committee, 1/7/21.
3. Raymond offers “very low” starting salaries for Teachers. -Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Tina McCoy, speaking to the Budget Committee, 1/7/21.

School Article 4 - Special Meeting

If the Collective Bargaining Agreement identified in Article 3 fails, this article gives the School Board the authority to call one special meeting, at its option, to address cost items in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the School Board and the Raymond Education Association (REA). (1)

A YES vote allows the School Board to call a special meeting to address cost items in Article 3.

A NO vote does not authorize a special meeting

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To give the School Board the opportunity to renegotiate the contract and then present it to the voters at a special meeting.
- To avoid having to petition the court to allow the School Board to hold a special meeting after the contract is renegotiated.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To avoid potential costs for a special meeting (about \$1,200 for a simple ballot, more for a printed ballot).

References:

1. RSA 32:20, Municipal Budget Law, Special Meetings.

School Article 5 - Treasurer’s Stipend Increase

This article will increase the stipend to the School District Treasurer from \$3,000 to \$3,750. The duties of the elected District Treasurer are defined by State statute and include custody of monies, investing funds, and meeting all State and Federal obligations. (1) (2) There has been no increase for 14 years. (3) The cost of the \$750 raise, with an estimated tax impact of \$0.000784, is already included in the Operating Budget Warrant Article, so there is no additional tax impact stated here. This article would decide whether the budgeted stipend would increase or not

A YES vote will increase the District Treasurer’s stipend to \$3,750

A NO vote would keep the stipend at \$3,000.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide a modest increase in payment to the School District Treasurer.
- Agree with the proposed Operating Budget, which includes the \$750 raise.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to assign those funds to a different purpose.
- Interest in decreasing the Operating Budget.

References:

1. See RSA 197:23-a “Treasurer’s Duties.”
2. “The Treasurer of the School District shall be elected tri-annually and shall not be a member of the School Board. He/She shall receive such remuneration as the electorate may determine and perform such duties pertaining to the fiscal affairs of the School District as outlined in the New

Hampshire statutes relating to public schools. If no one is elected and accepts, the School Board shall appoint the Treasurer. A Deputy Treasurer shall be appointed by the Treasurer subject to the approval of the Board.” Taken from the Raymond School District Policy Elected Board Officials, Adopted: June 6, 2002.

3. SAU 33 Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore speaking to the Budget Committee, 1/7/21. She also stated that the new rate would be comparable to that in nearby communities.

School Article 6 - Deputy Treasurer Training Stipend

This article allows payment of \$500 to the individual training the Deputy Treasurer for the School District. The position of Deputy Treasurer was established previously in case of illness or lack of availability of the District Treasurer. This article was suggested by the School District Auditors. This amount is already included in the Operating Budget with an estimated tax impact of \$0.000523; there is no additional tax impact.

A YES vote will approve payment of a \$500 stipend to the trainer of the School District Deputy Treasurer.

A NO vote will not approve the stipend payment.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The amount of the proposed stipend is considered modest.
- Consider it important to have a trained person in this position for continuity of service.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Consider there is little need to pay a stipend for training as the services of the Deputy Treasurer have not been needed for over 15 years. (1)
- Prefer that the Deputy is trained by the Treasurer without extra cost.

References:

1. SAU 33 Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore, speaking to the Budget Committee, 1/7/21.

School Article 7 - Capital Reserve Funds

This article will raise \$375,000 and deposit the funds into three School Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) to support the School District’s 20-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The amount requested this year is an increase of \$41,924 as compared to last year’s request. Estimated Tax impact is \$0.39 per thousand of valuation, or \$78.00 on a \$200,000 home.

School District Equipment, Facilities Maintenance and Replacement CRF (est. 2006): \$183,998 (decreased from \$265,951 last year) for security/safety upgrades, bathroom floor upgrades at Raymond High School (RHS), water line controls, and to put aside some funds for future year projects. (1) The balance in this CRF is \$955,552. (2)

Technology CRF (est. 2001): \$151,992 (increased from \$55,000 last year) to replace a security camera & phone system and to save for future projects. (1) The balance in this CRF is \$120,203. (2)

Food Service Equipment CRF (est. 2006): \$39,010 (increased from \$12,125 last year) to upgrade the reach-in cooler at RHS, and to replace the dishwasher & convection oven at IHG Middle School. (1) The balance in this CRF is \$63,764. (2)

These balances do not include the current Fiscal Year CIP decreases for projects that were delayed due the pandemic. Approximately. \$333,076 will be taken out of these balances within the next month or so. (2)

A YES vote raises \$375,000 to fund three School District CRFs.

A NO vote would not fund the identified CRFs in the School District CIP this year.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Consider these upgrades necessary.
- To avoid spikes in the tax rate and interest on borrowed/bonded funds by saving gradually.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Don’t agree with purposes for these funds.
- To finance high cost items through other methods.

References:

1. School District Presentation to the Budget Committee 12/1/20.
2. SAU 33 Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore, in an email 1/25/21.

School Article 8 - CRF Contribution from Year-End Fund Balance

This article will allow the School Board to place up to \$75,000 from the year-end fund balance into the Equipment, Facilities Maintenance, and Replacement Capital Reserve Fund (CRF), established in 2006. (1) The balance in this fund has increased over the years by saving part of the year-end fund balance, but is considered underfunded (2) as compared to the needs outlined in the District’s 20-year Capital Improvement Plan. (3) The fund balance is currently \$995,552 and the requested funds would be used to build up the CRF for such projects as school building safety improvements and repairs. For example, anticipated needs for the upcoming school year total \$362,578. Additionally, a new roof will be needed at the IHG Middle School at an estimated cost of \$1,497,140. (4) There is no new tax impact.

A **YES vote** means the School District can transfer up to \$75,000 from the year-end fund balance into the CRF.
A **NO vote** means that all the year-end surplus, other than any amount retained for a contingency fund as allowed by State law, must be returned to the taxpayers. (4)

- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To save part of the year-end funds for future long-term projects defined by the Capital Improvement Plan.
 - To reduce the total amount that may need to be bonded for the Middle School roof replacement.
- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- To return the year-end surplus to the taxpayers, other than any amount allowed by State law as a contingency fund.
 - Prefer to delay funding this CRF.

- References:**
- This CRF was established as a means to save for items costing over \$10,000 that have a useful life of 5+ years.
 - This CRF is considered “significantly underfunded but making progress.” -SAU 33 Business Administrator Marjorie Whitmore speaking at the School District presentation to the Budget Committee, 1/7/21).
 - Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Tina McCoy, in an email 1/22/21.
 - Raymond School District Capital Improvement Plan Needs Assessment and Bonds Assessment, 11/20/19.

School Article 9 - Water Easement Funds to CRF

This article will allow the School District to place the \$10,003 received from the Town of Raymond as final payment on the water easement 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 that well with the existing Town water supply (School Warrant Article 8, Town Warrant Article 15 in 2017). The District used funds from this same CRF, and the Town had agreed to repay that \$110,000 over a period of 5 years. (1) There is no additional tax impact.

- A **YES vote** will allow the School to place the Town’s final repayment for the water easement (\$10,003) 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 put the funds back into the CRF whence they were originally borrowed.
 - To build up funds for this CRF which is considered underfunded for projected needs.
 - To avoid the possibility of tax spikes by planning and saving ahead of time.
- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- To put the funds to other purposes.
 - Prefer to have the funds used to reduce taxes.

- References:**
- “Declaration of Well Water System Permanent Licenses, Rights, & Easements” 5/1/2018.

School Article 10 - Up to 5% Retention of funds

This article will increase the amount of funds allowed to be retained as a Contingency Fund by the School District from 2.5% to up to 5% of its net assessed value. (1) The State legislature increased the allowable percentage in September 2020. (2) A public hearing is required prior to expenditure and year-end financial

reports to the Department of Education and Department of Revenue Administration are required. Over the years, the School District has accumulated the current maximum of 2.5% by choosing to set aside some unused funds at the end of each fiscal year. (3) For this school year, funds have been retained per the 2.5%, primarily on savings from “unfilled jobs.” (4) With that, and savings from previous years, the balance in that fund is \$448,143. These funds are intended to serve as a contingency fund for unexpected situations. There is no new tax impact.

- A **YES vote** will increase the amount of unexpended funds allowed to be saved cumulatively by the School District from 2.5% to up to 5% of the District’s net assessment, and allow expenditure after a public hearing.
A **NO vote** will maintain the current allowable 2.5% retention of School District funds.
- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To save money in a contingency fund for an emergency situation.
 - To increase the amount of potential savings to the new, allowable amounts.

- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- Prefer the budget surplus be used for other or more specific purposes.
 - Prefer that the funds be used to reduce the tax rate next year.

- References:**
- RSA 198:5 Assessment. – The selectmen of the town, in their next annual assessment, shall assess upon the taxable property of the district a sum sufficient to meet the obligations above enumerated, with such alterations thereof as may be voted by the district, and shall pay the same over to the district treasurer as the school board shall require for the maintenance of schools.
 - RSA 198:4-b Contingency Fund. – II. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a school district by a vote of the legislative body may authorize, indefinitely until specific rescission, the school district to retain any unused portion of the year-end unassigned general funds, from the preceding fiscal year in subsequent fiscal years, provided that the total amount of year-end unassigned general funds does not exceed, in any fiscal year, 5 percent of the current fiscal year’s net assessment under RSA 198:5.
 - Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Tina McCoy, in an email 1/22/21.
 - School Board Chairman Joe Saulnier speaking at the Budget Committee meeting, 1/7/21.

TOWN WARRANT

The following Candidates 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) Selectmen for 3-year terms:**
Scott Campbell
Curt Fitton
Timothy P. Cahill
- Two (2) Budget Committee Members for 3-year terms:**
Dennis Garnham
- Two (2) Planning Board Members for 3-year terms:**
Patricia Bridge
Kendra Ferm
Paul Ayer
- Two (2) Ethics Committee Member for a 3-year term:**
Kenneth Hajjar
Tracy Merrill
Gretchen Gott
- One (1) Trustee of the Trust Funds for a 3-year term:**
Phillip Merrill
- One (1) Library Trustee for a 3-year term:**
Valerie Moore

Town Article 2 – Zoning Amendment 1: Wetlands - 2.9.1

This article adds language to the Zoning Ordinance that further defines the benefits of wetlands as to “filter and enhance water quality” in protecting drinking water quality, and corrects a typographical error.

A **YES vote** adds additional information to describe the functions of wetlands in protecting drinking water. Also corrects a typographical error in the last sentence of the paragraph.

A **NO vote** leaves the language as is.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To reinforce the reason why wetlands are important to drinking water.
- Supports the protection of drinking water as identified as a number two priority in 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results. (1)
- The changes are informational and typographic only and do not impact the regulation or administration of the regulation.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to not include any additional language regarding the function of wetlands.
- Do not believe the typographical error needs to be corrected.

References:

1. 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results for quality of life and future land use. Section IV page 51: tinyurl.com/y6cdn8v7
2. Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020 - Conservation Commission Website: tinyurl.com/y2jk5b92
3. Wetlands and Water Quality - Purdue University Cooperative Extension: tinyurl.com/y5hbh4ew

Town Article 3 – Zoning Amendment 2: Amend Purposes of Conservation District

This article adds an additional purpose for Conservation Zone G, which is to include maintaining the health and water storage function of wetlands so that they may continue to support water quality and access to drinking water in Raymond. The new language will read “4.9.1.9. Maintain the health and water storage function of wetlands so that they may continue to support water quality and access to drinking water in Raymond.” (1)

A **YES vote** adds an additional purpose to Conservation Zone G that includes more specific language for maintaining the health of wetlands in order to support quality drinking water.

A **NO vote** leaves the purpose section as is.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To reinforce the reasons that wetlands are important to drinking water. (2) (3)
- Supports the protection of drinking water as identified as a number two priority in 2009 Master Plan survey UNH results. (4)
- The changes do not impact the regulation or administration of the regulation.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefers not to add an additional purpose to Zone G.
- Do not support the language in the proposed amendment.

References:

1. Planning Board meeting on 12/17/20.
2. Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020 - Conservation Commission Website: tinyurl.com/y2jk5b92
3. Wetlands and Water Quality - Purdue University Cooperative Extension tinyurl.com/y5hbh4ew
4. 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results for quality of life and future land use. Section IV page 51: tinyurl.com/y6cdn8v7

Town Article 4 – Zoning Amendment 3: Shoreland Protection Area Boundaries

This article changes setbacks from 25 feet to 100 feet in the Shoreland Protection Area within the Zone G Conservation District for areas defined as ‘priority wetlands’. These ‘priority wetlands’ were identified in the “Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020,” (1).

A two-thirds majority is required for passage as a Zoning Ordinance Protest Petition has been filed per RSA 675:5. (2)(3)(4)

A **YES vote** expands the area within the Shoreland Protection Area from 25 feet to 100 feet for priority wetlands.

A **NO vote** leaves the Shoreland Protection Area as currently defined.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Support increased protection of wetlands that can impact the quality of the Town’s drinking water. (5)
- Have concerns regarding the quality of the Town’s drinking water for the

future. (6)

- Support the protection of drinking water as identified as a number two priority in the 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results for quality of life and future land use (page 51). (7)
- To further protect fish and wildlife habitats, store floodwaters, and maintain surface water flow during dry periods. (10)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Believe that increasing the setback to 100 feet is too much.
- Want to consider other options for protecting water sources before amending this zoning ordinance. (3)(9)
- Don’t agree with the results or methodology of the “Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020.” (1)(8)
- Process for seeking variances for new zoning is not yet determined. (9)

References:

1. Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020 - Conservation Commission Website: tinyurl.com/y2jk5b92
2. RSA 675:5 Zoning Ordinance Protest Petition. This RSA explains that a favorable vote of 2/3 is required when a zoning change is protested by 20% of specified property owners.
3. Citizen presentation at Board of Selectmen meeting, 1/11/21: tinyurl.com/1e0nlthc
4. “Protest Petition Informational Documents,” PowerPoint: tinyurl.com/yxoqzow8
5. “Wetlands and Water Quality: How Wetlands Contribute to Water Quality; Raymond Wetlands Evaluation Proposed Amendments to Zoning” Raymond Conservation Commission. tinyurl.com/y5zxfbd6
6. Wetlands and Water Quality - Purdue University Cooperative Extension: tinyurl.com/y5hbh4ew
7. 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results for quality of life and future land use, section IV page 51: tinyurl.com/y6cdn8v7
8. Wetland Zoning infographic and Residential Mapping, “Raymond Rights” website: tinyurl.com/545xrunn
9. Discussion at Town Deliberative Session, 2/6/21: tinyurl.com/4txd2abh
10. Wetland Protection and Restoration, US Environmental Protection Agency: tinyurl.com/2cj8sq8n

Town Article 5 – Zoning Amendment 4: Increase Wetland Setbacks in Conservation District

This article changes the area and dimensional requirements for wetland setbacks from 25 feet to 100 feet for priority wetlands, and from 25 feet to 75 feet for all other wetlands. It also moves the information on the wetland setbacks to a new section.

A two-thirds majority is required for passage as a Zoning Ordinance Protest Petition has been filed per RSA 675:5. (1)(2)(3)

A **YES vote** changes the setbacks to either 75 feet or to 100 feet for specified, priority wetlands.

A **NO vote** leaves the wetland setback as is at 25 feet.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Support increased protection of wetlands to protect water quality. (4)
- Have concerns regarding the quality of the Town’s drinking water and groundwater for the future. (5)
- Support the protection of drinking water and wetlands as identified as a number two and three priority in the 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results for quality of life and future land use (page 51). (6)
- To further protect fish and wildlife habitats, store floodwaters and maintain surface water flow during dry periods. (10)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Believe that the 75 foot and 100 foot setback increase is too much.
- Want to consider other options for protecting water sources before amending this zoning ordinance. (2)(9)
- Disagree with the results or methodology of the “Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020.” (7)(8)
- Process for seeking variances for new zoning is not yet determined. (9)

References:

1. RSA 675:5 Zoning Ordinance Protest Petition. This RSA explains that a favorable vote of 2/3 is required when a zoning change is protested by 20%

of specified property owners.

2. Citizen presentation at Board of Selectmen meeting, 1/11/21: tinyurl.com/1e0nlthc
3. “Protest Petition Informational Documents” tinyurl.com/yxoqzow8
4. “Wetlands and Water Quality: How Wetlands Contribute to Water Quality; Raymond Wetlands Evaluation Proposed Amendments to Zoning” Raymond Conservation Commission: tinyurl.com/y5zxfbd6
5. Wetlands and Water Quality - Purdue University Cooperative Extension: tinyurl.com/y5hbh4ew
6. 2009 Master Plan UNH survey results for quality of life and future land use, section IV page 51: tinyurl.com/y6cdn8v7
7. Wetland Mapping and Evaluation Final Report - August 2020 - Conservation Commission Website: tinyurl.com/y2jk5b92
8. Wetland Zoning infographic and Residential Mapping, “Raymond Rights” website: tinyurl.com/545xrunn
9. Discussion at Town Deliberative Session, discussion 2/6/21: tinyurl.com/4txd2abh
10. Wetland Protection and Restoration, US Environmental Protection Agency: tinyurl.com/2cj8sq8n

Town Article 6 – Zoning Amendment 5: Remove Sewer Overlay District

This article will amend the Town’s Zoning Ordinance by removing wording about the Sewer Overlay District. The Sewer Overlay District was approved by voters in March 2006 to encourage a mixture of land uses as part of a unified development planned near Exit 4. More specifically, this Overlay District was created in conjunction with the Town’s initiative to construct and operate a municipal wastewater facility to complement a mixed use development (commercial, industrial, and limited multi-family residential) at Exit 4. (1) Since that time, the development project was not created and the application for development expired. Another project is in development on part of that site, which will not require a wastewater facility.

A YES vote will remove the Sewer Overlay District from the Town Zoning Ordinance.

A NO vote will retain the Sewer Overlay District as part of the Town’s zoning.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The mixed-use development project was abandoned thus eliminating the need for the Overlay District.
- A Sewer Overlay District can be put back into the Zoning Ordinance in the future if needed.
- To discourage development that would require a wastewater facility.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To retain the ordinance should another development be proposed requiring Town septic.
- Would like this option to remain open at this site.
- To encourage development that would require a wastewater facility.

References:

1. 2019 Raymond Zoning Ordinance.

Town Article 7 – Zoning Amendment 6 - Accessory Dwelling Units

This article adds an additional requirement to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) regulations for the Town of Raymond. The Town Code defines ADUs as “an option for homeowners to offer separate and independent living space for their extended families, caregivers or others, or to offer small dwelling units as rentals to offset the expense of maintaining the dwelling.” (1) ADUs were added to the Town Code in 2017, and the proposed amendment will require a certificate of occupancy (2) to meet specific health and safety requirements (e.g. electrical, plumbing, septic) in the same way the primary residence does. ADUs created prior to March 2021 will not require meeting this new Code until the property is sold or otherwise transferred to a new owner.

A YES vote will add a requirement for a Certificate of Occupancy to ADUs and grandfather some current owners.

A NO vote will not add these proposed standards to the Zoning code.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To assure that the dwelling meets health and safety standards.
- To allow current homeowners a grace period for making necessary health and safety improvements.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- May require additional expenses to the new homeowner to meet these conditions.
- Prefer to keep the current regulations for ADUs in place.

References:

1. Raymond Zoning Ordinances, 197-6.10.5.
2. Raymond Zoning Code, Chapter 214-1: In the interest of the health, safety and general welfare of all persons residing in the Town, it shall be mandatory for all property owners in the Town owning property, as herein defined, to file a certificate of occupancy with the Board of Selectmen of the Town of Raymond in the form and manner as prescribed by said Board prior to the occupancy of said property.

Town Article 8 – Zoning Amendment 7: Agriculture

This article will amend the Town Zoning Ordinance by adding an Agriculture section and remove the requirement for a 2. If approved, this new ordinance would require that all agricultural & farming activities be conducted according to State guidelines (1) and require that housing, space, etc. for livestock follow NH Cooperative Extension guidelines. (2)

A YES vote would amend the Zoning Ordinance in Raymond to include a new section, “Agriculture,” which details specific guidelines for raising livestock..

A NO vote would not create a new “Agriculture” section in the Zoning Ordinance.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide best practices for agriculture according to State and County guidelines.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To keep the current Zoning regulations as is, without specifics for agriculture.

References:

1. According to the NH Department of Agriculture, implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs) can minimize the potential for agricultural nonpoint source water pollution and other adverse environmental and social problems. tinyurl.com/y5mto9du
2. UNH Cooperative Extension “Housing and Space Guidelines for Livestock.” tinyurl.com/y2z88h96

Town Article 9 – Zoning Amendment 8 - Change Definition of Agriculture

This article will add a new definition of “Agriculture” to the Raymond Zoning Ordinance by adopting that used by the State of NH including definitions for livestock, crops, plants, roadside stands, and farmers markets. (1) The article will also change the definition of Non-Commercial Agriculture so there is no specific land acreage requirement. (2)

A YES vote would adopt the State’s definition for “Agriculture” into the Town Zoning Ordinance and remove the two-acre requirement for non-commercial agriculture.

A NO vote would maintain the requirement of a minimum of two-acres for non-commercial agriculture and a new definition of “Agriculture” would not be adopted.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To clarify the term “agriculture.”
- To remove the lot size for agricultural activities that are not for profit.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Disagreement with the State of NH definition.
- Prefer to keep the size requirements for non-commercial agriculture.

References:

1. See NH RSA 21:34-a Farm, Agriculture and Farming states “I. The word “farm” means any land, buildings, or structures on or in which agriculture and farming operations or activities are carried out or conducted and shall include the residence or residences of owners, occupants, or employees located on such land. Structures shall include all farm outbuildings used in the care of livestock; in the production and storage of fruit, vegetables, or nursery stock; in the production of maple syrup; greenhouses for the production of annual or perennial plants; and any other structures used in the operations or activities named in paragraph II(a) or (b) of this section or any combination of such individual operations or activities. II. The words “agriculture” and “farming” mean all operations or activities of a farm...”
2. If approved, the wording would be: 13.1.5.2. NON-COMMERCIAL AGRICULTURE: Agricultural use of land accessory to a residential use where the lot size exceeds two acres.

Town Article 10 – Zoning Amendment 9 - Add Nuisance Definitions

This article will add two definitions of the term “Nuisance” to the Town Zoning Ordinance. A “Private Nuisance” will be any activity that “substantially and unreasonably interferes” with another’s property (e.g. neighbor), above the usual level of noise/activity. A “Public Nuisance” will be “an unreasonable interference with a right common to the general public” (e.g. on Town property, at a public event), affecting health, safety, peace, and comfort

A YES vote will add a definition of what constitutes a public or private nuisance in the Town of Raymond.

A NO vote will keep the Zoning Code as is, without a definition of “nuisance.”

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To clarify what could be considered a nuisance in Raymond.
- To provide citizens a recourse for substantial and unreasonable interference.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not want a nuisance ordinance.
- Consider the definition too broad or general for its intended purpose.

Town Article 11 – Zoning Amendment 10 - Workforce Housing

This article will add a new definition to the Town Zoning Ordinance for “Workforce Housing” as none currently exists. The definition will be the same as that of the State of NH in RSA 674:58 IV. (1) This definition includes pricing guidelines as compared to income for both rentals and ownerships.

A YES vote would add the State’s definition of “Workforce housing” to the Town’s Zoning Ordinance.

A NO vote would leave the Zoning Ordinance without such a definition.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- So there will be a local definition of Workforce housing.
- To match the State of NH’s definition of this term.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not agree with the State of NH’s definition of Workforce housing.
- Do not want to change the Town’s zoning code.

References:

1. RSA Section 674:58 IV states: Workforce housing means housing which is intended for sale and which is affordable to a household with an income of no more than 100 percent of the median income for a 4-person household for the metropolitan area or county in which the housing is located as published annually by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Workforce housing also means rental housing which is affordable to a household with an income of no more than 60 percent of the median income for a 3-person household for the metropolitan area or county in which the housing is located as published annually by the HUD. Housing developments that exclude minor children from more than 20 percent of the units, or in which more than 50 percent of the dwelling units have fewer than two bedrooms, shall not constitute workforce housing.

Town Article 12 – Operating Budget/Default Budget

This article will raise and appropriate \$8,487,677 to fund the Operating Budget, or if the article fails, will raise \$8,687,412 to fund the Default Budget. (1) These amounts do not include other money warrant articles on this year’s ballot that may pass or fail. These amounts do include the Water Department Budget (2), which is self-funded by water users, has no tax impact, and is not included in the information that follows. 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 proposed Town Operating Budget, without the Water Budget, is \$7,637,631, which is a decrease of \$142,633 or -1.83% as compared to last year’s actual operating budget. (3)(4) Budget increases include State-required labor costs (e.g. contributions to the State retirement system, exempt/non-exempt labor law), division of Tax Collector/Town Clerk from one position to two positions as voted in 2018, postal charges related to Covid-19, and welfare department payments for rent. Budget decreases include oil-based energy savings due to lower demand relating to Covid-19, moving budgeted lines to Warrant Articles to allow citizen vote, ongoing implementation of 2018 spending protocols, fewer anticipated legal expenses, and one eliminated position in the Planning Department & Economic Development.

The proposed Water Department Operating Budget is \$850,046 which is a decrease of

\$57,100 or -6% as compared to last year’s budget. (4) Water budget increases include life insurance contracts. Water budget decreases include consulting & engineering, contracted equipment & services, infrastructure repair & maintenance, and other technical services.

The estimated tax impact of the proposed 2021 Operating Budget (without the self-funded Water Budget) is \$5.198 per thousand of valuation or \$1,039.60 on a \$200,000 home. The estimated tax impact of the Default Operating Budget is \$5.315 per thousand of valuation or \$1,063.00 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote would raise and appropriate \$8,487,677 to fund the Town’s Operating Budget and the Town’s Water Budget.

A NO vote raises and appropriates \$8,600,468 to fund the Town’s Default Budget and the Town’s Water Budget.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To approve the proposed Town’s Budget for 2021.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To approve the Town’s Default 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. The actual budget includes the 2021 proposed budget plus any money warrant articles voted forward in March 2021 plus any obligations already contracted for.
4. “Town of Raymond 2021 Appropriations Package Operational Budgets and Warrant Articles.”

Town Article 13 – Capital Improvements

This article will raise and appropriate \$355,350 for the purpose of funding seven previously established Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) to support the Towns’ Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CRFs were created to purchase, repair, or maintain Town equipment and buildings that cost over \$20,000 or have a lifespan of at least 5 years. The total amount requested is an increase of \$10,500 or approximately \$0.005 (one-half a cent) as compared to last year.

If this article passes, the funds would be distributed as follows:

- Highway Department Heavy Equipment is increased by \$15,000 to \$45,000;
- Police Department & Dispatch Equipment, Vehicle, and Facilities is increased by \$10,500 from zero dollars in 2020;
- Fire Department Equipment and Vehicle increases by \$70,000 from \$30,000;
- General Government Buildings Maintenance & Improvements is decreased by \$5,000 to \$115,000;
- Highway Department Vehicle Repair and Replacement is decreased by \$10,000 to \$40,000;
- Bridge & Culvert is decreased by \$47,500 to \$34,500;
- Parks Equipment and Facilities would decrease by \$22,500 to \$10,500.

The following CRFs continue to be zero funded: Sidewalks, Master Plan Updates, New Town Facilities, Library, and Recreation Department Equipment, Vehicles and Facilities. (1)

An ongoing, annual 3% increase in Capital Improvements has been recommended by Town Manager and the CIP Committee based on the Town’s 40-year analysis (2) in order to project needs. Estimated 2021 tax impact is \$0.368 or \$73.60 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote will raise and appropriate \$355,350 to fund seven of the Town’s twelve CRFs.

A NO vote will raise no funds for the Town’s CRFs.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To save gradually and avoid spikes in the tax rate.
- To be able to make direct purchases without borrowing or without borrowing the entire amount.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Disagreement with one or more of the areas to be funded.
- To finance higher cost items with bonds and pay for items as built/purchased/used.

References:

1. When these CRFs were originally built, they were built...either by departments (even if there was no defined Capital need) or for a very specific...short-term effort. This previous approach to Capital funding not only cost approximately 16% more to sustain in annual funding to meet defined capital needs and also has frozen funding in CRFs that A) have no defined CIP projects B) been so underfunded they serve no real purpose or C) were created to address a very specific short-term (sometimes unexecuted) goal or effort. -Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email 1/4/21.
2. This analysis mapped each CRF over 2 or 3 replacement cycles until 2061. Changes in population were not considered but annual reviews can allow adjustments. -Town Manager Joe Ilsley speaking to Budget Committee, 1/5/21.

Town Article 14 – Capital Reserve Funds (Water Revenues)

This article will raise and appropriate \$200,000 for the following Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) for the Water Department: Construct, Repair and Maintain Town Water Treatment Facility \$50,000; Water System Infrastructure \$45,000; Water Storage Facilities \$100,000; Water Department Utility Replacement Vehicle \$3,000; New Well Site Acquisitions \$2,000.

This amount of \$200,000 is the same as requested last year and is based on anticipated Water Revenues according to the 2020 Town Water Department Assessment. There is no tax impact as revenues from the Town water users would pay to fund the CRFs.

A YES vote approves putting \$200,000 into the Water Department CRFs.

A NO vote would add nothing to those CRFs.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To save for major expenses related to the public water system.
- To avoid spikes in the cost of water services.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Preference to bond major purchases when needed.
- Disagree with any of the CRFs to be funded.

Town Article 15 – Mosquito Control

This article will raise \$40,000 to fund the mosquito control program in Raymond. The mosquito program monitors and controls mosquitoes carrying diseases such as Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE) and West Nile Virus (WNV) primarily by larvicide and emergency spraying, and on-request spraying of public assembly areas including playgrounds and the Common. (1) Sites are routinely treated and checked and the Selectmen receive regular updates on results. The funds requested are the same since 2016 and include the cost of lab testing. Estimated tax cost: \$0.041 per \$1,000 of tax valuation or \$8.20 on a \$200,000 home.

A YES vote funds the mosquito control program in Raymond.

A NO vote will not fund the mosquito control program in Raymond.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To reduce the risk of exposure to mosquito-borne illnesses such as Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE) and West Nile Virus (WNV).
- NH Department of Health and Human Services raised Raymond's risk of EEE to a moderate level as Candia and Fremont mosquitoes tested positive in 2019. (2)
- Raymond mosquitoes tested positive for West Nile Virus (WNV) in 2018. (4)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Raymond has not tested positive for any mosquito-borne illnesses since 2018. (3)
- Does not guarantee prevention of any mosquito-borne disease.
- Concern about possible chemical exposure.

References:

1. Dragon Mosquito Control, Public Notice for Raymond, NH, 2020: tinyurl.com/y363g45v
2. Discussion at Board of Selectmen meeting, 10/21/19: tinyurl.com/y45e8jzx

3. NH Department of Health and Human Services, Arboviral Risk Map, 2020: tinyurl.com/y59svu3q

4. NH Department of Health and Human Services, Arboviral Risk Map, 2019: tinyurl.com/y668shw3

Town Article 16 – 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 higher education without such taxpayer assistance.

References:

1. Raymond awarded two scholarships in 2020 of \$1,000 each.
2. As of 11/30/20, the balance in the Town Scholarship Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) account was \$7,316.23, per Julie Jenks, Town of Raymond Finance Manager via 1/13/21 e-mail.

Town Article 17 – 4th of July 2021 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 had taken place for over 20 years through support from local businesses, community organizations, and private individuals, until 2020 when it was canceled due to COVID-19 guidelines on public gatherings. (1) July 4th activities for 2021 are yet to be determined. 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 4th 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.

References:

1. Last year's allocation for the July 4th celebration was moved to unexpended funds as there was no community-wide celebration. -Town Manager Joe Ilsley speaking at the Board of Selectmen meeting, 12/14/20.

Town Article 18 – Social Services Agencies

This article will raise \$40,000 for twelve Social Service agencies that provide services to Raymond residents. (1) The Board of Selectmen capped the amount awarded to \$40,000. (2) The estimated tax impact is \$0.041 per thousand of valuation or \$8.20 on 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.
- You or someone you know has been impacted and needed the services.

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 an increase from 2020: Southern NH Services/Rockingham Community Action: \$4,000 (up \$22), and Rockingham County Nutrition Program: \$6,000 (up \$2,253).

- These agencies are proposed to be funded at the same level as last year: Child Advocacy Center \$2000, Waypoint (formerly Child and Family Services of NH) \$6000; Home Health and Hospice Care \$1,000.
 - The following agencies are proposed to be funded at a lesser amount as compared to 2020: HAVEN: \$4,000 (down \$175); Retired Senior Volunteer Program: \$500 (down \$100); Chamber Children’s Fund: \$2,000 (down \$1,000); Raymond Coalition for Youth: \$7,000 (down \$3,000).
 - The following agencies will receive funding, and although did not request funding in 2020, they had been awarded funds in prior years: American Red Cross: \$1,000, and Richie McFarland Children’s Center: \$5,000.
2. Requests from Social Services in 2020 totaled \$90,322. Requests in 2021 totaled \$95,285.

Town Article 19 – Waste Disposal Special Revenue Fund (Fund 18)

This article asks voters to spend \$849,000.00 from a Special Revenue Fund (SRF) (1)(2) to pay for residential curbside trash and recycling removal (Pay As You Throw/PAYT). The funds in that SRF accumulated through sales of yellow bags and recycling bins, and through transfer station fees. This fund was created by voters in 2006 with Warrant Article 33 and requires annual voter approval to gain access to these funds. Approval by a majority of the voters is required for passage. 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 could continue.

A NO vote means the Town would have no legal way to access them; they would be unable to be used and would remain in the SRF. Residential curbside trash & recycling removal could be significantly impacted.

- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To continue residential curbside trash & recycling removal.
 - To allow officials to access the funds already set aside for the purpose of paying 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. RSA 31:95-c Special Revenue Funds. Towns may vote to restrict revenues, or any portion of revenues, from a specific source to expenditures for specific purposes...and be separate from the general fund.
 2. The funds in this SRF are usually completely expended each year for the costs of the program.

Town Article 20 – 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 \$241,126 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. (2) There is no tax impact.

A YES vote authorizes the Department of Public Works to withdraw \$241,126 from its Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund and requires the use of the money prior to December 31, 2023.

- 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) that the money will be spent on.

- 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.
 2. The Town tends to carry a balance of \$200,000-\$400,000 in this fund to cover any unanticipated road repairs. -Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email, 1/27/21.

Town Article 21 – Road Reconstruction Projects

This article raises and appropriates \$360,500 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) The goal of road repair is to bring the major roads on a maintenance cycle with scheduled repairs instead of major reconstruction. (2)

The state will contribute \$241,126 this year towards the town’s road maintenance as stated in Warrant Article 20. 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. (3)

Estimated tax impact: \$0.373 per \$1000 of tax valuation or about \$74.60 for a \$200,000 home.

- A YES vote** allows the town to continue some of the most needed road reconstruction projects.
- A NO vote** results in roads receiving temporary repairs and not reconstruction.
- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To enable the Public Works Department to reconstruct some roads rather than continue to make repairs to those roads.
 - To try to decrease the percentage of road miles in need of reconstruction.
- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- Disagreement 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. Town Manager Joe Ilsley to Board of Selectmen (BOS) Meeting 10/05/20.
 3. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer, BOS Meeting 11/21/16.

Town Article 22 – Establish Contingency Fund

This article will establish a contingency fund in the amount of \$79,117 as allowed by State law (1) from the fund balance which will be used for unexpected expenses. Any appropriated money remaining 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 amount requested in this Warrant Article is less than requested last year due to the calculations done on a smaller budget. (2) The Board of Selectmen will be required to prepare a detailed report of expenditures. A majority vote is required for passage. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote would create a contingency fund and set aside \$79,117 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 unexpected expenses.
- 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 or disaster relief.

- References:**
1. RSA 31:98-a Contingency Fund. “Such fund shall not exceed one percent of the amount appropriated by the town for town purposes during the preceding year excluding capital expenditures and the amortization of debt.”
 2. This amount will change every year and will continue to decrease as the funding focus changes to Capital Investment, which is not included in the 1% calculation. In both years since the Town implemented the Contingency Fund, it has not needed to access these funds. -Town Manager Joe Ilsley, in an email, 1/4/21.

Town Article 23 – Sick and Vacation Non-Union Expendable Trust Fund

This article asks voters to authorize the withdrawal of up to \$35,000 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 leave employment. Typically, the Town first uses monies budgeted in the Operational Budget for payouts,

and then uses the Trust Fund if additional funds are needed. (2) This amount was increased from \$20,000 by the voters at Deliberative Session (2/6/21) due to the higher liability of the Non-Union fund as compared with that of the Union fund. A payout of \$40,000-\$50,000 from the Non-Union fund is anticipated in the next year. (3)(4) There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote moves \$35,000 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. “As a general rule, the Town’s past practice since 2019, has used the amount Budgeted in the Town Operational Budget first and then used these funds as a secondary funding source if the amount needed exceeds those funds in the Operational Budget. However, due to the drastic reduction in Buy-Out liabilities (estimated to be reduced...by 70% of when the Buy-Out Mitigation Strategy Started) and the fiscal uncertainties of Covid-19; the Town will first use these accounts and then use the Town Operational Budget if this cost exceeds the amounts available.” -Town Manager Joe Ilsley, in an email 1/25/21.
 3. Town Manager Joe Ilsley, speaking at Town Deliberative Session, 2/6/21.
 4. The balance in this fund is \$22,112.27 as of November 2020 according to the Town Deliberative Session handout, 2/6/21.

Town Article 24 – Sick and Vacation Union Expendable Trust Fund

This article appropriates up to \$5,000 to be withdrawn from the Unassigned Fund Balance and deposited into the Sick and Vacation Union Expendable Trust Fund (1) for Union employees. This amount was decreased from \$20,000 by voters at the Deliberative Session (2/6/21) in an effort to better fund the Non-Union fund (2021 Warrant Article 23). The Union fund currently contains a balance of \$87,953.53 with no known expenditures in the next year. (2)(3) 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 leave Town employment. 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 2021 Operating Budget. Funds will be used from the Unassigned Fund Balance. There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote approves using up to \$5,000 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 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, speaking at Town Deliberative Session, 2/6/21.
 3. Town Deliberative Session handout, 2/6/21.

Town Article 25 – Elderly Exemption Increase and Revaluation Adjustment

This article will change the property tax exemption for residents over 65 years of age who meet specific income & asset requirements. For a resident between the ages 65-75 years, \$125,000 of assessed value is exempted; for ages 75-80 years \$137,500 is exempted; for ages 80+ years \$162,500 is exempted. Residents can qualify for these exemptions if the senior has been a NH resident for at least 3 consecutive years and owns the real estate, or, if the property is owned by the spouse, they must have been married for 5 consecutive years. Asset requirements state the senior must have a net income of no more than \$31,853 (if single) or up to \$43,190 (if married), and have net assets of \$73,469 or less, excluding the value of the residence. Thus far, 118 citizens have qualified for this program. Estimated tax impact: \$0.02 per thousand of tax valuation or \$4.00 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 help keep up with the cost of living. (1)
- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- To keep the elderly exemption at the current level.

- References:**
1. 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...” Town Manager Joe Ilsley, “Talk of the Town,” December 2018 edition.

Town Article Article 26 – Blind Exemption Revaluation Adjustment

This article will adjust the current property tax exemption for people who are legally blind as determined by the State. (1) The annual exemption, as determined by the legislative body, is based on an assessed residential property value of \$62,500. The Warrant Article was recommended by the Town Assessor to avoid potential tax liabilities of exempted residents due to the anticipated change in property values from the 2021 Revaluation. (2) Thus far, the number of citizens who have qualified for this exemption is three. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote would increase property tax exemptions for qualifying property owners.
A NO vote would keep the current property tax exemptions for those individuals.

- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To avoid negative financial impacts for residents who are legally blind.
- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**
- Want to keep property tax exemptions as is.

- References:**
1. RSA 72:37 Exemption for the (legally) Blind.
 2. Information presented with Draft Warrant Articles.

Town Article 27 – Disabled Exemption Revaluation Adjustment:

This article will adjust the current property tax exemption for people who have disabilities according to Social Security guidelines (1) and who meet specific requirements. Residents with disabilities can qualify for these exemptions if: they have been a NH resident for at least 5 consecutive years and own the real estate, or if the property is owned by the spouse, they must have been married for a minimum of 5 consecutive years. Asset requirements state the person must have a net income of no more than \$27,000 (if single) or no more than \$37,000 (if married), and have net assets of \$70,000 or less, excluding the value of the residence. Thus far, the number of citizens who have qualified for this exemption is 36. There is no new tax impact.

- A YES vote** would increase property tax exemptions for qualifying property owners.
A NO vote would keep the current property tax exemptions for those individuals.
- Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**
- To avoid negative financial impacts for residents who have disabilities. (2)
- Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Want to keep property tax exemptions as is.

References:

1. RSA 72:37-b Exemption for the Disabled.
2. Information presented with Draft Warrant Articles.

Town Article 28 – Disabled Veterans Credit Increase

This article will provide a \$500 increase to the current property tax credit of \$2,500 for Veterans who were honorably discharged and are 100% Permanently and Totally Disabled, as determined by the Department of Veteran Affairs. This tax credit also applies to their surviving spouses. In 2004, the Town adopted Warrant Article 41 (amended by Warrant Article 33 in 2005) providing 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) An estimated total of 46 Raymond Veterans/spouses will be eligible. (2) A majority vote is required for passage. Estimated tax impact is \$0.01 per thousand of tax valuation or \$2.00 on a \$200,000 home.

A **YES vote** will increase the residential tax credit to \$3,000 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 \$2,500.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Wish to provide a \$500 tax credit increase to qualifying Veterans and surviving spouses, for a total of \$3,000.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Want to maintain the current tax credit of \$2,500 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. Next year, the amount will be included in the Town budget rather than in a warrant article. The goal is to achieve the State maximum of \$4000. -Town Manager Joe lsley, speaking to the Budget Committee, 10/13/20.

Town Article 29 – One-Time or Cyclic Procurement Capital Reserve Fund

This article will place \$161,500 from the Unassigned Fund Balance into the One-Time or Cyclic Procurement Capital Reserve Fund (CRF). (1) This CRF was established by voters in 2020 by Warrant Article 20 and, at that time, set aside \$154,400 for operational budget purchases that are either repeating or single time.

This year, projected one-time or cyclic purchases include potential impacts associated with Covid-19 at \$20,000 (e.g. extra sanitation and PPE for Deliberative session and voting, equipment/materials for Town employees handling citizens’ in-person business, signage & mailings for citizens, legal reviews of State guidelines/ mandates), the mailing costs associated with the 2021 Revaluation at \$6,500, and modernization of the Raymond Police Department to better meet law enforcement industry standards and reduce liabilities to the community and the officers (body cameras at \$76,000 and, based on State of NH 2020 Recommendations, electronic fingerprinting capabilities at \$19,000 to facilitate FBI reporting & enhance detection of suspects taken into custody).

There is no new tax impact.

A **YES vote** transfers \$161,500 into the One-Time or Cyclic Procurement CRF and sets aside that sum to cover the specific one-time and cyclical costs as listed above.

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.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To plan ahead for one-time or cyclical expenses by setting aside money in a CRF.
- Setting aside money in the CRF will help stabilize and avoid spikes in the tax rate.
- To fund a CRF from the Unassigned Fund Balance instead of current taxes.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to pay for these one-time or cyclic expenses through the Operational Budget.
- Do not support one or more 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.”

Town Article 30 – Road Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund

This article will appropriate the sum of \$300,000 to be placed in the 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. This fund is 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. 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. “According to the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) figures, the Town of Raymond’s Unassigned Fund Balance is \$5,028,616. This amount represents a \$679,869 increase from 2019 figures and is a net change in retention of 2.09% from 14.86% retained to 16.95% retained...DRA recommends Municipalities retain between 5% (minimum) through 17% (maximum)” -Town Manager Ilsley in an email 1/25/21.

Town Article 31 – Facility Revitalization Fund

This article will add \$700,000 to the Facility Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) established in 2020. This fund was created to address infrastructure issues regarding town-owned properties, including restoring and refurbishing the Torrent Hose Company (the old fire house) for much needed Town office space and storage. Other town properties currently do not have adequate access as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (1), and some need to be brought up to code with respect to energy and safety requirements. Funds from the Unassigned Fund Balance (UFB) will be transferred to this CRF. (2) There is no new tax impact.

A **YES vote** will add \$700,000 from the UFB into this CRF to be used for renovation of Town buildings and related expenses.

A **NO vote** will not add any monies to the Facility Revitalization CRF.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To provide needed office and administrative space at no current cost to taxpayers.
- Think that restoring the old fire house could be less expensive than buying land and erecting a new building.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to fund the Town buildings & property restorations in a different way.
- Want the UFB to be used in a different way.
- Do not want to restore existing Town buildings & property.

References:

1. “About the ADA Standards”: tinyurl.com/dr2gh91t
2. “According to the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) figures, the Town of Raymond’s Unassigned Fund Balance is \$5,028,616. This amount represents a \$679,869 increase from 2019 figures and is a net change in retention of 2.09% from 14.86% retained to 16.95% retained...DRA recommends Municipalities retain between 5% (minimum) through 17% (maximum)” -Town Manager Ilsley in an email 1/25/21.

Town Article 32 – Establish a Town Vehicle and Equipment Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund

This article will create a new Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) to save money for the purchase of vehicles and equipment needed for Town operations (e.g. Fire, Police, and/or Public Works Departments). Currently, there are several CRFs for specific Town departments and these new funds could be combined with other municipal vehicle and equipment CRFs to expedite savings and purchases. This article will also place \$257,500 into the new CRF, using funds from the Unassigned Fund Balance (UFB). This amount was determined by the Town’s 2020 Capital Investment 40-year Analysis of projected needs. (1) There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote would create a new CRF for any necessary Town vehicle or equipment and place \$257,500 from the UFB in it.

A NO vote would not create or fund the proposed CRF.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Could decrease competition among Town departments in funding needed vehicles and equipment.
- Could expedite savings for prioritized purchases.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Consider the existing CRF satisfactory for funding Town vehicles and equipment.
- Disagree with using monies from the Unassigned Fund Balance for a new CRF.

References:

1. The Town analysis revealed an annual deficit of \$257,500 between needs and funding for town-wide vehicles and equipment through the current Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) causing delay in inability to make purchases. A 10-year projection revealed a potential \$2.8 million deficit. -Town Manager, Joe Ilsley in an email, 1/25/21.

Town Article 33 – Establish an Emergency Management Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund

This warrant article will establish and fund an Emergency Management Revitalization Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) with the purpose of improving the Town’s Emergency Response and Management Capabilities and enhancing the Town’s abilities to achieve National Incident Management Command and Control capabilities, as designated by the Federal Emergency and Management Agency (FEMA). (1) Building up these capabilities includes proper plans, training, equipment, and communications for a unified response to address emergencies. Additionally, this warrant article appropriates the sum of \$320,000 to be placed in this fund. The monies used to cover this item will be withdrawn from the Unassigned Fund Balance (UFB). There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote creates an Emergency Management Revitalization CRF and sets aside \$320,000 from the UFB to support the effectiveness of the Town’s Emergency Response.

A NO vote would make any Emergency Management costs identified come from the Operational Budget in the year of the expense instead of from the fund balance.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The Town’s dispatch console, used for communications and coordination in time of emergency, is in need of replacement. (2)
- To improve response to and management of disaster and emergency situations.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Consider the current response plan adequate to meet the Town’s needs.
- Would prefer the UFB is used for other purposes.

References:

1. The National Preparedness Goal defines what it means for the whole community to be prepared for all types of disasters and emergencies. The goal itself is succinct: “A secure and resilient nation with the capabilities required across the whole community to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from the threats and hazards that pose the greatest risk.” These risks include events such as natural disasters, disease pandemics, chemical spills and other man-made hazards, terrorist attacks and cyber attacks. tinyurl.com/1d64dncs
2. The dispatch console is used for communications with and among Police, Fire and Emergency Management personnel and vehicles within Raymond, and with Mutual Aid communities.

Town Article Article 34 – Establish a Capital Reserve Fund for the Purchase of 10 Old Fremont Road (Bean Tavern)

This article will create a new Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) to purchase Bean Tavern, the oldest home in Town (1) and the site of Raymond’s first Town Meeting, and transfer \$260,000 from the Unassigned Fund Balance (UFB) into the new CRF. Bean Tavern is located at 10 Old Fremont Road. It was built around 1750 (2) and is depicted on the official Town Seal. The first Town Meeting was held there on May 29, 1764 when it was known as Benjamin Bean’s Inn. (3) Once the Town purchases the property, residents can decide its purpose. (4)(5) There is no new tax impact.

A YES vote will approve the creation of a CRF and a transfer of \$260,000 from the UFB to purchase the Bean Tavern.

A NO vote will neither create nor fund the new CRF.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Want to preserve a part of Raymond’s history.
- Desire to create space for Town purposes.
- Don’t want commercial development at that location.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Unknown costs for rehabbing the building.
- Prefer that the property be used for commercial purposes to help with the tax base.
- No plan for the building’s future use has been identified.

References:

1. “Images of America - Raymond” by Kristin Ozana Doyle.
2. Town of Raymond, Bi-Centennial Celebration booklet, August 9-15, 1964.
3. “The Bean House is the oldest house in Raymond and in early years it was a tavern. The first town meetings were held there and it was also used as a house of worship, before the churches were built. This house was probably built around 1750. The Tavern was opened by Lieut. Benjamin Bean, probably before 1760. His son Thomas continued with the business until his death in 1804. The tavern was given up shortly thereafter. Town Meetings were held at the Bean Tavern even after the new meeting house was built. . . .” “Pictorial History of Raymond, N.H. 1764-1976” by the Raymond Historical Society.
4. A citizen working group would be formed to consider options, if this Warrant Article is approved. The building could be rehabilitated for an estimated \$1,000,000 and used as another public building, the building could be relocated and the land sold, the house/land could be sold with a deed restriction. The goal is to save it and then decide what to do. -Town Manager Joe Ilsley, speaking at the Budget Committee meeting, 10/13/20.
5. “The reason why the Board of Selectmen wanted to pursue a purchase and sales agreement is because the property was being marketed for commercial development. The Bean Tavern, although part of the sale, was not even listed in the MLS advertisement and was completely omitted from the MLS photos. This gave strong indications that not only was property being marketed for the commercial value of the land versus the local historical value of the Tavern, but the actual Tavern was viewed as a liability in attracting investors. It was the view of the Board of Selectmen, that if purchased for reason consistent with how the property was marketed, there would be a significant risk the Tavern would be demolished due to its current state of repair and that buyers would not realize or consider, the local historical value of the building.” -Town Manager Joe Ilsley in an email 1/25/21.

Town Article 35 – Cemetery Plot Fees Maintenance Fund

This article will close three expendable Trust funds (Cemetery Sale of Trees, Cemetery Sales of Lots, and Cemetery/Sale of Lumber) and move the balances into the previously established Cemetery Plot Fees Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund. These funds are used to maintain Town cemeteries. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote will move the funds into a previously established Capital Reserve fund available to the town to pay for cemetery maintenance and expansion.

A NO vote will keep the funds in several expendable Trust funds.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To permit the Trustees of the Trust funds to consolidate multiple funds into one Capital Reserve Fund for cemetery maintenance costs.
- To correct errors in the past that placed the funds into expendable funds. (1)(2)
- The Trustees of the Trust Fund consulted with and have the approval of the

NH Department of Justice Charitable Trusts Unit. (2)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To require the Cemetery Sale of Trees, Cemetery Sales of Lots and Cemetery/Sale of Lumber to remain as separate funds.
- Disagree with the recommendations of the NH Department of Justice Charitable Trusts Unit
- Disagree with the Trustees of the Trust Funds vote.

References:

1. 1985 Warrant Article 10: tinyurl.com/yylmbf2s
2. Trustees of the Trust Funds, 11/9/20, Item 2 at: tinyurl.com/y6kdebco

Town Article 36 – Closure of Designated Cemetery Funds

This article will authorize the Trustees of the Trust Funds to close three Non-expendable Trust funds. The balances will be divided and placed into previously established Capital Reserve Funds. Research by the Trustees and the NH Charitable Trusts Unit has revealed that the incorrectly named “Perpetual Care Fund” does not contain any actual perpetual care funds. The intent is to move funds identified as incorrectly placed in trust fund categories into two existing Capital Reserve Funds (CRF) for the maintenance and expansion of town cemeteries. This will make the full amount of the funds available to the Public Works department whereas now only the interest can be used. This action has no impact on the established Perpetual Care Funds. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote will make these funds available to the Town to pay for cemetery maintenance and expansion.

A NO vote will restrict the use of the funds to interest only and not principal.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To permit the Trustees of the Trust funds to reimburse the Town for cemetery maintenance and expansion costs.
- To correct errors in the past that placed the funds into Non-expendable funds (only interest can be spent). (1)(2)
- To move non perpetual care funds into the Capital Reserve Fund. (3)
- The Trustees of the Trust Fund consulted with and have the approval of the NH Department of Justice Charitable Trusts Unit to make this change. (2)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To restrict the use of these funds to interest only, not principal.
- To require the maintenance and expansion costs of town cemeteries to come from taxes only.
- Disagree with the recommendations of the NH Department of Justice Charitable Trusts Unit. (3)
- Disagree with the Trustees of the Trust Funds vote to move the funds. (2)

References:

1. 1985 Warrant Article 10: tinyurl.com/yylmbf2s
2. Trustees of the Trust Funds Minutes 11/9/20, Item 3: tinyurl.com/y6kdebco
3. Warrant Article 36 explained: tinyurl.com/y4uh4346

Town Article 37 – Citizen Petition: Zoning Amendment: To restrict any commercial signs promoting cannabis, or marijuana, drug-related paraphernalia or products

This Citizen Petition states, “Shall the Town of Raymond NH vote to amend zoning ordinance 271:A-7 Prohibited signs, to include: any sign that includes the marijuana plant or its likeness.”

This article would request that the Raymond Planning Board amend the Raymond Zoning ordinance to prohibit any signage displaying a marijuana leaf, its likeness, or images depicting drug-related paraphernalia, such as those in surrounding communities. This Warrant Article is advisory only. At least one public hearing will be required. There is no tax impact.

As a community, the Raymond Coalition For Youth (RCFY), established in 2002, has been working to reduce substance misuse amongst our youth. (1)(2)

This warrant article is NOT intended to limit or restrict the use of marijuana or hemp products for medical purposes, or CBD in any form.

A YES vote will advise the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board to prohibit marijuana and related signs in Town.

A NO vote will leave the zoning ordinances as is.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To limit marijuana commercialization, advertising, and marketing in Raymond. (3)
- Want to limit promotional or advertising signs in Raymond.
- Consider this type of advertising to be incompatible with the rural character of the Raymond community.

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not support a change in Raymond zoning law.
- Prefer that RCFY meet their objectives by other means.
- Opposed to placing limitations on advertising by cannabis-related businesses.

References:

1. Raymond Coalition for Youth Mission Statement: tinyurl.com/y2mx8stb
2. In the past eighteen years, youth marijuana use has dropped from 29% to 21% for past 30-day youth use. 2019 Youth Risk Behavior Survey result - Raymond and State of NH: tinyurl.com/y4y43qux
3. RAND Corporation - “Adolescents Who View More Medical Marijuana Advertising Are More Likely to Use Marijuana, Have Positive Views About the Drug.” tinyurl.com/y5ulupz3

Town Article 38 – Citizen Petition: Zoning Amendment: To restrict the commercialization of marijuana and marijuana-based products

This Citizen Petition states, “To restrict the commercialization of marijuana and marijuana-based products.” It will advise our Selectmen to prevent the establishment of any marijuana business in the town of Raymond, as such a business would increase marijuana product exposure to our youth and community. This Citizen Petition is to advise the Selectmen to oppose the establishment of the following businesses: commercial marijuana cultivation; marijuana testing facilities; marijuana product manufacturers; marijuana retailers; on-site marijuana consumption at a business location; or any other marijuana-related activity for commercial purposes by whatever name used. (1)

Nothing in this warrant article is intended to limit use of marijuana or hemp products for medical purposes.

This Warrant Article is advisory only. There is no tax impact.

A YES vote would advise the Selectmen (and subsequently the Planning Board) to oppose the future establishment of a marijuana-related business in Raymond, NH.

A NO vote would have no impact.

Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To support youth who want to limit access to a drug that they have personally seen impacting their family and friends. (2)
- To limit marijuana commercialization, advertising and marketing.
- To limit the cultivation of marijuana, which impacts our environment and watershed. (3)

Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Don’t want to restrict additional commercial endeavors in Town.
- Don’t want additional zoning law added to the Town code.

References:

1. As a community, the Raymond Coalition For Youth (RCFY), established in 2002, has been working to reduce substance misuse amongst our youth. Raymond Coalition for Youth: tinyurl.com/y4rl8c4o
2. According to the 2019 Raymond High School Youth Risk Behavior Survey: 2019 Youth Risk Behavior Survey: 43% of Raymond students think there is no risk from using marijuana once or twice a week; 48% think it is wrong or very wrong for someone their age to use marijuana; 70% of students think their parents think it is wrong or very wrong for them to use marijuana; 51% of Raymond high school students report it would be easy or very easy to obtain marijuana; 31% of NH Youth report living in a home with addiction: tinyurl.com/y4y43qux
3. The Environmental Downside of Cannabis Cultivation: “Unfortunately, marijuana is a fairly thirsty plant - cannabis water use can equal up to six gallons of water every day (and that’s just for one plant). That means a square mile of marijuana plants consume nearly 1 billion gallons of water during prime growing seasons. In areas where water supply is scarce, marijuana cultivation can take up more water than available - this has a direct negative impact on aquatic life and freshwater available for other

necessary aspects of both human and natural life.”

tinyurl.com/yyxg2bfn

The 2021 Guide is brought to the Raymond Community free of charge by the Raymond Voter Information Project, donations from Raymond citizens, in-kind contributions, and our Business Donors:

Ace Ben Franklin Hardware

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

I.C. Reed & Sons, Inc.

Serving Utilities & Industry Since 1953
Evans Drive, Raymond, NH 03077
(603) 895-2731

Inspired Yoga and Health

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

Jambs Jewelry

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

Langford's Laundromat

45 Route 27, behind Hannaford's, Raymond
603-895-3157 and

Natural or Not Salon & Spa

32 Harriman Hill Road, Raymond
www.naturalornot.com
603-895-5161

Madore Electric

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

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

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)

Satellite Solutions

Kathy Pouliot, Owner
Computer Repairs, Tune-Ups & IT Consulting
satellitesolutionsnh@gmail.com
603-706-0538

Universal Electric

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

Vernet Properties

Raymond Shopping Center, 978-744-4272, and

Tuckaway Tavern & Butchery

58 Route 27, Raymond
www.thetuckaway.com
603-244-2431

WATCH CANDIDATES NIGHT ON RCTV ON DEMAND

www.raymondnh.gov/rctv

Click on the On Demand Video Site

Make your selections and bring your list to the polls

Town Warrant Articles

- 1 - Town Candidates
- 2 - Zoning Amend. 1: Wetlands 2.9.1.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 3 - Zoning Amend. 2: Conservation District.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 4 - Zoning Amend. 3: Shoreland Protection.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 5 - Zoning Amend. 4: Wetland Setbacks.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 6 - Zoning Amend. 5: Remove Sewer Overlay.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 7 - Zoning Amend. 6: ADUs.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 8 - Zoning Amend. 7: Agriculture.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 9 - Zoning Amend. 8: Def. of Agriculture.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 10 - Zoning Amend. 9: Add Nuisance Def.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 11 - Zoning Amend. 10: Workforce Housing.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 12 - Operating Budget/Default Budget.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 13 - Capital Improvements.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 14 - CRFs (Water Revenues).....Y ☐ N ☐
- 15 - Mosquito Control.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 16 - Scholarship Fund.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 17 - 4th of July 2021.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 18 - Social Service Agencies.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 19 - Waste Disposal SRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 20 - Shim and Overlay SRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 21 - Road Reconstruction.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 22 - Establish Contingency Fund.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 23 - Sick & Vaca. Non-Union Fund.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 24 - Sick & Vaca. Union Fund.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 25 - Elderly Exemption.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 26 - Blind Exemption.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 27 - Disabled Exemption.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 28 - Disabled Veterans.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 29 - One Time or Cyclic CRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 30 - Road Revitalization CRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 31 - Facility Revitalization CRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 32 - Estab. Town Vehicle & Equip. CRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 33 - Estab. Emergency Management CRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 34 - Estab. CRF for the Purchase Bean Tavern.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 35 - Cemetery Plot Fees Maint. Fund.....Y ☐ N ☐

- 36 - Closure of Designated Cemetery Funds.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 37 - Cit. Pet. Restrict Signs for Cannabis, etc.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 38 - Cit. Pet. Restrict Commercialization of Marij, etc.Y ☐ N ☐

School Warrant Articles

- 1 - School District Candidates
- 2 - Operating Budget.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 3 - REA Collective Bargaining.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 4 - Special Meeting.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 5 - Treasurer’s Stipend Increase.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 6 - Deputy Treasurer Training Stipend.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 7 - Capital Reserve Funds.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 8 - CRF from Year-End Fund Balance.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 9 - Water Easement Funds to CRF.....Y ☐ N ☐
- 10 - Up to 5% Retention of Funds.....Y ☐ N ☐

SEE YOU AT THE POLLS!

Tuesday March 9, 2021

7 AM to 7 PM

Iber Holmes Gove

Middle School

Epping Road at School Street

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