

Chapter 5

Miscellaneous Information



The Senate of the State of New Hampshire

107 N. Main Street, Room 302, Concord, N.H. 03301-4951

MATTHEW S. HOUDE
District 5

Office 271-2104
TTY/TDD
1-800-735-2964

Legislative Update from Sen. Matthew Houde, District 5 – March 2010

Let me start by saying “thank you”. It is a privilege and honor to represent Hanover, which is part of Senate District 5, in the NH Senate. As you gather for town meeting, I wanted to share some of the rewards (and challenges) of the current session in Concord.

2009 Highlights

While much energy and attention was focused, appropriately, on the state budget last year, the Legislature also addressed bills involving same sex marriage (passed), mandatory seat belts (did not pass), and medical marijuana (passed but was vetoed). While the same sex marriage bill was an historic moment, the latter two issues seem to be re-visited every session - and last year was no exception.

State Budget

The economic climate continues to challenge state and local governments. At the same time the need for services increases (for example, more people across the state are in need of Medicaid and unemployment benefits), the state has not collected enough revenue to address these needs. As a result, the Legislature and Governor continue to look for ways to close the gap. Many drastic cuts to programs have been proposed, and the Legislature has heard bills proposing various solutions on the revenue side – including expanded gambling. Gambling remains a controversial issue, and the vast majority of people I heard from in Senate District 5 do not support it. I voted against the gambling bill, but it passed the Senate 14-10. Regardless of what the House does with the bill, cuts alone cannot close the gap without severely hurting those in need of services; it is likely that we will need to find additional revenue as well. I welcome your thoughts and suggestions regarding this ongoing issue...

The fate of the LLC Tax

Everyday the “LLC tax” (technically, the extension of the interest and dividends tax to LLC distributions) looks less and less likely to remain in effect. Several bills have been heard that would either repeal or essentially eliminate the tax. Additionally, the Governor has indicated that he will support repeal – provided it is done as part of a wider review of state business taxes and solutions to the state’s revenue problems. (It was estimated that the LLC tax would generate \$15 million/year.)

Health Care Legislation

While the federal government has passed historic health care reform legislation, there is still much the state can do to address affordability and access. One bill that I sponsored, (SB 390) would provide employees of businesses that do not currently offer health care coverage a way to obtain it. Briefly, employees could choose from certain coverage options available through “cafeteria plans” set up by their employers. With cafeteria plans, employees pay for the coverage with pre-tax dollars (through payroll deductions) at a significantly reduced rate from the individual insurance market. The cost to the employer of setting up a plan is small; it ranges from \$0 (if the employer sets it up him/herself) to \$250 (if the employer hires an outside HR consultant to do so). Those costs - and more - would be recouped since the employer would be contributing less to federal employment taxes. This bill passed the Senate and now moves to the House.

Another bill that I introduced (SB 510) would establish a study commission to look at the differences between coverage for oral cancer treatment as opposed to IV cancer treatment. Currently, most health care insurers cover oral cancer medication under a pharmacy benefit, which requires a co-pay with each refill. On the other hand, IV cancer treatment is covered as a medical benefit - so that the insured only pays a one-time co-pay and a fixed deductible. The concern is that this may discourage health care providers from prescribing oral medication – even if oral treatment could prove beneficial. There are several questions surrounding the issue that remain unanswered, however, so – assuming the bill passes the House - a committee will be formed to collect information, take testimony, and make any recommendations for future legislation.

Hanover Water Works

The Senate also passed a bill of particular local concern regarding the municipalization of Hanover Water Works, which passed your special session late last year. The bill was sponsored by all of your representatives and was necessary to facilitate the transaction.

This has been a challenging session. The Legislature continues to address not only the issues discussed above, but also myriad other issues both large and small. All of your representatives welcome your input.

Best wishes for a productive town meeting!

Regards,



Matthew Houde
NH Senate – District 5
matthew.houde@leg.state.nh.us



Raymond S. Burton

338 River Road
Bath, NH 03740
Tel. (603) 747-3662
Car Phone (603) 481-0863
E-mail: ray.burton4@gte.net

*Executive Councilor
District One*

Report to the People of District One By: Executive Councilor Ray Burton

2009 was indeed the year of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)/Stimulus Funds in New Hampshire!

As of November 4, 2009, \$579,305,870.00 had been allocated in New Hampshire in nine areas: business/community; education; employment; energy; health; housing; safety; technology and transportation. Of that \$181,463,876.00 went to Council District One towns and cities and the counties of Belknap, Carroll, Coos, Grafton and Sullivan.

The ARRA money has enabled local, state and county government to work on projects that have been in process and planning for years. For a complete listing of these projects go to: www.ed.state.nh.us/education/recovery/index.htm or write to my office.

Governor Lynch has now submitted the New Hampshire Transportation Plan to the New Hampshire House and Senate. Highways/bridges, rail, aviation and public projects are among the proposed recommendations. Contact your local State Senator and Legislator for details about what projects you believe to be key ones for your region.

As Councilor, I do not see new revenues being raised in New Hampshire State Government. With the decline in existing revenues leading to cut backs in services, only time will determine what the law making branch has in mind for new dollars. Keep in close touch with your local State Senator and Legislator to make sure costs are NOT passed on to county and local government.

The Governor and Council are required by law to fill dozens of boards and commissions with volunteers. If you are interested in serving, please send a letter of interest and your resume to Governor John Lynch, Attention: Jennifer Kuzma, Appointment Liaison, State House, 107 North Main Street, Concord, NH 03301 For the current list of what possible appointments might be coming up go to: <http://www.sos.nh.gov/redbook/index.htm>.

There is a constant flow of informational items available at my office: tourist maps, consumer handbooks and the New Hampshire Constitution. Each Monday I send, via e-mail, the schedule of my weekly meetings and other information. Send me your e-mail to be added to the list at rburton@nh.gov or find the schedule on my State House web page at: <http://www.nh.gov/council/district1/schedules>.

Contact my office anytime I can be of help.



Towns in Council District #1

CARROLL COUNTY:

Albany, Bartlett,
Chatham, Conway, Eaton,
Eppingham, Freedom, Harr's Loc.,
Jackson, Madison, Moultonborough,
Ossipee, Sandwich, Tamworth,
Tulsa, Wakefield, Wolfeboro,

GRAFTON COUNTY:

Alexandria, Ashland, Bath,
Benton, Bethlehem, Bridgewater,
Bristol, Campton, Canaan,
Dorchester, Easton, Ellsworth,
Enfield, Franconia, Grafton,
Groton, Hanover, Haverhill,
Hebron, Holderness, Landaff,
Lebanon, Lincoln, Lisbon,
Livermore, Littleton, Lyman,
Lyme, Monroe, Orange, Orford,
Piermont, Plymouth, Rumney,
Sugar Hill, Thornton, Warren,
Waterville Valley, Wentworth,
Woodstock

BELKNAP COUNTY:

Alton, Belmont, Center Harbor,
Gilford, Laconia, Meredith,
New Hampton, Sanbornton, Tilton

COOS COUNTY:

Berlin, Carroll, Clarksville,
Colebrook, Columbia, Dalton,
Dixville, Dummer, Errol,
Gorham, Jefferson, Lancaster,
Milan, Millsfield, Northumberland,
Pittsburg, Randolph, Shelburne,
Stewartstown, Stark, Stratford,
Whitefield

SULLIVAN COUNTY:

Charlestown, Claremont, Cornish,
Croydon, Grantham, Newport
Plainfield, Springfield, Sunapee

2009 Summary of Legal Activity

<u>Case/Type</u>	<u>Plaintiff Attorney</u>	<u>Defendant Attorney</u>	<u>Town Legal Expenses</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
Telecommunication		Robert Ciandella	\$ 576	Ongoing Legal Research
- West Central NH Regional Health & Security Communication Consortium		Robert Ciandella	\$ 2,950	Ongoing Legal Research
- SegTEL, Inc.	Caroline Cole	Robert Ciandella	\$ 143,499	Settled
- PUC Utility Pole Docket		Robert Ciandella	\$ 3,392	Ongoing
Salvatoriello -Avellino Health Violation	Sean Gorman	Laura Spector	\$ 1,433	Resolved
Glynn ZBA Appeal	John Glynn	Walter Mitchell	\$ 726	Withdrawn
Paragon ZBA Appeal	Barry Schuster/ Robert Miller	Laura Spector	\$ 919	Pending
Patton Zoning Violation	James Mulligan	Laura Spector	\$ 1,068	Pending
Municipalization of Hanover Water Works Co.		McLane, Graf	\$ 31,882	Ongoing legal
General Legal Advice				
Municipal Law	-	Walter Mitchell	\$ 18,187	
Civil & Employment Law	-	Mark Broth	16,829	
	-	Charles Bauer/ Daniel Mullen	<u>\$ 2,023</u>	
		Total General Legal Advice	<u>\$ 37,039</u>	
		Total	<u><u>\$ 223,484</u></u>	

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Fire	Fire Safety Crowd Control	Cost +35%	Cost +35%	Cost +35%	Cost +35%
Fire	Private Fire Hydrants – Fees Ultimately Governed by Most Current Hanover Water Works Company NH PUC Order	\$1,364.37/yr	\$1,621.09/yr	\$1,685.33/yr	\$1,685.33/yr
Fire	Annual Monitoring Fee – Master Fire Box	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$300.00
Fire	False Alarm Charge – Fire Service	\$100.00	1 st : Free 2 nd : \$100.00 3 rd : \$200.00 4 th and beyond: \$300 per response	1 st : Free 2 nd : \$100.00 3 rd : \$200.00 4 th and beyond: \$300 per response	1 st : Free 2 nd : \$100.00 3 rd : \$200.00 4 th and beyond: \$300 per response
Fire	Rescheduling of Fire Alarms or Sprinkler Acceptance Test because of contractor/owner not ready for test	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Fire	<u>Building Permits:</u> Stand-Alone Gas Installation and/or Replacement	\$55.00	\$55.00	\$55.00	\$55.00
Fire	<u>Building Permits:</u> Additional Appliances (Gas) beyond Original Permit	n/a	n/a	\$15.00/per appliance	\$15.00/per appliance
Fire	<u>Building Permits:</u> Stand-Alone Oil Installation and/or Replacement	\$55.00	\$55.00	\$55.00	\$55.00
Fire	<u>Building Permits:</u> Additional Appliances (Oil) beyond Original Permit	n/a	n/a	\$15.00/per appliance	\$15.00/per appliance
Fire	Re-inspection Fee – Gas or Oil	n/a	n/a	\$50.00	\$100.00
Fire	Projects Requiring Outside Consulting Assistance (where outside consulting services for plan review, testing or inspection are required)	Full cost +10% admin charge	Full cost +10% admin charge	Full cost +10% admin charge	Full cost +10% admin charge
Ambulance	Per Capita – Hanover	\$18.58	\$20.19	\$21.50	\$22.31
Ambulance	Per Capita – Lyme	\$18.58	\$20.19	\$21.50	\$22.31
Ambulance	Per Capita – Norwich	\$18.58	\$20.19	\$21.50	\$22.31
Ambulance	Community Contributions Adjustment to Cover Insurance Contractual Obligations for Ambulance Calls Originating in Community	Pro-Rated Share of Lost Revenues	Pro-Rated Share of Lost Revenues	Pro-Rated Share of Lost Revenues	Pro-Rated Share of Lost Revenues

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Ambulance	Report Copies for Reports 1-4 Pages	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Ambulance	Report Copies for Reports over 4 Pages	\$10.00 +\$.50/page over 4 pages	\$10.00 +\$.50/page over 4 pages	\$10.00 +\$.50/page over 4 pages	\$10.00 +\$.50/page over 4 pages
Ambulance	<u>Treatment with Transport - Basic Life Support – (plus mileage)</u>	\$300.00	\$375.00	\$375.00	\$400.00
Ambulance	<u>Treatment with Transport - Advanced Life Support Level 1 – (plus mileage)</u>	\$350.00	\$475.00	\$475.00	\$475.00
Ambulance	<u>Treatment with Transport - Advanced Life Support Level 2 – (plus mileage)</u>	\$500.00	\$650.00	\$650.00	\$675.00
Ambulance	<u>Treatment with Transport - Special Care Transport</u>	\$575.00	\$700.00	\$700.00	\$775.00
Ambulance	Mileage Rate	\$9.00/mile	\$11.00/mile	\$11.00/mile	\$11.00/mile
Ambulance	<u>Treatment/No Transport – Advanced Life Support</u>	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – Oxygen Charge</u>	\$45.00	\$45.00	\$45.00	\$45.00
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – Defibrillation</u>	\$70.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – Esophageal Obturator Airway</u>	\$70.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – Endotracheal Tube Administration</u>	\$70.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – Cardiac Monitoring</u>	\$90.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – IV/Drug Administration</u>	\$75.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Ambulance	<u>Additional Treatment Charges (with or without Advanced Life Support Transport) – Medications</u>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Ambulance	Emergency Services Paramedic Intercept Charge	n/a	\$125.00	\$125.00	\$200.00
Ambulance	Special Event Standby	\$100.00/hr	\$150.00/hour	\$150.00/hour	\$150.00/hour
General Administration	Processing Fee for Returned Deposit Item (NSF Checks or Checks Drawn on Closed Accounts)	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
General Administration	Late Fee on Unpaid General Service Invoices (billed through the Town's Accounting Office) Balances over 45 Days Old	12.00% per annum interest	12.00% per annum interest	12.00% per annum interest	12.00% per annum interest
General Administration	Photocopying – single page (8.5" x 11.0")	\$.25/page	\$.25/page	\$.25/page	\$.25/page
General Administration	Photocopying – single page (8.5" x 14.0")	\$.50/page	\$.50/page	\$.50/page	\$.50/page
General Administration	Photocopying – single page (11.0" x 17.0")	\$.75/page	\$.75/page	\$.75/page	\$.75/page
General Administration	Copies of Appraisal Card for Property Owner	No charge	No charge	No charge	No charge
General Administration	Copies of Appraisal Card for Requesters Other than Property Owner	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
General Administration	Copies of Warranty Deed	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$1.00/page	\$1.00/page
General Administration	Copies of Tax Map	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
General Administration	Copies of Tax Bills for Property Owner	No charge	No charge	No charge	No charge
General Administration	Copies of Tax Bills for Requesters Other than Property Owner	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
General Administration	Electronic Files from Town Databases – on diskette or e-mailed (no data filtering a/o manipulation)	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
General Administration	Customized Reports from Town Databases (e.g., Assessment and Town Clerk Databases)	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$50.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
General Administration	Valuation Listing (Hardcopy) from Assessment Database (Hardcopy)	No charge	No charge	No charge	No charge
General Administration	Mailing Labels from Town Databases	\$.35/page	\$.35/page	\$.35/page	\$.35/page
General Administration	Hanover Code of Ordinances and Regulations	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
General Administration	Hanover Master Plan - 2003	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
General Administration	Master Plan Land Use Concept Map	\$2.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00
General Administration	Zoning Ordinance plus Map	\$7.00	\$8.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
General Administration	Zoning Map	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00
General Administration	Subdivision Regulations	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
General Administration	Copies of Recorded Tapes	n/a	\$5.00 each	\$5.00 each	\$5.00 each
General Administration	Site Plan Regulations	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
General Administration	Building Code Ordinance	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00
General Administration	Open Space, Water Resources, and Other One-Sided Color Maps	\$.50	\$.50	\$1.00	\$1.00
General Administration	Trail Maps – Selected Individual Trails	\$1.00/each	\$1.00/each	\$1.00/each	\$1.00/each
General Administration	Trail Maps – Combined Area Trails	\$4.00/each	\$4.00/each	\$4.00/each	\$4.00/each
General Administration	Notary Public Services – per signature – Non-Residents	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
General Administration	Notary Public Services – per signature for Hanover Residents	No charge	No charge	No charge	No charge
General Administration	Vendor Permit - Daily	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
General Administration	Vendor Permit for 9 Months beginning March 1 and ending November 30	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
General Administration	Pole License	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
General Administration	Articles of Agreement	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
General Administration	Vital Statistics (e.g., Certified Copy of Birth Certificate)	\$12.00	\$12.00	\$12.00	\$12.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
General Administration	Lamination of Vital Statistics Records	\$.50/certificate	\$1.00/certificate	\$1.00/certificate	\$1.00/certificate
Highway	Driveway Permits	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$75.00
Highway	Private Construction - Class VI Highway Permit	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Highway	Excavation Permits	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$75.00
Howe Library	Overdue Materials Fine (with exceptions below)– before 2 nd Notice	\$.10/day	\$.10/day	\$.10/day	\$.10/day
Howe Library	Overdue Fine for videos, DVDs, CD-ROMs, art prints and reference books	\$1.00/day	\$1.00/day	\$1.00/day	\$1.00/day
Howe Library	Interlibrary Loan Fee – all fee payers per transaction	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Howe Library	Museum Pass Non-Pickup Fee	n/a	n/a	\$5.00	\$5.00
Howe Library	Museum Pass Overdue Return Fee	n/a	n/a	\$5.00/day	\$5.00/day
Howe Library	Amazon Kindle (electronic book display) Overdue Fee	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1.00/day
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Non-Resident Family – 12 Month Membership	\$100.00	\$110.00	\$115.00	\$120.00
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Non-Resident Family – 3 Month Membership	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Non-Resident Senior Citizen – 12 Month Membership (65+)	\$75.00	\$80.00	\$80.00	\$80.00
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Dresden Student Card; (Dresden Tuition Students – paid for by SAU, not by student)	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Dresden Employee Card	n/a	n/a	n/a	No charge
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Resident Childcare Providers – A proportion of the Non-Resident Family 12-Month Membership fee of \$115.00 based on percentage of non-resident children whose families do not have Howe Library non-resident memberships; borrowing limits apply	varies	varies	varies	varies

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Howe Library and Etna Town Library	Non-Resident Childcare Providers; borrowing limits apply	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$115.00	\$120.00
Planning and Zoning	Combined Application for Building and Zoning Permits: Fee as appropriate from below plus \$25.00:				
Planning and Zoning	Minimum Permit Fee: Residential:	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
	Commercial, Institutional, Multi-Family, and Other Non-Single-and-Two-Family-Residential Construction, Additions, Renovations, Alterations:	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Planning and Zoning	Single- and Two-Family Houses	\$25.00 plus \$0.50/sq.ft.	\$25.00 plus \$0.50/sq.ft.	\$25.00 plus \$0.50/sq.ft.	\$25.00 plus \$0.50/sq.ft.
Planning and Zoning	Residential Renovations	\$0.25/sq.ft.	\$0.25/sq.ft.	\$0.25/sq.ft.	\$0.25/sq.ft.
Planning and Zoning	Non-Habitable Structures Accessory to One- and Two-Family Residential: Porch, garage, shed, fence, pool, temporary trailer, retaining wall, and similar	\$0.25/sq.ft.	\$0.25/sq.ft.	\$0.25/sq.ft.	\$0.25/sq.ft.
Planning and Zoning	Commercial, Institutional, Multi-Family, and Other Non-Single-and-Two-Family-Residential Construction, Additions, Renovations, Alterations:	\$50.00 plus:	\$50.00 plus:	\$50.00 plus:	\$50.00 plus:
Planning and Zoning	for Portion of Construction Cost up to \$10,000,000	\$5.50 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$5.50 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$5.50 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$5.50 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost
	for Portion of Construction Cost between \$10,000,001 and \$20,000,000	\$4.15per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$4.15per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$4.15per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$4.15per \$1,000 of Construction Cost
	for Portion of Construction Cost Exceeding \$20,000,000	\$1.85 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$1.85 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$1.85 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost	\$1.85 per \$1,000 of Construction Cost

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Planning and Zoning	Sign, Awning, or Canopy	\$30.00	\$25.00, plus \$30.00 for electrical or foundation	\$25.00, plus \$30.00 for electrical or foundation	\$25.00, plus \$30.00 for electrical or foundation
Planning and Zoning	Moving or Demolition	\$50.00	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Building & Zoning Permits:</u> Revision Plan Review and Partial Submissions	5% surcharge for each occurrence	\$50.00 per hour of review time	\$50.00 per hour of review time	\$50.00 per hour of review time
Planning and Zoning	Projects Requiring Outside Consulting Assistance (where outside consulting services for plan review, testing or inspection are required)		The Town of Hanover has 60 days to review complete applications. In the event an applicant wants expedited review, or the Building Inspector deems the scope and complexity of the project to warrant outside review, the applicant shall, in addition to fees specified herein, pay costs of review by a third-party consultant selected by the Town.		
Planning and Zoning	Duplicate Inspections Log	n/a	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
Planning and Zoning	Zoning Permit (not part of Combined Application)	n/a	\$25.00	\$35.00	\$35.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Building Permits:</u> Blanket Permit per Project (Sec. IX of Building Code Adoption Ordinance)	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Building Permits:</u> Permit Extension	n/a	n/a	n/a to \$50.00	n/a to \$50.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Building Permits:</u> Re-Inspection	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Building Permits:</u> Additional Inspections	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Zoning Board of Adjustment:</u> Special Exception	\$150.00	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Planning and Zoning	<u>Zoning Board of Adjustment:</u> Variance	\$150.00	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Planning and Zoning	<u>Zoning Board of Adjustment:</u> Appeal of Administrative Decision	\$150.00	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Planning and Zoning	<u>Zoning Board of Adjustment:</u> Equitable Waiver	\$150.00	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Planning and Zoning	<u>Zoning Board of Adjustment:</u> Hearing Under RSA 674:41	\$150.00	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$150.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Planning and Zoning	<u>Zoning Board of Adjustment:</u> Rehearing (to be Refunded if Relief Granted)	\$50.00	\$50.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$50.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$50.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Planning and Zoning	<u>Planning Board:</u> Subdivisions, All Types, payable at time of design review application	\$200 base fee plus \$100 per lot, plat, site, or other division of land including units per RSA 672:14	\$200 base fee plus \$100 per lot, plat, site, or other division of land including units per RSA 672:14, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$200 base fee plus \$100 per lot, plat, site, or other division of land including units per RSA 672:14, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$200 base fee plus \$100 per lot, plat, site, or other division of land including units per RSA 672:14, plus actual costs of notifying abutters

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Planning and Zoning	<u>Planning Board:</u> Site Plan Review Base Fee Plus additional cumulative as follows, based on Estimated Full Cost of Construction (ECC), as verified by the Building Inspector:	\$500.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters, plus:	\$500.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters, plus:	\$500.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters, plus:	\$500.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters, plus:
	\$0 to \$2,500,000 ECC	\$5.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$5.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$5.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$5.00 per \$10,000 of ECC
	\$2,500,001 to \$5,000,000 ECC	\$4.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$4.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$4.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$4.00 per \$10,000 of ECC
	\$5,000,001 to \$10,000,000 ECC	\$3.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$3.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$3.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$3.00 per \$10,000 of ECC
	\$10,000,001 to \$15,000,000 ECC	\$2.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$2.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$2.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$2.00 per \$10,000 of ECC
	\$15,000,001 to \$20,000,000 ECC	\$1.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$1.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$1.00 per \$10,000 of ECC	\$1.00 per \$10,000 of ECC
	Over \$20,000,000 ECC	\$-0- per \$10,000 of ECC	\$-0- per \$10,000 of ECC	\$-0- per \$10,000 of ECC	\$-0- per \$10,000 of ECC
	Planning and Zoning	Town Staff Technical Review of Subdivision and Site Plan Drawings – Revised Plan Fee	\$100/sheet for review of revised drawings	\$100/sheet for review of revised drawings	\$100/sheet for review of revised drawings
Planning and Zoning	Modification to Any of the Above	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$200.00
Planning and Zoning	<u>Planning Board:</u> Minor Lot Line Adjustment	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Planning and Zoning	<u>Planning Board:</u> Boundary Agreement	\$100.00	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$100.00, plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Planning and Zoning	Wetlands Administrative Permit	\$25.00	\$50.00 plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$50.00 plus actual costs of notifying abutters	\$50.00 plus actual costs of notifying abutters
Police	Pistol Permits (4 year Permit)	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Police	Special Services Detail – Police Personnel	\$49.00/hour (\$36.30/hr for officer + 35% admin. chg.)	\$50.29/hour (\$37.25/hr for officer + 35% admin. chg.); plus signage and barricade rental, if required Note: Certain Non-Profits may qualify for reduction in the admin. chg. from 35% to 14%	\$51.80 (\$38.37/hr for officer + 35% admin. chg.); plus signage and barricade rental, if required Note: Certain Non-Profits may qualify for reduction in the admin. chg. from 35% to 14%	\$54.58 (\$38.75/hr for officer + 5.85% State Share of Retirement Contribution + 35% admin. chg.); plus signage and barricade rental, if required Note: Certain Non-Profits may qualify for reduction in the admin. chg. from 35% to 14%
Police	Reports (Flat Fee)	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Police	Fingerprints (Non-Resident)	\$15.00	\$20.00	\$20.00 for first 2 cards and \$5.00 for each additional card	\$20.00 for first 2 cards and \$5.00 for each additional card
Police	Photos on CD or Diskette	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Police	DVD of Cruiser Video used for Discovery	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$25.00
Police	Alcohol Diversion: Ages 12-15	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
Police	Alcohol Diversion: Ages 16-20	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
Police	Marijuana Diversion – under 17	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Police	Penalty to Reschedule 2 nd Diversion Counseling Session	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00
Police	Alarm Connection Fee – One- Time Charge	\$50.00	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00
Police	Annual Monitoring Fee	\$325.00 within Town; \$425.00 out-of- Town	\$325.00 within Town; \$425.00 out-of- Town	\$325.00 within Town; \$425.00 out-of- Town	\$325.00 within Town; \$425.00 out-of-Town
Police	Pro-Rated Monthly Monitoring Fee	\$33.00/mo	\$33.00/mo	\$33.00/mo	\$33.00/mo
Police	Police Service – Residential	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Police	Police Service – Commercial	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Police	Penalty Charge for Inaccurate Call List	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Police	<u>Dog License</u> – Neutered Male and Female; and Puppies Under 7 Mos.	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50	\$6.50
Police	<u>Dog License</u> – Unneutered Male and Female	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.00	\$9.00
Police	<u>Dog License</u> – First Dog – Sr. Citizen Owner	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	\$2.00
Police	<u>Dog License</u> – Late Fee per Month after May 31	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$1.00
Police	<u>Dog License</u> – Group License for 5 or more Dogs	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Police	Nuisance Dog Fine	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
Police	Menace Dog Fine	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Police	Vicious Dog Fine	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Police	Unlicensed Dog Fine	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals</u> – Peripheral Space Monthly Rentals	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals</u> – CBD (Commercial Business District) Space Monthly Rentals	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals (Lease w/6 mo. Commitment)</u> – Facility Space Monthly Rentals Level 2	\$140.00	\$140.00	\$140.00	\$140.00
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals (Lease w/6 mo. Commitment)</u> – Facility Space Monthly Rentals Level 3	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals (Lease w/6 mo. Commitment)</u> – Facility Space Monthly Rentals Level 4	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>				
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals</u> – Monthly Facility Pass	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00				
Parking	<u>Lot Rentals</u> – ZBA (Zoning Board of Adjustment) Required Monthly Lot Rentals	\$75/space	\$75/space	\$75/space	\$75/space				
Parking	Temporary Parking Permits	\$7.50/day	\$7.50/day	\$7.50/day	\$7.50/day				
Parking	<u>30 Consecutive Day Parking Permit</u> – Hovey Lane and lower Lebanon Street	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00				
Parking	<u>Annual Parking Permits</u> – Replacement of Misplaced Permits	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00				
Parking	<u>Annual Parking Permits</u> – Fee for Lost or Unreturned Parking Permits	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00				
Town Parking Garage Rates – Please Note: Total parking facility charge increases every additional 10-15 minutes stay between hours.									
		Hourly Rate	Total \$	Hourly Rate	Total \$	Hourly Rate	Total \$	Hourly Rate	Total \$
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 1 st Half Hour	Free	\$-0-	Free	\$-0-	Free	\$-0-	Free	\$-0-
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 2 nd Half Hour	\$.50	\$.50	\$.50	\$.50	\$.50	\$.50	\$.50	\$.50
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 2 nd Hour	\$.75	\$ 1.25	\$.75	\$ 1.25	\$.75	\$ 1.25	\$.75	\$ 1.25
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 3 rd Hour	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.25	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.25	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.25	\$ 1.00	\$ 2.25
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 4 th Hour	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.25	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.25	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.25	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.25
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 5 th Hour	\$ 2.50	\$ 6.75	\$ 2.50	\$ 6.75	\$ 2.50	\$ 6.75	\$ 2.50	\$ 6.75
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 6 th Hour	\$ 2.50	\$ 9.25	\$ 2.50	\$ 9.25	\$ 2.50	\$ 9.25	\$ 2.50	\$ 9.25
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 7 th Hour	\$ 3.75	\$ 13.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 13.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 13.00	\$ 3.75	\$ 13.00
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – 8 th Hour and Over	\$ 2.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 15.00
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – Parking between 6:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. Flat Rate Monday thru Friday		\$ 1.00		\$ 1.00		\$ 1.00		\$ 1.00
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Short Term Rates</u> – Saturdays Only Park Less than 3 Hours		No Charge		No Charge		No Charge		No Charge

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Validation Stickers</u> One Hour @ \$0.50 each (minimum purchase 96)	\$48.00	\$48.00	\$48.00	\$48.00
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Validation Stickers</u> One Hour Bulk @ \$0.35 each (minimum purchase 984)	\$344.40	\$344.40	\$344.40	\$344.40
Parking	<u>Town Parking Garage – Validation Stickers</u> All-Day @ \$15.00 each (minimum purchase 10)	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Expired Meter</u>	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 14 Days</u>	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 28 Days</u>	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Overtime Violation (2 Hr. Zone)</u>	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 14 Days</u>	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 28 Days</u>	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Overtime Meter Feeding</u>	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00	\$20.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 14 Days</u>	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 28 Days</u>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – 2nd Meter Ticket This Date</u>	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 14 Days</u>	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 28 Days</u>	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – 3rd Meter Ticket This Date</u>	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 14 Days</u>	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Fine After 28 Days</u>	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations – Towing Charge (Winter Parking Ban)</u>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00	\$110.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Handicapped Space	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$250.00	\$500.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$1,000.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$510.00	\$510.00	\$510.00	\$1,000.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – No Parking 12:01 a.m. – 7:00 a.m.; 2:00 a.m. – 6:00 a.m.	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Parking in Prohibited Zone	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Parking in Prohibited Zone *Enhanced Fine*	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$80.00	\$80.00	\$80.00	\$80.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$90.00	\$90.00	\$90.00	\$90.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – No Town Permit	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Left Wheels to Curb	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Loading/Bus Zone	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$75.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$150.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$160.00	\$160.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Improper Parking	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Parking on Sidewalk	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Parking in Restricted Area	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00	\$30.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 14 Days	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parking	<u>Meter Violations</u> – Fine After 28 Days	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00
Parking	Summons Surcharge (Certified Mailer plus Postage)	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	n/a
Parking	Boot Removal Fee	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Public Grounds	Cemetery Lots – Hanover Residents	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00
Public Grounds	Cemetery Lots – Non- Residents	\$500.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Public Grounds	Interment	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$600.00
Public Grounds	Cremation Interment	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00
Public Grounds	Gravestone Foundation	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$500.00
Public Grounds	Project Inspection	\$75.00/hr	\$75.00/hr	\$75.00/hr	\$75.00/hr
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Resident Fees</u> – Baseball, Softball, Soccer, Basketball, Field Hockey, Volleyball, Track (Grades 7/8: Norwich participant pays Resident Fee; Norwich Parks & Recreation Department helps underwrite this fee for Norwich participants)	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$40.00	\$50.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Non- Resident Fees</u> – Baseball, Softball, Soccer, Basketball, Field Hockey, Volleyball, Track	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$60.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs All Basketball Participants – Facilities Usage Fee Made Payable to SAU #70</u>	n/a	n/a	\$35.00	\$40.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Resident Fees – Girls Lacrosse</u>	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$50.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Non-Resident Fees – Girls Lacrosse</u>	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Resident Fees – Boys Lacrosse</u>	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$65.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Non-Resident Fees – Boys Lacrosse</u>	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$75.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Resident Fees – Football</u>	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$60.00	\$65.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Non-Resident Fees – Football</u>	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$70.00	\$75.00
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs – Adult Softball Team Entry Fee</u>	\$22.00/game	\$22.00/game	\$22.00/game	\$22.00/game
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Resident Fees – Adult Softball</u>	\$8.00/player	\$8.00/player	\$8.00/player	\$8.00/player
Parks and Recreation	<u>Athletic Programs Non-Resident Fees – Adult Softball</u>	\$16.00/player	\$16.00/player	\$16.00/player	\$16.00/player
Parks and Recreation	Late Registration Fee for Registrations Received after Deadline	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$15.00	\$20.00
Parks and Recreation	Instructional Athletic Programs Resident Fees	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$25.00	\$30.00
Parks and Recreation	Instructional Athletic Programs Non-Resident Fees	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$35.00	\$40.00
Parks and Recreation	Dragonfly Summer Day Camp (Full Session of 6 wks) Resident Fees Per Morning or Afternoon Session	\$150.00	\$150.00	\$175.00	\$175.00
Parks and Recreation	Dragonfly Summer Day Camp (Full Session of 6 wks) Non-Resident Fees Per Morning or Afternoon Session	\$300.00	\$300.00	\$350.00	\$350.00
Parks and Recreation	Dragonfly Summer Day Camp (Session of 1 wk) Resident Fees Full Days Only	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$85.00
Parks and Recreation	Dragonfly Summer Day Camp (Session of 1 wk) Non-Resident Fees Full Days Only	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$170.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Parks and Recreation	Dragonfly Summer Day Camp (Daily Rate) Resident Fees Full Days Only	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$20.00/day
Parks and Recreation	Dragonfly Summer Day Camp (Daily Rate) Non-Resident Fees Full Days Only	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$40.00/day
Parks and Recreation	Circle H Camp for Rising Kindergartners (5 days/week for 6 wks) – Residents Only	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$125.00	\$125.00
Parks and Recreation	Mini-Camps – Resident Fees	\$20.00/day	\$20.00/day	\$30.00/day	\$30.00/day
Parks and Recreation	Mini-Camps – Non-Resident Fees	\$35.00/day	\$35.00/day	\$40.00/day	\$40.00/day
Parks and Recreation	Tween Camp –Resident Fees			\$70.00/wk	\$70.00/wk
Parks and Recreation	Tween Camp – Non-Resident Fees			\$140.00/wk	\$140.00/wk
Parks and Recreation	Camp Quest –Resident Fees			\$50.00/day or \$200.00/wk	\$50.00/day or \$200.00/wk
Parks and Recreation	Camp Quest – Non-Resident Fees			\$60.00/day or \$240.00/wk	\$60.00/day or \$240.00/wk
Parks and Recreation	Adult and Youth Instructional Programs – Fees Determined Based on Instructors’ Costs and Administrative and Materials Costs; Program Revenue is split 70/30 between the Instructor and the Recreation Department; Instructor may keep 70% of total income earned up to a maximum of \$75.00/hour after expenses.			varies	varies
Parks and Recreation	Athletic Field Rental	Up to \$100.00 per field per day	Up to \$100.00 per field per day	Up to \$100.00 per field per day	Up to \$100.00 per field per day
Parks and Recreation	Rental of Equipment	Up to \$25.00 for use of Recreational Equipment	Up to \$25.00 for use of Recreational Equipment	Up to \$25.00 for use of Recreational Equipment	Up to \$25.00 for use of Recreational Equipment
Parks and Recreation	Basketball Tournament Fees	\$30.00 per team	\$30.00 per team	\$30.00 per team	\$30.00 per team
Parks and Recreation	Middle School Dance Admission	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$5.00
Parks and Recreation	Rental of R.W. Black Community and Senior Center Facilities – see Attached Schedule				
Recycling	Recycling Bins	\$5.00	\$5.00	\$7.00	\$7.00

Town of Hanover – Rate and Fee Schedule

Adopted by the Board of Selectmen: June 22, 2009

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Trash Dumping	Dump Ticket to City of Lebanon Landfill (includes surcharge to partially fund curbside recycling program)	\$1.50 for disposal of 36 pounds	\$1.50 for disposal of 30 pounds	\$15.00 for punch-card of 10 punches; disposal of 29 pounds per punch	\$15.00 for punch-card of 10 punches; disposal of 29 pounds per punch

Recapture Fee Table – The Recapture Fee will be determined by multiplying the peak day flow in gallons by \$10.14 per gallon. The following are flows which shall be used to determine the peak day flow from a sewer connection:

<u>Meter Size</u>	<u>FY2007-2008 Sewer Rates</u>		<u>FY2008-2009 Sewer Rates</u>		<u>FY2009-2010 Sewer Rates</u>	
	<u>Annual Base Capacity Charge</u>	<u>Flow Charge per 1000 Cubic Feet of Water Used</u>	<u>Annual Base Capacity Charge</u>	<u>Flow Charge per 1000 Cubic Feet of Water Used</u>	<u>Annual Base Capacity Charge</u>	<u>Flow Charge per 1000 Cubic Feet of Water Used</u>
5/8"	\$83.00	\$27.24	\$83.00	\$27.24	\$84.00	\$27.24
3/4"	\$235.00	\$27.24	\$235.00	\$27.24	\$236.00	\$27.24
1"	\$615.00	\$27.24	\$615.00	\$27.24	\$616.00	\$27.24
1 1/4"	\$921.00	\$27.24	\$921.00	\$27.24	\$920.00	\$27.24
1 1/2"	\$1,227.00	\$27.24	\$1,227.00	\$27.24	\$1,227.00	\$27.24
2"	\$1,964.00	\$27.24	\$1,964.00	\$27.24	\$1,964.00	\$27.24
3"	\$4,620.00	\$27.24	\$4,620.00	\$27.24	\$4,620.00	\$27.24
4"	\$7,219.00	\$27.24	\$7,219.00	\$27.24	\$7,220.00	\$27.24
6"	\$43,313.00	\$27.24	\$43,313.00	\$27.24	\$43,312.00	\$27.24
Average Domestic Bill (275 gallons/day)		\$448.56		\$448.56		\$450.00
Unmetered Sewer Accounts Include 25% Surcharge Above Average Domestic Bill		\$560.70		\$560.70		\$563.00

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Sewer	Strength Charge – Additional Strength surcharge shall be one of the following, whichever is highest: <i>BOD Surcharge</i> Volume (MG) X 8.34 X (BOD - 250) X \$2.65/pound BOD = Biochemical Oxygen Demand OR <i>TSS Surcharge</i> Volume (MG) X 8.34 X (TSS - 250) X \$2.65/pound TSS = Total Suspended Solids				
Sewer	Septage – Tipping Fee for Residents (<u>fee is per 1,000 gallons</u>)	\$110	\$110	\$110	\$110
Sewer	Septage – Tipping Fee for Non-Residents (<u>fee is per 1,000 gallons</u>)	\$130	\$130	\$130	\$130
Sewer	Septage – Tipping Fee for Non-Residents from Towns who have banned Land Application of Sludge (<u>fee is per 1,000 gallons</u>)	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200

Recapture Fee Table – The Recapture Fee will be determined by multiplying the peak day flow in gallons by \$10.14 per gallon. The following are flows which shall be used to determine the peak day flow from a sewer connection:

<u>Dept/Board</u>	<u>Type of Fee</u>	<u>Adopted FY2006-07</u>	<u>Adopted FY2007-08</u>	<u>Adopted FY2008-09</u>	<u>Adopted FY2009-10</u>
Sewer	Connection Fee for Hanover Sewer System – Includes Basic Fee of \$200.00 to Cover 1 Inspection and a Recapture Fee of \$1.40/gallon of GPD (Gallons per Day as determined below)	\$200.00 + \$1.40/gallon of GPD	\$200.00 + \$10.14/gallon of GPD	\$200.00 + \$10.14/gallon of GPD	\$200.00 + \$10.14/gallon of GPD

	Description	GPD	Units
Apartment	Studio (one bedroom)	225	
	Per Bedroom	150	bedroom
Athletic Facilities including Gyms and Stadiums	Participant	15	person
	Classroom	15	seat
	Spectator	3	seat
Bar/Lounge		20	seat
Bed & Breakfast		60	Bedroom
Camps	Campground w/ comfort station	25	site
	Recreation Trailers	90	site
	Construction Sites	50	site
	Day Camp no meals	15	site
	Resort Camp (night & Day) limited plumbing	50	person
	Dining Facility Only	25	person
Catering & Dinning Facilities		12	patron
Church	Sanctuary	5	seat
Country Club	Dining Room	10	seat
	Snack Bar	10	seat
	Locker and Showers	20	locker
Dentists	Chair	200	each
	Staff	35	employee
Doctors Office	Patient	10	each

Recapture Fee Table – The Recapture Fee will be determined by multiplying the peak day flow in gallons by \$10.14 per gallon. The following are flows which shall be used to determine the peak day flow from a sewer connection:

	Staff	35	employee
Dog Kennels		50	kennel
Dwelling (two bedroom minimum)		150	bedroom
Rooming House with meals		60	bedroom
Rooming House without meals		40	bedroom
Factories (excluding industrial waste)			
	Light industry w/o cafeteria or showers	20	employee
	Light industry with cafeteria no showers	25	employee
	Light industry with cafeteria and showers	35	employee
	Warehouse	35	employee
	Assembly	20	employee
	Research Facilities		to be determined
Floor Drain	not allowed		
Fraternities & Sororities		150	bed
Hairdressers		150	chair
		35	employee
Hospital			
	Bed	250	Bed
Hotel & Motel			
	single bed	100	bed
	double bed	200	bed
Laundromats, coined operated		500	machine
Maintenance Facility			to be determined
Nursing Homes & Assisted Living Facilities		125	bed
Office Building			
	W/O cafeteria	15	Employee
	With cafeteria	20	employee
	Unspecified Office Space	15	100 SF
Picnic Parks			
	Bathroom only	5	person
	Bath house, showers and toilets	10	person
Restaurant or Cafeteria			
	Eat-in with bathroom and kitchen waste	40	seat
	Eat-in paper service, plus toilet and kitchen waste	20	seat
	Kitchen waste only	3	seat

Recapture Fee Table – The Recapture Fee will be determined by multiplying the peak day flow in gallons by \$10.14 per gallon. The following are flows which shall be used to determine the peak day flow from a sewer connection:

Bars and lounges	20	seat
Bars and lounges	35	employee
Function Rooms	12	seat
School		
Boarding	100	bed
Day Care & Nursery	15	Person
Day, without gym, cafeteria or showers	15	Person
Day, without gym, showers with cafeteria	20	Person
Day, with gyms, showers and cafeteria	35	Person
Post Secondary School/Classroom	15	student visit
Post Secondary School/Dormitory	85	bed
Post Secondary School/Dormitory with Cafeteria	125	bed
Service Stations	10	vehicle
Shopping Centers:		
Large Dry Goods	5	100 SF
With meat dept. with garbage grinder	NOT ALLOWED	
With meat dept. w/o garbage grinder	11	100 SF
With deli	3	meal
Small Dry Goods	100	Each
With deli	3	meal
Swimming Pools	1000	800 SF
Tennis Courts	250	per Court
Theatres	5	seat
Workers		
Construction bathroom only	5	employee

Food grinding is prohibited – period – if discovered, a notice to cease the activity within 30 days, or penalties of \$150.00/day shall be instituted. A reoccurrence will be charged \$500.00, and then disconnection of service.

Discharges of Fats Oil and Grease (F.O.G.) above 250 mg/L shall be assessed any line flushing charges. Any blockages or Sanitary Sewer Overflow's (SSO) attributed to F.O.G. shall warrant the discharger to be charged for all cleanup and administrative costs as well as an impact fee of \$500.00, with disconnection of service after 2 occurrences.

**2009 TOWN MEETING
TOWN OF HANOVER
Tuesday, May 12, 2009
Hanover High School Gymnasium**

The annual Town Meeting of the Town of Hanover, New Hampshire convened on May 12, 2009 at 7 a.m. by the Town Moderator, Daniel Nelson, at the Hanover High School Gymnasium. Moderator Nelson explained that the polls would be open from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of voting for candidates for Town Offices and for all other articles requiring vote by official ballot as set forth in Articles One through Four of the Town Meeting Warrant.

ARTICLE ONE: To vote (by nonpartisan ballot) for the following Town Officers:

Two Selectmen, each to serve for a term of three (3) years;

Katherine S. Connolly	302 (Re-elected)
Judith A. Doherty	288 (Elected)
Write-ins	6

One Moderator to serve for a term of one (1) year;

Daniel M. Nelson	324
Write-ins	2

One Library Trustee to serve for a term of three (3) years;

Rhonda N.S. Siegel	314
Write-ins	1

One Trustee of Trust Funds to serve for a term of three (3) years.

Judson T. (Jay) Pierson	322
-------------------------	-----

ARTICLE TWO (to vote by ballot): To see if the Town will vote to amend the existing Hanover Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Hanover Planning Board in Amendment No. 1:

The following is on the official ballot:

“Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 1 as proposed by the Hanover Planning Board for the Hanover Zoning Ordinance as follows?”

Amendment No. 1 would amend two definitions in Section 902 Term Definitions: the definition of “essential service” by adding “electrical transformers” to the list of minor additions; and the definition of “structure” by adding “electrical transformers” to the list of those items not considered structures.

At a public hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Hanover Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that Town Meeting adopt this zoning amendment.

RESULTS: YES 317 NO 29 ARTICLE PASSED

ARTICLE THREE (to vote by ballot): To see if the Town will vote to amend the existing Hanover Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Hanover Planning Board in Amendment No. 2:

The following is on the official ballot:

“Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 2 as proposed by the Hanover Planning Board for the Hanover Zoning Ordinance as follows?”

Amendment No. 2 would amend Section 317.2 paragraph E to allow the display on a scoreboard of a team logo, the name of the athletic field, and the name of the athletic facility donor(s); and to prohibit commercial advertising of any type on an athletic scoreboard.

At a public hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Hanover Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that Town Meeting adopt this zoning amendment.

RESULTS: YES 310 NO 35 ARTICLE PASSED

ARTICLE FOUR (to vote by ballot): To see if the Town will vote to amend the existing Hanover Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Hanover Planning Board in Amendment No. 3:

The following is on the official ballot:

“Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 3 as proposed by the Hanover Planning Board for the Hanover Zoning Ordinance as follows?”

Amendment No. 3 would amend Section 502.5 by adding a new paragraph G which grants the Planning Board the authority to approve any arrangement and dimension of required parking spaces in a Planned Residential Development that the Board deems appropriate to the safety and design of the development.

At a public hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Hanover Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend that Town Meeting adopt this zoning amendment.

RESULTS: YES 282 NO 64 ARTICLE PASSED

BUSINESS MEETING

Moderator Nelson started the meeting and introduced Rohan Zeng and Rine Uhm (students from the Ray School) who performed *America the Beautiful*.

Moderator Nelson asked that the members of the Board of Selectmen introduce themselves. Chairman Brian Walsh, Vice Chairman Kate Connolly, Selectman Bill Baschnagel, Selectman Peter Christie, and Selectman Athos Rassias introduced themselves to the audience.

Moderator Nelson asked Julia Griffin, Town Manager, to introduce the Department Heads and Town Staff. Ms. Griffin introduced Hank Tenney, Recreation Director; Mary White, Howe Library Director; Corey Stevens, IT Director; Roger Bradley, Fire Chief; Nick Giaccone, Police Chief; Peter Kulbacki, Public Works Director; Mike Ryan, Assessor; Betsy McClain, Administrative Services Director; Jonathan Edwards, Planning & Zoning Director; and Myra Johnson, Human Resources Director.

Moderator Nelson noted that it was a daunting task to appear as the Town’s Moderator. He attended his first Town Meeting in 1977 and he has long been an admirer of Harry Bird’s and Willy Black’s management of these meetings. He stated he would do his best and be mindful that this is the townspeople’s meeting; this is one of the few places and few occasions where they practice direct democracy and his role is to facilitate the proceedings that allows full deliberation of the matters before them and that provides the procedure for voting that reflects the will of the people of the Town.

Moderator Nelson gave an overview of the process for Articles being brought forth and subsequent discussions. Moderator Nelson stated that the Select Board members would read the motion only once unless there was a request that it be repeated. He also requested the meeting’s permission to allow non-residents to speak to the articles pertaining to Social Service funding requests.

Moderator Nelson noted that he would be recusing himself during deliberation and voting for Article Fourteen concerning the Hanover Water Works Company because he has been involved in this issue as an employee of Dartmouth College. Willy Black has agreed to preside over that discussion.

ARTICLE FIVE: To choose the following Town Officers to be elected by a majority vote:

Vice Chairman Connolly MOVED to nominate the following persons for the following offices:

One member of the Advisory Board of Assessors for a term of three (3) years;

- ***Richard Birnie***

Three Fence Viewers, each for a term of one (1) year;

- ***Edward Lathem, William Garrity, and Robert Morris***

Two Surveyors of Wood and Timber, each for a term of one (1) year;

- ***John Richardson and Ed Chamberlain***

One Pine Park Commissioner for a term of three (3) years;

- ***Linda Fowler***

Such other officers as the Town may judge necessary for managing its affairs.

Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

There was no further discussion on Article Five. **The motion passed and the nominees were ELECTED.**

ARTICLE SIX: To receive reports from the Selectmen, Town Clerk, Treasurer, Collector of Taxes and other Town Officers and to vote on any motion relating to these reports and to receive any special resolutions that may be appropriate and to vote thereon.

Vice Chairman Connolly MOVED that the reports from the Selectmen, Town Clerk, Treasurer, Collector of Taxes and other Town Officers as printed in the 2008 Town Report be accepted, as well as any Special Resolutions. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

Vice Chairman Connolly read the following statement to recognize Nancy Collier's contributions to the Town of Hanover:

"Nancy Collier has been an appointed official in Hanover for over 21 years. She joined the Hanover Conservation Commission in 1983 and served as its' chair from 1987 until 1992. A break from public service began in 1993, presumably to tend to her two young sons and lasted until 1997 when Nancy was appointed to the Planning Board. In 1999 Nancy was elected Chairman and served as the chair of the Hanover Planning Board for a decade until her resignation last month.

Nancy has provided thoughtful, reliable and intelligent leadership through the review of over 200 site plans and subdivisions.

The leadership required to complete the nine-year 2003 revision of the Hanover Master Plan demanded stamina, negotiating skills, and determination. Through the last half of the nine year Master Planning process and for a number of successful smaller planning projects that contributed to the Master Plan or that have implemented the Master Plan Nancy kept the Board on task, always patient, working through complex sets of goals and recommendations and always maintaining a spirit of camaraderie amongst board members.

Nancy's leadership has included active participation in many of the other projects that she oversaw over the years. Some of the projects in which Nancy has been involved are:

As a Conservation Commissioner, Nancy helped to locate and apply for funding to protect three properties using LCIP funds and as Chairman she oversaw the development of our first Wetlands Ordinance.

During her tenure as Chairman of the Planning Board; Nancy chaired the Scenic Locales Committee which undertook an inventory of scenic locales in Hanover and developed a strategy for protecting these beautiful and/or historic places.

Nancy participated as a member of the Downtown Vision Committee in 2001 which developed a set of downtown design guidelines as well as a comprehensive set of Zoning Amendments for our downtown, the Mountain Bike Subcommittee which produced a plan for a system of mountain bike trails, the Route 120 Corridor Management Plan Steering Committee in 2006-2007 which sought a management plan for the

inter-municipal Route 120 corridor, the Rural Group in 2007 which sought strategies for protecting natural resources in rural Hanover and the Wetlands Group in 2007 which amended the wetlands regulations to more closely conform to State regulations.

On to the best part; Nancy, as Planning Board Member & Chair:

She ran efficient meetings keeping the discussion on track and on point. Her minimal tolerance for a lack of succinctness, beating around the bush and for intellectual rambling and musing was well known. At the same time, she respected divergent views and consistently showed her respect for others and their ideas, including the most long-winded. She handled all manner of frustrations such as the inevitable slowdowns, tangents, and side-channels appearing in the discussions in an exemplary manner and with a self-control that over time became legendary.

She was always well prepared for every meeting, going over all the identifiable issues ahead of time and mentally organizing the meeting in advance distilling and organizing the issues as well as keeping track of the progress on each case.

She has always challenged the P&Z staff--on timeliness, diligence in researching and consideration of all aspects of a case relevant to the Planning Board's review and decision-making. She demanded adherence to lawfully prescribed procedures and standards in guiding the Board on prospective improvements to rules and regulations as well as proper follow-through on processing and enforcing the Board's decisions.

She has always been intelligent, creative, cheerful, energetic and positive in her leadership of the Planning Board. The policies that evolved and the laws and ordinances that were created and enacted during Nancy's tenure on the Board will serve to guide the Town's development well into the future. The Town of Hanover has been truly enhanced by the selfless service of Nancy Collier and will forever be in her debt."

Vice Chairman Connolly and Julia Griffin, Town Manager, presented Nancy Collier with a Town of Hanover rocking chair as a token of the Town's appreciation for her service.

Moderator Nelson invited Jill Polli to make a presentation for the Recreation Volunteer of the Year. Ms. Polli made the following presentation:

"The Hanover Parks and Recreation Department has 5 great employees, but that is not nearly enough people to run all of the programs and sports events that we put on each year. The department requires dozens of volunteers each year as coaches and for special events such as Pond Party, Muster Day and the Old Fashioned 4th of July. Without volunteers we would never be able to offer the programs we have available to all of you here in Town. That being said, each year we as the Parks and Recreation Board like to acknowledge and individual who has provided some of the much needed support that our department requires.

I am honored to be acknowledging the person who is receiving the Hanover Parks and Recreation Department volunteer of the year award for 2009. He is someone who runs a local family business but somehow has found the time to coach baseball, basketball and football for our department. You all may know Mike Campbell has the owner-operator of the Hanover Tru-Value Hardware Store but you may not be aware that he has been an invaluable resource to our children. In asking around about Mike, I found that Mike volunteered to be the head coach of the 4th-6th grade football program which, as Mike Ivanoski pointed out to me, is no easy task and it translates in to a lot more than just coaching. Being a head coach required Mike to oversee the coaching staff, plan practices, help with fundraising – and the list goes on. Mr. Ivanoski pointed out that Mike Campbell volunteers so that the children in our community can be children, and that they are provided with numerous opportunities to shine as teammates and as individuals. Mr. Ivanoski said that Mike "is an inspiration to me and many of our community members."

But while he finds time to coach three sports, Mike is also a Scout Leader and an annual volunteer at the Howl at the Moon event put on by Dartmouth.

Mike is also active as Hartford High Schools Alumni Association President and has been so since 2004. Mike is husband to Sonya and father to Larissa, Spencer and Bryce.

I know that Mike is going to have a tough call next fall when his son Bryce moves up and out of the age bracket that Mike coaches in football – as the younger players are begging Mike to remain with them. It is heartening to see that Mike has gained the respect of his players that they do not want to see him go.

I could go on for quite a while as I spoke to numerous other folks who were happy to tell me Mike Campbell stories – but I think you get the idea!

Mike is valued by the school community, the Dartmouth community and certainly by the Hanover Parks and Recreation Department. He is a kind, caring and hardworking man who constantly gives to others. It is time for Mike Campbell to be recognized for all that he does. Congratulations Mike!!”

ARTICLE SEVEN: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$10,380 for deposit into the Land and Capital Improvements Fund, and to authorize funding of this amount by transfer from the Land Use Change Tax Reserve, with no funds being raised by taxation. The amount appropriated is the equivalent of 50% of the total collected in the Land Use Change Tax Reserve in the fiscal year 2007-2008. Funds that have been deposited into the Land Use Change Tax Reserve Fund come from land use change taxes, paid by property owners when they take their land out of current use.

Selectman Baschnagel stated that he would read each Article (Articles Seven through Eleven) and then ask for discussion before a vote.

ARTICLE EIGHT: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$10,380 for deposit into the Conservation Fund created as authorized by RSA 36-A:5.1, and to authorize funding of this amount by transfer from the Land Use Change Tax Reserve, with no funds being raised by taxation. The amount appropriated is the equivalent of 50% of the total collected in the Land Use Change Tax Reserve in the fiscal year 2007-2008. Funds that have been deposited into the Land Use Change Tax Reserve Fund come from land use change taxes, paid by property owners when they take their land out of current use.

ARTICLE NINE: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$1,187,570 and authorize payment into existing capital reserve funds in the following amounts for the purposes for which such funds were established:

Ambulance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 50,100
Bridge Replacement and Renovation Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 30,000
Building Maintenance and Improvement Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 50,000
Dispatch Equipment and Dispatch Center Enhancements and Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 10,000
Fire Department Vehicle and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 64,000
Highway Construction and Maintenance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 240,000
Parking Operations Vehicles and Parking Facility Improvements Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 62,210
Police Vehicles and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 66,000
Road Construction and Improvements Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 20,000
Sewer Equipment and Facilities Improvements Capital Reserve Fund	\$580,260
Town Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund	\$ 15,000

ARTICLE TEN: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$369,986 for the purposes listed below, and to authorize funding these amounts by withdrawal from the listed capital reserve funds in the following amounts:

Ambulance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund <i>Ambulance 150</i>	\$161,000
Highway Construction and Maintenance Equipment Capital Reserve Fund <i>Leaf vacuum, Truck 03, Chipper, Dozer, V-Box</i>	\$169,700

Sander
Police Vehicles and Equipment Capital Reserve Fund
Cruiser – Utility Vehicle

\$ 39,286

This will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32:7, VI and will not lapse until these specified purchases are complete or June 30, 2012, whichever is sooner.

ARTICLE ELEVEN: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$35,135 for deposit into the Municipal Transportation Improvement Fund, and to authorize funding of this amount by transfer from the Transportation Improvement Fee Reserve, with no funds being raised by taxation. This amount is equivalent to the total Transportation Fee surcharge for each motor vehicle registered in the Town of Hanover (\$5.00 per vehicle) during fiscal year 2007-2008.

Selectman Baschnagel MOVED Articles Seven through Eleven as written in the Town Warrant. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

John Ruth questioned the need to replace the ambulance and the police cruiser in this budget. Fire Chief Roger Bradley stated that the ambulance is 10 years old and needs extensive repair or to be replaced. Police Chief Nicholas Giaccone stated that the cruiser up for replacement is the Expedition. The Expedition is now 7 years old and should have been replaced last year according to the fleet management schedule. The amount of \$39,286 includes the cost of the vehicle and the extra equipment such as the radios, lights, sirens and mobile data system.

Chairman Walsh stated that the Town has capital reserve schedules that are developed by Frank Austin from Public Works and Betsy McClain, Finance Director for all of the vehicles and equipment in Town. They project when it is economically beneficial to replace vehicles and sell the used vehicles in the market. During budget discussions, the Board asks this very question and whether they can put off replacement for another year or how they can save money on this transaction.

The motion PASSED and Articles Seven through Eleven were ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE TWELVE: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$18,154,412 to pay the operating expenses of the Town for the 2009-2010 fiscal year, for the purposes set forth in the Town budget. This sum does not include the funds voted in any of the preceding or succeeding articles.

Selectman Christie MOVED that the Town vote to raise and appropriate \$18,154,412 to pay the operating expenses of the Town for the 2009-2010 fiscal year, for the purposes set forth in the Town budget. This sum does not include the funds voted in any of the preceding or succeeding articles. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

Selectman Christie made the following presentation to Town Meeting:

“This is a great budget. Usually I tell you all the bad stuff first and then end with the good, but I am going to reverse that order this year.

I am also going to try and be brief, since I think there is perhaps more interest in Article 14 coming up shortly and because I have not yet negotiated with our new town Moderator my “one minute per million” prerogative. I am also not sure of the size of his hook should I run over.

We started this budget season forecasting a 7.5% overall tax increase to maintain the status quo based on our five year plan. This gave us concern in light of the economic downturn, the State threat to withhold significant money that normally comes our way, and a possible county tax increase for the new jail.

Given all these concerns, the Select Board asked Julia to prepare not only a steady state budget, but also to identify and prioritized cuts that would get us to 5% and 3.5% tax rate increases.

Julia, Betsy, and the Department Heads rolled up their sleeves and in the spirit of understanding that this could not be a “business as usual” budget, did a exemplary job of delivering proposed budgets that started at 5% and worked their way down to a 0% increase. The Board ultimately settled on a final budget with a

Town –wide overall tax impact of 0.6% for municipal services, including fire protection. Because we are still phasing in the new Fire District allocations approved in 2008, the impact on your taxes will vary based on your Fire District as highlighted in the Town Report.

This overall tax increase of less than one percent was accomplished even while taking into account anticipated decreases in local revenue from such areas as building permit fees, car registration fees, and short term investment income.

These lower revenues were somewhat offset by a low December CPI which impacts many wage increases, by a low increase in health care costs, and by retirements that were filled by staff earlier in their careers.

All this is good, but the elephant in the room is what the State will eventually do to balance their budget. The State is facing a budget shortfall in the range of \$550 million, and because they have no broad based taxes to turn to, they are going through their usual gyrations to balance their budget. Although this is still a work in progress we are fearful of a significant downshifting of taxes to the local level. This would take the form of the State no longer sharing the customary amount from Meals and Rooms taxes, for Building Aid, and for Block Grants to name a few. In total the Town received over \$900,000 from the state in the current fiscal year, much of which is at risk for next year.

After much discussion the Select Board decided that should the State renege on its commitments to the Town, we will have no choice but to pass those revenue shortfalls along as an additional tax hike compliments of Concord. The amounts are potentially too big to be dealt with at the local level without serious disruption to local services. This may also be compounded by the underfunding of the State Retirement fund and the eventual building of the new county jail, both of which will require significant tax revenue to pay the bills

So, I think we have done our job at the local level to reduce spending in line with reduced local revenues and general economic conditions for our citizens, but we will have to wait and see what comes out of Concord.

I once again thank all of Department Heads and, for that matter, all Town staff who do such a fine job day in and day out. With that I would like to open the floor for discussion.”

Elizabeth Crory asked about the Downtown Business Service District which showed a decrease and she wondered what it was and why it has changed. Chairman Walsh stated that this is the Downtown Marketing District which was created at the merchants’ request approximately five years ago and there is a Selectmen’s Advisory Committee which decides how much they would like to tax themselves for the coming year. This year they are asking that the amount of funds raised be half of what it has been previously because of the economic conditions. Instead of raising \$50,000, they have asked that the Town raise \$25,000. It comes directly from the downtown properties and goes into creating business for the downtown properties.

Elizabeth Crory asked if this was connected to the Parking Garage Fund. Chairman Walsh stated that this is different from the Parking Garage.

The motion PASSED and Article Twelve was ADOPTED as written.

Moderator Nelson moved on to Article Fourteen at the recommendation of the Board of Selectmen and then would return to Article Thirteen.

ARTICLE THIRTEEN: To see if the Town will direct its Legislative Delegation to support continued full funding of municipal aid for Rooms & Meals, Revenue Sharing, Highway Aid and the New Hampshire State Retirement System contributions on behalf of municipalities from State revenue sources and not Federal stimulus funding.

Chairman Walsh MOVED that the Town vote to direct its Legislative Delegation to support continued full funding of municipal aid for Rooms & Meals, Revenue Sharing, Highway Aid and the New Hampshire State Retirement System contributions on behalf of municipalities from State revenue sources and not Federal stimulus funding. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Moderator Nelson asked for any discussion on Article Thirteen. Chairman Walsh stated that this motion was written by the New Hampshire Municipal Association and put into a number of March Town Meetings throughout the State when it appeared that the money which is usually given to municipalities was being used to balance the State's budget instead. There was hope that there would be Federal stimulus money that would help fund the schools. Since that time, the budget that was passed by the House took half of the money provided to the Town's and it is unclear how much money will come through to the Town. The essence of the motion sends a message to the legislators in Concord telling them not to balance the State budget with property taxes.

The motion PASSED and Article Thirteen was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE FOURTEEN: To see if the Town will vote to acquire those assets of Hanover Water Works Company, Inc. necessary to operate the water system as a municipal utility serving the Town's inhabitants, in accordance with RSA 38. If approved, there will be a second vote by Special Town Meeting in the fall of 2009 to approve the price to acquire the water utility assets. A two-thirds vote is required on this article.

Moderator Black was asked to present Article Fourteen. She noted she was approached just prior to Town Meeting to act as Moderator for this Article.

Selectman Christie stated that he would be drinking a lot of water during this presentation and made the following statement regarding Article Fourteen:

“The wording on this article was mandated by State law, but unfortunately does not fully reflect our intent. To correct this I have added language in my motion that hopefully makes it clear that the vote tonight merely allows the Select Board to negotiate a final municipalization agreement and that that agreement will be subject to a vote at a Special Town Meeting in the fall.”

Selectman Christie MOVED that the Town vote to acquire those assets of Hanover Water Works Company, Inc. necessary to operate the water system as a municipal utility serving the Town's inhabitants, in accordance with RSA 38. If approved, there will be a second vote by Special Town Meeting in the fall of 2009 to approve the price to acquire the water utility assets. In addition to price, the final transfer agreement between the Town and the Hanover Water Works Company to acquire the assets will be brought before the above mentioned Special Town Meeting. A two-thirds vote is required on this article. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

An audience member asked Selectman Christie to read the wording that was added to the original Article 14. Selectman Christie re-read the following:

“In addition to price, the final transfer agreement between the Town and the Hanover Water Works Company to acquire the assets will be brought before the above mentioned Special Town Meeting in the fall of 2009.”

Selectman Christie offered the following as an overview of Article Fourteen:

“Municipalization of the water supply is not a new topic and has been discussed periodically over at least the past 30 years. In fact, one of the reasons that the Town agreed to actually operate the water company under contract some 5 years ago was in anticipation of possible municipalization.

So why now? About nine months ago the Town approached the College to reopen discussions. We realized that we had a small window before Jim Wright's retirement and that dealing with the Water Company would probably not be a high priority for the new President. We had also built and were successfully operating the new filtration plant which was a major investment that was now behind us. From our operating experience we could also see many opportunities to be more cost effective and were anxious to take advantage of them. In early discussions, the College generously agreed to increase the Town's ownership in the Water Company from 47.2% to 50% which was a major step forward in giving the Town additional control of future use of the Water Company land.

The time seemed right, and a joint task force was created. The College was represented by Adam Keller (VP of Finance), Bob Donin (College Council) and Dan Nelson (Special Assistant to the President). The Town was represented by Julia, myself and Jay Pierson. Jay is one of four Town representative on the Water Company Board and the current President of the Water Company, a CPA by training and profession, a former Hanover Select Board member and long time Hanover resident and contributor to the Town - and perhaps most importantly a member of the infamous Over the Hill skiing gang so Jay and I had plenty of time to discuss all the issues riding up chairlifts at Sunapee and the Skiway.

Hopefully you have read the FAQ's that were sent to you. I do not plan on repeating all of that detailed information but rather to give an overview. Please remember that we are NOT voting tonight on municipalization, but rather only to authorize the Select Board to take the next step of developing the final plan. The work to date has been aimed at putting enough meat on the bones so that you have a pretty good idea of where this might all lead, but there is a lot more to do before the fall.

Let's quickly look at where we are today and what we hope to accomplish with municipalization.

Today the Town receives its water from a private company which is regulated by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). Under municipalization the Town would assume ownership of all the hard assets of the water company, along with its liabilities, and would no longer be regulated by the PUC.

The PUC has several expensive requirements that would be reduced or eliminated by municipalization. For example, the current water company must keep a separate set of books in PUC format, must apply to the PUC for any rate increases at a cost of around \$50,000 per application, and cannot have capital reserve funds to address capital project needs.

As a municipal service the Town would set up an Enterprise fund within its existing accounting structure similar to what we now have for waste water treatment. Water rates would be set by the Select Board and we would be able to utilize capital reserve funds. In the event of a need for bonding, the Town would have access to less expensive financing than the existing Water Company. We would also see additional savings on insurance, billing, and audit costs to mention a few.

It is important to remember that the costs of supplying water are supported entirely by the rates charged to water customers. Current rates are adequate to offset current costs, and the plan is to use the savings from municipalization to fund capital reserves. Municipalization will have no impact on current water rates and will have a positive impact in funding reserves and controlling future costs.

The Water Company customers will be well served by this change.

Property taxes will also not be impacted by municipalization. The property taxes currently paid by the Water Company to the General Fund will continue to be paid via a "payment in lieu of taxes" from the new water supply enterprise fund to the General Fund thus keeping the General Fund whole.

So what happens to the Water Company? As described in the FAQ's, specific hard assets will be sold to the town for \$1. These include the filtration plant, the reservoirs themselves, the water distribution system, storage tanks, etc. The Town will also assume the debts of the Water Company which are primarily the bond obligations which were used to purchase the assets that are being transferred. In essence the Water Company will be converted to a land holding company and will retain some 1,400 acres that make up the current water shed. That land will continue to be protected by the existing Federal, State and local ordinances and by being in a "forestry" zone. None of those protections will change. Also remember that a Town Meeting vote is required to change zoning or to sell Town owned land, thus giving considerable control over future use of Water Company land to you the citizens.

In addition, the Towns ownership in the Water Company would increase from 47.2% to 50%. This is significant, because it makes the Town an equal partner with the College in proposing any future use of the land. I know that this is not everything that some would like, but please do not underestimate the importance of this change as it moves the Town from a minority interest to an equal partner with the College

as we move down the road. If we move forward with municipalization, no change in use could be proposed for this land without consensus between the Town and the College.

Where from here? Full municipalization will require a vote by the Trustees of the College and by two Town Meeting votes, one tonight and one in the fall. Tonight we are asking the Town to give the Selectmen approval to consider municipalization and subsequently to call a Special Town Meeting in the fall to seek approval of the specific agreement with full terms and conditions. As I have mentioned, the work so far has been aimed at giving you a good sense of where this all leads, but there is a lot of detailed work still to do prior to a final Town Meeting vote.

Again, we are NOT voting tonight to municipalize the water system, but only to authorize the Select Board to do the remaining homework and to prepare the definitive agreement which will be subject to additional public hearings and eventually to a Town Meeting vote.

Through the public hearing process we have heard many questions and concerns about the long term future of the land, the governance of the revised Hanover Water Company, the legal separation of the reservoirs from the surrounding watershed to name a few. Many good ideas and legitimate concerns are on the table to be considered as we move to the final plan.

So with that let me open the floor to questions.”

Moderator Black asked for discussion from the floor.

David Bradley had a procedural question and asked what it is that requires a two-thirds vote and wanted to know if it applied to both votes. Ms. Griffin stated that RSA 38 specifically addresses the municipalization of water and electric utilities and that RSA requires two votes, one at a regular Town Meeting and the other at a subsequent Special Town Meeting; each vote needs to be two-thirds.

Judy Reeve, Chairman of the Conservation Commission, stated that she wanted to reiterate their previous statement that the Commission made regarding their position on the municipalization proposal: *The Hanover Conservation Commission withholds support from the present HWWC municipalization proposal. The proposal is insufficiently specific regarding the ultimate protection, control and disposition of Hanover watershed land.*

Ms. Reeve stated that the Commission was established to protect the proper utilization and other natural resources and the protection of watershed resources.

Ms. Reeve personally and separate from the Conservation Commission, has concerns about the liabilities and finances that the Town of Hanover would be taking on with the municipalization of the Hanover Water Works Company. She noted that Dartmouth would be released from liabilities and they would disengage from activities unrelated to Dartmouth’s mission. Her opinion is that Dartmouth engages in many activities that are unrelated to their mission. She has three areas of concern: 1) contamination, 2) liabilities and 3) finances. She didn’t find enough information to make a rational vote. She wondered whether Dartmouth would agree to a hold harmless clause as part of the contract.

Barbara McIlroy, President of the League of Women Voters, asked whether the agreement will include the final disposition of the land holding company. Selectman Christie stated that it would clearly address the structure of the land holding company.

Ms. McIlroy encouraged people to vote for this proposal as it is now worded. The League of Women Voters asked the Board to consider the following regarding the process:

1) Arrange for maximum transparency in the negotiation process; to maximize the understanding about the evolving agreement, they urge the Board to keep the public informed on the negotiations and ideally this would mean that meetings would be properly noticed and that the public would be permitted to observe, not necessarily speak and be able to review the Minutes. They understand that this may not be possible under such negotiations but other ways to update the public are regular listening sessions, use of the website and full debate and discussions about various actions and sticking points.

2) Consider several alternative arrangements for managing the watershed land. The Select Board has proposed a 50/50 proposal but somebody may have a better proposal. The disposition of the watershed land remains an open question. They urge the Board to explore options for protection.

3) Gather input from citizens at Town Meeting and during the negotiation period.

Bob Russell noted that he listened to the previous comment regarding concerns about contamination and felt that it was an irrational objection.

John Ruth asked what the benefit would be for him to approve municipalization since he is not on Town water.

Selectman Christie stated that by not being on the water system, he would not be impacted positively or negatively relative to the cost of the water coming out of his well. There is considerable advantage to having the Town be an equal partner with the College which will help the entire Town including those individuals on wells. There will be no impact on property taxes with this proposal; currently the Water Company pays taxes to the Town and that goes into the General Fund. If the municipalization goes forward, the current plan is to have the Enterprise Fund make a payment in lieu of taxes in that same amount so that the General Fund is kept whole and therefore the property taxes will not be affected by this.

Peter Bouchard asked what assurance does he have in future years that this will not affect property taxes and the issue regarding the \$280,000 payment in lieu of taxes; what is the assurance that the Town will receive that money?

Selectman Christie stated that all costs of water supply are paid for by the water customers in the form of rates. Payment in lieu of taxes will require a vote from Concord and they must get approval before going forward. The Board anticipates that they will receive this approval.

Nancy Carter supports and encourages other to allow staff to move forward with this proposal.

Kim Perez has concerns that the Hanover Water Works Company does not have to hold public hearings. Selectman Christie confirmed that the Water Works Company would continue as a private company. The land holding company would have to go through the zoning process including Town Meeting for any changes.

Anne Downey, Sargent Street, asked whether the vote in the fall would be a Town Meeting vote or whether it could be done as an all day ballot vote. Selectman Christie stated that this would be done with a Town Meeting vote. Ms. Downey stated that her concern is that this is not on people's radar and asked for an all day ballot vote. Selectman Christie stated that they cannot have an all day vote on this per State law. Ms. Downey encouraged an increase in communication and there are a lot of things that people need to learn about this. She would hate to see this proposal defeated now and would encourage people to support this proposal and move forward.

Bob Keene asked how this can be a private company for which they are stockholders and not have access to meetings in some form. Selectman Christie stated that the current ownership is 47.2% by the Town and it is a private company and not subject to Right-to-Know laws or State laws. That status doesn't change; the only change is the percentage of ownership.

David Bradley asked that the Town get an expanded opinion on the all day voting issue and asked whether Town Meeting can vote for all day voting. He feels that this can be done.

Robin Carpenter stated that it is his understanding that an action should be by paper ballot. Mr. Carpenter provided a petition with signatures to require a paper vote on this issue. Moderator Black announced that with receipt of the petition, they would conduct a paper ballot vote.

Mr. Carpenter went on to express his concerns regarding the finances, governance process and issues surrounding land protection. He stated that there is not a firewall between the rates and the taxpayers. He fears that 10 years from now, the agreement will not be flexible enough. He has questions about the savings benefit the Town claims it will receive with municipalization and how this will get shared between the users

and the taxpayers. He also had questions about risk. If there is a bond, the assumption is that it will sit on the Town for the ratepayers to pay.

Mr. Carpenter offered the following amendment to the motion:

“To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Select Board to negotiate to acquire those assets of the Hanover Water Works Company, Inc. necessary to operate the water system as a municipal utility serving the Town’s inhabitants, in accordance with RSA 38; and to negotiate with Dartmouth College, a Charter, By-Laws and a Mission Management Plan for the surviving entity retaining all other assets of the Hanover Water Works Company. If approved, there will be a second vote by Special Town Meeting in the fall of 2009 to see if the Town will vote to approve the Charter, By-Laws and Plan and acquire the water utility assets. A simple majority vote is required.”

Mr. Carpenter explained the differences between the wording he proposes, versus the wording provided by the Select Board.

The motion was SECONDED from the floor.

Moderator Black re-read the proposed amendment. Moderator Black noted that the amendment cannot include changing the two-thirds vote requirement.

Rich Howarth, 2 Sausville Road, stated that there was huge value in having 1 neighbor versus having 2. The Town and the College took 2,000 acres of land and manage it under one entity. The staff of the Water Company not only works on the infrastructure but it also oversees the land. Mr. Carpenter’s amendment is so important because having one entity in charge of the eco systems and the land; he worries about who is actually going to be handling land management and it bothers him that this hasn’t been answered.

Elsa Garmine asked whether this amendment is changing the vote in September. Moderator Black stated that the changes in the amendment requires a Charter, By-Laws and a management plan by September.

Jim Mitchell stated that it is his understanding that tonight’s vote is to move forward. He applauds the amendment and the concerns brought forth. He urges everyone to vote down the amendment and have the Select Board bring the right package for final approval in September.

Sheila Buckley asked the Select Board to clarify why Mr. Carpenter’s amendment isn’t a good idea. Ms. Griffin stated that the wording for the Article is specific to RSA 38. The statute was written anticipating that the municipalization of a water utility would be a hostile takeover. The Town has consulted with two attorneys in addition to Walter Mitchell who suggested the wording of the Article. Removing the word “price” from the Article would not be appropriate. Ms. Griffin stated that in changing the vote to majority vote might be challenged later.

Selectman Christie reiterated that through the public hearing process, the Board has gathered questions and concerns that will be worked on.

Deb Nelson called the question. The audience voted to end the discussion. **The proposed amendment to the original motion FAILED by majority vote.**

Elizabeth Crory suggested that the Town consider placing part of the savings into a reserve fund and part of it to reduce the rates. Ms. Crory asked how the title will be held and had concern that the Town will own the assets but not the land.

Ms. Griffin explained that the land on which the hard assets sit will be owned by the Town.

Peter Williamson made a suggestion that they provide an explanation as to why this is fair for the Town and the College. He would like to know how the College is being charged for water. There is suspicion that the College will be taking advantage of the Town. He would like to see this information before the vote in the fall.

Hilary Pridgen would like to see what the Charter and the By-Laws will be for the land holding company prior to the next vote.

Richard Podolec stated that he works on the Finance Committee. He noted that they asked many of the same questions regarding this transaction. He read the following statement in support:

Hanover Finance Committee supports Article Fourteen as moved by Selectman Christie and looks forward to reviewing the final agreement before the Town Meeting in September, 2009.

Winifred Stearns, 5 Dorrance Place, noted that she heard that the public would not have to worry about any changes to zoning on this land. She was interested in the word conservation and felt that this is the only thing that will protect the land. Zoning can be changed through the Planning Board and presented to Town Meeting. She wanted to know who would be allowed to challenge the forestry designation. She would like to see some form of commitment between now and September from the Select Board that they would consider putting this land into conservation.

Jed Williamson called the question regarding the original motion. The audience unanimously agreed to end the discussion.

Moderator Black instructed the audience to use their paper ballots to vote for or against the original motion for Article Fourteen.

RESULTS: YES 196 NO 10 ARTICLE PASSED

ARTICLE FIFTEEN: To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Hanover Planning Board to delegate its site plan powers and duties in regard to minor site plans to a site review committee of technically qualified administrators designated by the Planning Board, with the concurrence of the Town Manager, in accordance with the provisions of RSA 674:43 III. This special site review committee shall have final authority to approve or disapprove minor site plans; however, the decision of the committee may be appealed to the full Planning Board.

Vice chairman Connolly MOVED that the Town vote to authorize the Hanover Planning Board to delegate its site plan powers and duties in regard to minor site plans to a site review committee of technically qualified administrators designated by the Planning Board, with the concurrence of the Town Manager, in accordance with the provisions of RSA 674:43 III. This special site review committee shall have final authority to approve or disapprove minor site plans; however, the decision of the committee may be appealed to the full Planning Board. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

Vice Chairman Connolly offered the following additional information regarding Article Fifteen:

“At the present time when an application is made to the Planning Board for Site Plan review which is required for construction of and /or the change in size or use of all principal and accessory uses of non-residential and multi-family residential dwellings, parking Facilities and outdoor Eating Establishments the application is reviewed by the Planning and Zoning staff and when it is considered complete placed on the Planning Board agenda and a hearing is held. Occasionally this request appears as a waiver of the Site Plan review usually when the expansion or use does not create more than 1000 sq ft and/or the change does not materially affect the abutters or the area.

This request is to allow the Planning Board to delegate the review of some Site Plans to a committee of qualified administrators designated by the Planning Board with the agreement of the Town Manager. This procedure is permitted by the NH State Law RSA 676:4 (III) and requires that "the Planning Board adopt or amend its regulations specifying application, acceptance and approval procedures and defining what size and kind of site plans may be reviewed by the Site Plan review Committee prior to authorizing the Committee". If this request is approved, after placing the use and size change thresholds and the application, acceptance and approval procedures into the Site Plan regulations, the Planning Board may delegate some Site Plan approval hearings to a committee of qualified administrators. The rights of the applicants and the abutters will be the unchanged as the hearings will be warned, the abutters notified and the hearings will be subject to public hearing procedures including minute taking. An appeal of the Committee's decision may be made to the Planning Board by the applicant or abutters. All of the

applications are reviewed by the Planning and Zoning staff and the Planning Board wishes to be able to delegate "minor Site Plan" approvals to the staff or other qualified administrators."

Moderator Nelson asked for additional discussion.

Robert Morris stated that he feels that this Article is disastrous. He wants to make sure that the people making the decisions are qualified to do so.

Winifred Stearns, 5 Dorrance Place, felt that this Article provides an extra level of bureaucracy. She felt that this was more of a stalling tactic and that there would be employees with conflicts of interest. The term "minor" is of concern. Vice Chairman Connolly stated that the parameters regarding a minor subdivision or site plan review have not yet been set. Ms. Stearns felt that there were a lot of unanswered questions regarding the setting of the parameters and this could become a slippery slope. She felt that this would also create a large expense and questioned whether Minutes would be taken and at what cost.

Ms. Griffin noted that the Article came at the suggestion of the Planning Board. She also stated that the Planning Board is very busy and this would streamline the process for the smaller projects with a minor site plan review. There have been complaints about the wait on the Planning Board agenda for the smaller projects. Town Staff knows the regulations and has a feel for the Planning Board's past decisions. The appeal is in place in case the applicant doesn't agree with the Staff decision. She felt that 9 times out of 10 the applicants will be happy.

Ms. Stearns was concerned about what would happen if someone wasn't happy with the outcome of the review and she doesn't feel that it's workable. She also questions the possibility of a conflict of interest.

Vice Chairman Connolly stated that the appeals would go directly to the Planning Board.

Rich Howarth questioned how this would work. Would an appeal be an issue of fact or would it be about interpretation of the ordinance?

Vice Chairman Connolly stated that this amendment allows the Planning Board to set up the process. She presumed it would be treated like any other Planning Board case on the basis of the law.

Bob Russell stated that he is in favor of this because he feels that the majority of the time, there would not be a problem. If there was a problem, it would go back to the Planning Board. **Mr. Russell called the question. This was SECONDED from the floor.** The audience unanimously agreed to end the discussion.

The motion PASSED and Article Fifteen was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE SIXTEEN: Shall the Town vote to adopt the provisions of RSA 36-A: 4-a, I (b) to authorize the conservation commission to expend funds for contributions to 'qualified organizations' for the purchase of property interests, or facilitating transactions related thereto, where the property interest is to be held by the qualified organization and the town will retain no interest in the property?

Selectman Baschnagel MOVED that the Town vote to adopt the provisions of RSA 36-A: 4-a, I (b) to authorize the Conservation Commission to expend funds for contributions to 'qualified organizations' for the purchase of property interests, or facilitating transactions related thereto, where the property interest is to be held by the qualified organization and the town will retain no interest in the property. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

Selectman Baschnagel stated that this is an opportunity for the Town legislature to give the Conservation Commission some additional authority. Currently, the Commission is charged with overseeing the Town lands and acquiring land within the Town for conservation purposes. They do not have the authority to assist in the funding of an outside agency, for example, Upper Valley Land Trust in purchasing a piece of property in the Town. Approval of this motion would give the Conservation Commission additional flexibility in how they go about facilitating the conservation plan.

Moderator Nelson asked for further discussion. There was no further discussion.

The motion PASSED and Article Sixteen was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE SEVENTEEN: Shall the Town vote to adopt the provisions of RSA 36-A:4-a, I(a) to authorize the conservation commission to expend funds to purchase interests in land outside the boundaries of our municipality in contiguous municipalities, subject to the approval of the Board of Selectmen?

Selectman Baschnagel MOVED that the Town vote to adopt the provisions of RSA 36-A:4-a, I(a) to authorize the Conservation Commission to expend funds to purchase interests in land outside the boundaries of our municipality in contiguous municipalities, subject to the approval of the Board of Selectmen. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Selectman Baschnagel stated that this Article would give the Conservation Commission permission to spend funds to purchase properties that are not within the Town of Hanover but adjacent to Town properties that they have interest in.

Judy Reeves stated that the Conservation Commission would request a vote in favor on this Article.

The motion PASSED and Article Seventeen was ADOPTED as written.

Chairman Walsh asked that Selectman Bill Baschnagel come forward.

Chairman Walsh noted that this was Bill's last meeting as Selectman and read the following statement:

"This is both a sad moment and a time of celebration. It's sad because I'm going to miss Bill's sense of humor and his attention to both detail and the future. There are very few people that can look at both details and the future. And it's a time to celebrate, time to celebrate Bill's years on the Select Board and his long and continuing service to Hanover. Bill came to town in the late 1950's and fell in love with our Town.

As a student, Bill was involved with the volunteer Fire Department in Town and the Dartmouth Outing Club. He went away and he served our country for a number of years but in the end, his love for Hanover drew him back. Bill has remained connected to our Fire Department and our emergency services, he often will report at Selectmen's meetings, recent activity on the scanner, for example. He has continued to connect with the land in a number of very helpful ways. I want to review quickly Bill's service to the Town, it's broad and it's deep. He was on the Building Code Advisory Board from 1984 to 1998; he was elected as a member of the Hanover Improvement Society in July of 2000 and became a Director in 2007 and has served as Secretary for a year; he was on the Affordable Housing Commission in 2003; his actions on Parking and Transportation in the Town and the region have touched virtually everything that has happened; Bill has been on the PTB from 1990 to 1993 and then 2000 to 2009 but the records might have been wrong and he's sure that Bill served from 1990 to the present. He was on the Parking Facility Task Forces and co-chaired one of them. He's been on the Advance Transit Board since 2003; he's been on the Upper Valley Transportation Advisory Committee from 2000 to the present and the Transportation Management Association Board since its inception.

Bill has served as a Selectman to the Town between 2000 and 2009. He's been the Selectmen's representative to the Conservation Commission during that time as well as the Planning Board alternative. We, the people and the businesses of Hanover have been well served and owe you a debt of gratitude Bill, it's also time for you to have a proper place to rest and relax and reflect, thus we give you the chair." Selectman Baschnagel was presented with a chair from the Town of Hanover in appreciation to his years of service."

Selectman Baschnagel stated that it has been a privilege and pleasure to serve the Town. He appreciates the Town's support over the years. It's the little things that make the difference and it has been fun to get to know the staff and the volunteers within the Town and they are the ones making the difference.

ARTICLE EIGHTEEN: To see if the Town will vote to establish an Affordable Housing Commission, as a restructuring of the current Affordable Housing Commission, pursuant to RSA 673:1, II, which shall be constituted according to the provisions of RSA 673:4-c, RSA 674:44-h through j, and other pertinent New Hampshire Statutes which govern municipal commissions, their conduct, and their receipt of appropriated funds to carry out their charge; and to see if the Town will vote to establish an affordable housing revolving

fund, pursuant to RSA 31:95-h, according to terms and conditions to be determined by the Board of Selectmen.

Selectman Christie MOVED that the Town vote to establish an Affordable Housing Commission, as a restructuring of the current Affordable Housing Commission, pursuant to RSA 673:1, II, which shall be constituted according to the provisions of RSA 673:4-c, RSA 674:44-h through j, and other pertinent New Hampshire Statutes which govern municipal commissions, their conduct, and their receipt of appropriated funds to carry out their charge; and to see if the Town will vote to establish an affordable housing revolving fund, pursuant to RSA 31:95-h, according to terms and conditions to be determined by the Board of Selectmen. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Robert Strauss, Chairman of the Affordable Housing Commission, stated that the current structure of the Affordable Housing Commission is as an advisory arm of the Board of Selectmen. They do not have the provision in their Charter to raise money for their own needs. The money they need would be used for studies needed within the Town. They have relied on other entities to fund the studies through money from the NH Housing Finance Authority. If this Article passes, the Commission could restructure and they would have the authority to go to the NHHFA themselves to obtain funding for projects within the Town. The name, however, will not change and they will remain the Affordable Housing Commission.

The motion PASSED and Article Eighteen was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE NINETEEN: To see if the Town will vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to enter into a inter-municipal agreement by and among the Towns of Orford, Lyme, Hanover, Enfield, Springfield, Newbury, New London and Sunapee, to create a non-profit corporation to develop a broadband communications network, in accordance with RSA 53-A.

Selectman Rassias MOVED that the Town vote to authorize the Board of Selectmen to enter into a inter-municipal agreement by and among the Towns of Orford, Lyme, Hanover, Enfield, Springfield, Newbury, New London and Sunapee, to create a non-profit corporation to develop a broadband communications network, in accordance with RSA 53-A. Chairman Walsh SECONDED the motion.

Ms. Griffin stated that the Town of Hanover has coordinated with seven other communities to form WCNH which stands for West Central New Hampshire in order to gain access to broadband in the outer reaches of the Town. In NH, municipalities cannot bond for broadband unless they are significantly underserved. In looking at possible funding, if they create an inter-municipal non-profit organization, they may be eligible for some funding for this project. This question was also on the March Town Meeting Warrants for the other seven towns and all of the communities voted to enter into the agreement. It would enable non-profit corporation to be able to receive money including donations to move forward to develop a broadband communications network. This is not something that is going to happen overnight.

An audience member asked if the Town was going to be using Fairpoint Communications. Ms. Griffin stated that they could use any number of providers and Fairpoint could be one of them.

The motion PASSED and Article Nineteen was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE TWENTY: (Article by agency request) To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$1,650 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by the New Hampshire Association for the Blind. This is the third year this article has appeared on the warrant.

Selectman Rassias MOVED that the Town vote to raise and appropriate \$1,650 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by the New Hampshire Association for the Blind. This is the third year this article has appeared on the warrant. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Selectman Rassias explained that after three years on the Warrant, the request would then become part of the budget that comes before the Select Board.

Moderator Nelson asked if there were any representatives from the NH Association for the Blind that would like to speak to the Article. There were no representatives and no discussion.

The motion PASSED and Article Twenty was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE TWENTY-ONE: (Article by agency request) To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$627 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by Tri-County Community Action Project (Tri-County CAP). This is the third year this article has appeared on the warrant.

Selectman Rassias MOVED that the Town vote to raise and appropriate \$627 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by Tri-County Community Action Project (Tri-County CAP). This is the third year this article has appeared on the warrant.

Moderator Nelson asked if there were any representatives from Tri-County CAP that would like to speak to the Article. There were no representatives from Tri-County CAP.

Bob Russell asked how the amounts are chosen for each agency. Selectman Rassias stated that these amounts came forward at the request of the agency. Chairman Walsh clarified that the money amounts relate to the number of residents that are served and the costs of the services that they provide. After three years, the agencies are included as part of the budget and are not brought forward individually.

Another audience member voiced her support of Tri-County CAP and acknowledged the work and the demand for the need. She suggested that this stay on the budget year after year.

The motion PASSED and Article Twenty-One was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE TWENTY-TWO: (Article by agency request) To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$550 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA). This is the second year this article has appeared on the warrant.

Selectman Rassias MOVED that the Town vote to raise and appropriate \$550 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA). This is the second year this article has appeared on the warrant. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED.

The motion PASSED and Article Twenty-Two was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE TWENTY-THREE: (Article by agency request) To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$3,410 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by the Outreach House. This is the second year this article has appeared on the warrant.

Selectman Rassias MOVED that the Town vote to raise and appropriate \$3,410 to support the services provided for the residents of Hanover by the Outreach House. This is the second year this article has appeared on the warrant. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Susan Shinn stated that she is not a resident of Hanover but the Administrator of Outreach House. Outreach House was founded in 1991 and opened in 1997 through the work of a group of Hanover residents concerned about the lack of affordable housing that could provide care for senior adults in the Upper Valley. Located on South Park Street across from the Dartmouth Athletic facilities; they provide daily supportive residential care for 9 older adults and their mission is to provide a loving, caring, supportive, and comfortable family living environment in an affordable and attractive setting that enhances independence.

Ann Chamberlain provided testament to the fact that her 95 year old mother loves it at Outreach House and encourages support of the Article.

Kim Perez thanked the Select Board for increasing funding for the social service agencies across the board in this budget. She noted that Outreach House raised money for an energy audit and noted that there would be future fundraising taking place.

The motion PASSED and Article Twenty-Three was ADOPTED as written.

ARTICLE TWENTY-FOUR: To transact any other business that may legally be brought before this Town Meeting.

Selectman Rassias MOVED that the Town vote to transact any other business that may legally be brought before this Town Meeting. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Tim Pillsbury stated that he would like the Town to encourage organizations from the social service agencies to send representatives to speak about the services that they provide to the Town and why the residents should fund them.

Moderator Nelson thanked the audience members for attending.

Chairman Walsh MOVED to adjourn Town Meeting. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:45 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles Garipay, Town Clerk

Minutes prepared by Elizabeth S. Rathburn

**2009 SPECIAL TOWN MEETING
TOWN OF HANOVER
Tuesday, October 27, 2009
Hanover High School Gymnasium**

The Special Town Meeting of the Town of Hanover, New Hampshire convened on October 27, 2009 at 7 p.m. by Moderator Pro Tempore Harry Bird. Moderator Bird gave an overview of the voting procedure and announced that Articles One and Two would require a ballot vote. Moderator Bird stated that while Article Three, in theory, could be a voice vote, he is aware that there will be a motion from the floor to have a ballot vote. Moderator Bird suggested having Town Meeting discuss the Articles and then have one vote for all three after the discussion.

Moderator Bird asked for Chairman Walsh to make a motion.

Chairman Walsh wanted to thank Moderator Bird for providing his services for this Special Town Meeting.

Chairman Walsh MOVED that voting under Articles 1, 2 and 3 commence immediately after discussion has concluded and the question has been called on all three articles. Voting will be by separate YES/NO paper ballots for each article that will be marked by the voter and each deposited into separate ballot boxes. Ballots will be issued by ballot clerks as voters present themselves at the checklist. Voting will continue at this meeting for at least one hour and until all present who wish to vote have voted. The ballot boxes will then be sealed and kept in protective custody until tomorrow morning, Wednesday, October 28, 2009. Voting will then continue from 7:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. at this same meeting location. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Kim Perez asked if any changes made to the warrant would be made part of the vote tomorrow. Moderator Bird stated that any amendments to a warrant article would be made from the floor and must be disposed of before they call the question on the warrant article. Moderator Bird further clarified that, if passed, the exact amendments would be posted on the voting booths so that it is clear what the residents are being asked to vote on.

THE TOWN MEETING VOTED UNANIMOUSLY IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

Moderator Bird asked for a motion for Article One.

Chairman Walsh MOVED ARTICLE ONE: That the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$8,570,916 through the incurrence of indebtedness in accordance with the provisions of the New Hampshire Municipal Finance Act, RSA 33 by the Town's assumption of the two existing loans originally made to the Hanover Water Works Company through the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund (NH DES DWSRF), which assumption has been consented to by NH DES DWSRF; and to take all action as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this vote. Although this debt will be a general obligation of the Town, it is intended and expected that funding for the debt service associated with these loans will be paid exclusively by water rates collected from users of the water utility. A two-thirds ballot vote is required. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Chairman Walsh asked Betsy McClain, Finance Director, to speak to the details of the motion. Ms. McClain made the following statement:

As part of the Purchase Agreement between the Town of Hanover and the Hanover Water Works Company, all of the physical operating assets (such as the filtration plant, storage tanks, reservoirs and dams, the distribution system, etc.) will be transferred to the Town. Along with the transfer of these assets, the Town will also assume the outstanding balance of debt associated with the original acquisition of these assets. Articles #1 and #2 request that Town Meeting authorize the Town to take on this debt.

State law requires that all articles appearing on the warrant which propose the issuance of debt in amounts greater than \$100,000 must appear first on the warrant. Consequently, Town Meeting Articles #1 and #2 come before the "star of the show" – Article #3, the general warrant article addressing the Municipalization of the water utility. Certainly, no Hanover Water Works Company debt would be assumed by the Town if Warrant Article #3 is defeated.

With that as general background, Warrant Article #1 requests Town Meeting authorization for the Town to assume the two existing Water Company loans issued through the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund. The New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services knows that the Hanover Water Works Company is considering a transfer of its operating assets to the Town and has consented to the transfer and the subsequent reassignment of the existing Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund loans.

Some background on these specific loans:

On May 3, 1999 the Hanover Water Works Company executed a \$4,035,000 loan agreement for the upgrading of water distribution mains. Under the terms of the current loan agreement, this principal is payable over 20 years at an annual, fixed interest rate of 3.800%. The outstanding principal balance on this loan at June 30, 2010 will be \$2,713,845.

On April 26, 2005 the Hanover Water Works Company executed an agreement to borrow \$6,493,081 for the construction of the water filtration plant on Grasse Road and a water storage tank. Under the terms of the current loan agreement, this principal is payable over 20 years at an annual, fixed interest rate of 3.352%. The outstanding principal on this loan at June 30, 2010 will be \$5,857,071.

These two outstanding principal balances at June 30, 2010 equal the amount cited in this warrant article, \$8,570,916.

The principal and interest costs associated with this debt are already built into the existing water rates. All costs associated with these loans will be borne exclusively by users of the water utility.

Moderator Bird asked for further discussion.

TOWN MEETING VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO END DISCUSSION ON ARTICLE ONE AND PROCEED TO VOTE BY SECRET BALLOT (AT THE END OF THE EVENING'S FULL DISCUSSION AS DETERMINED EARLIER).

Moderator Bird announced that discussion on Article One was now closed and asked for business under Article Two.

Chairman Walsh MOVED ARTICLE TWO: That the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$550,000 relating to the Town's assumption of an existing debt obligation of the Hanover Water Works Company currently held by Citizens Bank; and to authorize the Town to refinance this debt (and any related prepayment fees) through the issuance of not more than \$550,000 of bonds and notes in accordance with the provisions of the New Hampshire Municipal Finance Act, RSA 33; and to determine the rate of interest thereon as shall be in the best interest of the Town; and to take all action as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this vote. Although this debt will be a general obligation of the Town, it is intended and expected that funding for the debt service associated with this loan will be paid exclusively by water rates collected from users of the water utility. A two-thirds ballot vote is required. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Chairman Walsh asked Betsy McClain to speak to the details.

Ms. McClain made the following statement:

Warrant Article #2 requests Town Meeting authorization for the Town to refinance an existing Hanover Water Works Company commercial loan issued through Citizens Bank.

On June 14, 2005 the Hanover Water Works Company refinanced \$854,000 of its existing debt held by Citizens Bank. This debt was originally issued to construct an addition for the Grasse Road office building, a standby contact tank, and for equipment related to a previous water treatment process. The interest rate of the refinanced loan floats at 1.500% above the one-month LIBOR (the London InterBank Offered Rate, a standard financial benchmark). Interest rates during 2008 were as high as 6.530%. The outstanding principal balance on this loan at June 30, 2010 will be \$495,600.

This existing debt must be refinanced as the existing loan relates to assets to be transferred to the Town, and the loan is collateralized by a mortgage on the Hanover Water Works real property, only a portion of which will convey to the Town through Municipalization. Due to the particular structuring of this loan, there will be a prepayment penalty with the refinancing of this debt. The exact amount of the penalty will not be known until the time of the loan closing as its calculation uses the prevailing LIBOR rate. The warrant article anticipates a worst-case scenario of a \$54,400 prepayment penalty.

The outstanding principal balance at June 30, 2010 of \$495,600 plus the worst-case scenario for the prepayment penalty of \$54,400 equal the \$550,000 which appears in this warrant article.

The prepayment penalty will be significantly offset by projected savings achieved by the Town's refinanced loan at a fixed interest rate lower than the current rates being charged.

If passed, Warrant Article #2 will authorize the Town to refinance this Hanover Water Works Company loan as a general obligation of the Town which will be paid exclusively by the customers of the water utility. The principal and interest costs associated with this debt are already built into the existing water rates. All costs associated with this debt will be borne exclusively by users of the water utility.

Moderator Bird asked for further discussion. There was no further discussion on Article Two.

TOWN MEETING VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO END DISCUSSION ON ARTICLE TWO AND PROCEED TO VOTE BY SECRET BALLOT (AT THE END OF THE EVENING'S FULL DISCUSSION AS DETERMINED EARLIER).

Moderator Bird announced that discussion on Article Two was now closed and asked for business under Article Three.

Chairman Walsh MOVED ARTICLE THREE: I move that the Town vote to raise and appropriate \$1.00 for the purchase of the water utility assets owned by the Hanover Water Works Company, to include the water treatment plant, related water storage tanks, pump stations, distribution system, three (3) reservoirs, sufficient land within 250 feet around Reservoirs #1 and #2, all of the land around Reservoir #3, sufficient adjacent land to allow future expansion of the water treatment plant and storage tanks, and any other water utility assets required for the treatment and distribution of water,

as allowed by RSA 38:2-a, and which is in the public interest, and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to negotiate and execute all documents required to complete the transaction as proposed. The remainder of the land which will not be transferred to Town ownership as part of this transaction will remain with the Hanover Water Works Company, and the Town's ownership share of that company will increase from the current 47.2% to 50% as part of the approved transaction. All of the related transactions shall occur on or about July 1, 2010. Completion of the transaction will be dependent upon the passage of special State legislation to enable the municipal water utility to continue to make semi-annual property tax payments to the Town, School Districts and County. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

Moderator Bird invited Selectman Christie to make his presentation to Town Meeting.

Selectman Christie welcomed the audience members of Town Meeting. Selectman Christie made the following statement:

About a year ago the Town approached the College to explore the Town's interest in Municipalizing Hanover's water supply. The College was supportive and last May at Town Meeting the Board of Selectman was authorized to proceed and to call a Special Town Meeting which is where we find ourselves tonight.

Back in May we had a broad concept, no documents, but some ideas and requirements for moving towards Municipalization. So we arrive here tonight with more meat on the bones asking Town Meeting to "authorize the Board of Selectman to negotiate and execute all documents required to complete the transaction as proposed."

Since last May, a combined Town/College Task Force has worked to create the documents taking into consideration all of the input from numerous public hearings, informational sessions and last May's Town Meeting itself.

Task force members have been myself, Julia Griffin, Jay Pierson (current President of the Hanover Water Works Company ("HWWC")), former Selectman, and CPA by training and practice). Representing the College: Bob Donin, General Counsel; Paul Olsen, Director of Real Estate; and Peter Glenshaw, Director of Community Relations.

I have organized my presentation into three parts:

- 1) Making the case for Municipalization.
- 2) Land management and governance issues.
- 3) I will address concerns that have been raised in letters to the Valley News and a flyer that has been widely disseminated.

Let's get started and I do apologize to those who have heard parts of this presentation before.

I have been told by many that this proposal is "very complicated." My view is that while some of the details of specific agreements can appear complicated, the overall concept of what is being proposed and what we are trying to accomplish is relatively straight forward.

My objective tonight is to simplify what I can so that everyone has a good understanding of the big picture. If history repeats itself there will also be lots of detail questions, but it is my hope that we will not lose sight of the forest as we discuss the trees.

Current vs. Proposed

- Water is currently supplied by the Hanover Water Works Company (HWWC) – the proposal would change the supplier to the Town of Hanover.
- Rates are currently set by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). The proposal would change this to the Board of Selectmen.
- Operations Managed by Hanover Town Staff – this would remain the same.
- HWWC is owned by the Town (47.2%) and Dartmouth (52.7%). The proposal would change the ownership to 50.0% each.

Why Municipalization?

- Realization of \$100,000 in savings/year on a \$2,000,000 operating budget (5%).
- Ability to establish capital reserves for future system improvements.
- Access to lower cost bond financing, if needed.
- Lower water rates over the long-term.

Key Provisions of Municipalization

- Town to acquire operating assets and some land for \$1.00
 - Reservoirs and dams
 - Filtration plant
 - Water storage tanks
 - Distribution system
 - Land under hard assets and 250 feet around reservoirs
- Town to assume bond debt associated with these assets.
- Town to assume the financial assets and liabilities of the HWWCo.
- Town to establish a separate enterprise fund similar to the Water Reclamation Fund.
- HWWCo to become purely a land holding company.
- Town ownership will increase to 50%.

Other Impacts

- No impact on current water rates – savings applied to capital reserves.
- Favorable impact on future rates due to reserve funds and access to lower cost borrowing.
- No impact on General Fund.

Let's turn our focus to land management. Two major questions came out of Public Hearings and Town Meeting:

- 1) "Why are you separating the reservoirs from the watershed?" Environmentally they are a package.
- 2) "Why doesn't the Town either own all the land or have a conservation easement on it?"

On the first, we tried hard to keep the watershed and the reservoirs together, but in the end could not.

If Municipalization is to work financially, the HWWC has to get completely out of the Water Supply chain and the Town needs to own the reservoirs and dams in order to insure and maintain them.

On the second question, additional Town ownership of land or a conservation easement on the land was never part of the original proposal to the College.

When the Town approached the College to discuss Municipalization, we knew that in the past linking land use and Municipalization had prevented progress towards Municipalization so we stayed focused purely on Municipalization.

The Select Board is comfortable that the HWWC has done a good job in managing this land for over 100 years and has no intention of developing any of this land in the foreseeable future.

If, at some time down the road, the land is not needed as watershed to protect the reservoirs, there will be a community wide debate on how best to use the land with all interests, including the conservation interests, at the table.

Also, with the Towns new 50% ownership nothing can be proposed that is not supported by the Select Board, and should any changes require new zoning or the sale of the land, a Town Meeting vote will be required to make those changes.

Land and Resources

- Town to own reservoirs, 250 foot setback around reservoirs, and dams.

- HWWCo to continue to own roughly 1,164 (~80%) of the approximate 1,440 total acres currently owned by HWWCo.
- No change in:
 - Zoning
 - Local/State/Federal protection of land

What Happens to the Management of the Land not transferred to the Town?

	<i>Current</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
Land managed by Renamed HWWCo?	Yes	Yes
Name of Company?	HWWCo.	Trescott Co.
Private company?	Yes	Yes
What is the percentage of Town ownership?	47.2%	50.0%
Subject to Public Process (Right-to-Know)?	No	No
Open Director's Meeting?	No	No
Open Annual Meeting?	No	Yes
Company By-Laws re: Watershed Protection?	No	Yes
Town Directors appointed by Select Board?	Yes	Yes
Number of Town-appointed Directors	4 of 9	3 of 6
Sale of Land subject to Town Meeting approval?	No	Yes
Rezoning of Land subject to Town Meeting approval?	Yes	Yes

Required Approvals:

- Special Town Meeting
 - Tuesday, October 27th – 7:00 p.m. – HHS Gym
 - Potential all day voting on Wednesday, October 28th
- Trustees of Dartmouth College
- State Legislation 2010 Legislative Session
- NH PUC
- Hanover Board of Selectmen Approval of Final Documents

Supporting Documents:

- Letter of support from Dartmouth College
- Purchase Agreement
- Projected Budgets for Municipal Water Utility and the Land-Holding Company
- Agree-upon Procedures Report from Financial Auditors
- Financial Issues Memo
- Amended Articles of Incorporation
- Stock Transfer & Corporate Restructuring Agreement
- Draft Special Legislation
- Draft Rate Agreement
- Amended and Restated By-Laws of the Land-Holding Company

- 2009 Engineering Assessment
- 2002 Water Supply Treatment Study
- 1997 Engineering Assessment

Summary:

Municipalization will result in:

- Annual cost savings of \$100,000
- Ability to create capital reserve funds
- Access to favorable municipal borrowing rates
- Increased Town ownership of Land Holding Company from 47.2% to 50%

I would now like to turn my attention to some of the concerns that have been recently raised in the Valley News and via a flyer.

Last May the Town Meeting vote stated that “the final transfer agreement between the Town and the Hanover Water Company to acquire assets will be brought before the Special Town Meeting.”

First, let me clarify that the transfer agreement has *also* been called the Asset Purchase Agreement or simply the Purchase Agreement in the list of documents provided. It does NOT include the HWWC revised By-Laws or Articles of Incorporation or any of the other documents provided for your information.

The reason the Purchase Agreement is marked DRAFT is because to arrive at a “final” document, we came to realize that we had a number of tasks still to complete such as obtaining a survey, obtaining subdivision approval, and preparing a definitive list of assets. Each will be either expensive and/or time consuming, and we didn’t want to spend that money or time until we knew Town Meeting (and the Dartmouth Board of Trustees) had approved the basic transaction. We also recognized that any one of these steps might result in a wording change or some technical amendment to the draft. If we had presented the Purchase Agreement to Town Meeting as “final” and then found it necessary to make changes, the validity of the Town Meeting vote could be called into question. Therefore we marked it “draft.”

Having said that, the Select Board represents to Town Meeting that there will be no substantive changes to the Purchase Agreement. If any changes are made, they will be solely of a technical nature.

As mentioned previously, the final Purchase Agreement will be adopted by the Select Board only after a public hearing.

The flyer also asserts that there is, and I quote: “little clarity about how the town’s interests will be represented on the new company, appointments to the Board of Directors or transfer of land. “

I would like to address each of these.

First: There is no “new” company per se - just the Hanover Water Works Company assuming a new name and using this opportunity to restate its bylaws and articles;

Second: The Town’s interests will be represented by three Directors appointed by the Select Board. We have said that we do not plan to appoint any member from any special interest group but rather will most likely appoint generalist as we have done historically.

Third: The purpose of the renamed Water Company is stated in their Amended Articles of Incorporation which state:

“The purposes of the Company are to hold certain lands within the Town of Hanover, New Hampshire, a portion of which is within the watershed of the three reservoirs that supply the Town of Hanover with water for drinking, domestic, fire and other purposes, to regulate and manage the use of such watershed land for the protection of the water supply function of the reservoirs and associated land; and to protect and promote sustainable growth and management of the forest on said lands for timber production.

In conducting its activities, the Company will comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations pertaining to water quality and watershed protection, as they may be amended from time to time.”

Fourth: We agree with the flyer that more needs to be done relative to assuring that the sale of land will require Town Meeting approval. This came into focus at the informational session in Etna, and the Task Force has been working on the issue. At a subsequent meeting the Task Force agreed that improvement was needed and proposed language to button this down.

The proposed language will add a new section 2.11 in Article II of the Trescott Company By-Laws to read as follows:

Section 2.11 Actions Requiring Shareholder Approval. Notwithstanding any other provision of these bylaws, shareholder approval shall be required for any sale, lease, or mortgage of corporation property or assets.

We are having that solution reviewed by the Town’s attorney to make sure it works. We believe that by requiring the stockholders to vote on the sale of land (i.e., the Select Board in the Town’s case) and because the Select Board is not empowered to sell land by State Law without Town Meeting approval, we will have closed the loop.

The flyer also suggests that Town Meeting vote to postpone the final vote until the May 2010 when the Transfer /Purchase Agreement will be final.

Postponing until May will have several adverse consequences:

There are several critical tasks that need to happen before we can close that we really cannot or should not proceed on without a final vote.

We doubt that the State Legislature will act on our request for “payments in lieu of taxes” legislation that we discussed earlier before a final vote. This has the potential to delay the closing by one year, until June 2011, because of the legislature’s schedule.

We cannot submit our request to decertify the current Water Company to the PUC until the Town has acted.

We also do not want to spend the \$40-\$50,000 that a survey will cost before a final vote, and, without the survey, we can’t go before the Planning Board for subdivision approval.

Final completion of the loan transfer documents also requires final approval from the Town. Delay obviously means that we will not experience any of the savings as soon as we might otherwise and, of course, we still have the same problem of marking the Purchase Agreement final before doing all the things above as we have discussed.

In addition, there is a momentum to any deal of this sort which you need to maintain and an opportunity cost of prolonging the Town’s management attention to this. Murphy is always out there. We have a tough budget period ahead, and Julia and others need to focus elsewhere.

I think I have gone on long enough, but lest we not forget why we are doing all of this:

- Annual cost savings of \$100,000
- Ability to create capital reserve funds

- Access to favorable municipal borrowing rates
- Increased Town ownership of Land Holding Company from 47.2% to 50%

Selectman Christie thanked the audience for their patience.

Moderator Bird asked for discussion on Article Three.

Barbara McIlroy MOVED to AMEND Article Three; to delete the phrase “and execute” and to add “and bring the final transfer agreement to the May 11, 2010 Town Meeting for a vote.” The motion was SECONDED from the floor.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT to Article Three:

ARTICLE THREE: To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$1.00 for the purchase of the water utility assets owned by the Hanover Water Works Company, to include the water treatment plant, related water storage tanks, pump stations, distribution system, three (3) reservoirs, sufficient land within 250 feet around Reservoirs #1 and #2, all of the land around Reservoir #3, sufficient adjacent land to allow future expansion of the water treatment plant and storage tanks, and any other water utility assets required for the treatment and distribution of water, as allowed by RSA 38:2-a, and which is in the public interest, **and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to negotiate and execute all documents required to complete the transaction as proposed, and bring the final transfer agreement to the May 11, 2010 Town Meeting for a vote.** The remainder of the land which will not be transferred to Town ownership as part of this transaction will remain with the Hanover Water Works Company, and the Town’s ownership share of that company will increase from the current 47.2% to 50% as part of the approved transaction. All of the related transactions shall occur on or about July 1, 2010. Completion of the transaction will be dependent upon the passage of special State legislation to enable the municipal water utility to continue to make semi-annual property tax payments to the Town, School Districts and County.

Ms. McIlroy stated that the proposed changes to the by-laws mentioned tonight were not on the website so she did not have a chance to see them. Ms. McIlroy stated that she has three main concerns and made the following statements:

- 1) Last May, residents were promised that they would vote today on the finalized transfer agreement that would govern the new land-holding company. However, today they are being asked to give up that vote and give the Select Board authority to approve this agreement.
- 2) The agreement is not finalized. The associated documents have some problems, and lack clarity.
- 3) Residents need to know what the final document contain **before** we sign off on this project.

For the past century, the town has been fortunate in the wise management of the infrastructure and watershed land, with a useful alliance of town and gown.

Municipalization of the Water Company will offer several benefits for our town: a promise of lower rates for water users and an increase from 47% to 50% interest for the town in the new land-holding company. Therefore, we should be certain that this new company, with authority over 1100 acres of land, has the guidance that led the old water company through these last 116 years.

At the May 12 Town Meeting of this year, the Select Board promised that the Town Meeting (we the voters) should have the opportunity to vote for the *final transfer agreement* at today’s meeting. The transfer agreement mentioned in this amendment means the (Asset) Purchase Agreement which is now posted on the town’s website. And this document references other documents, including the Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws that govern the new land-holding company.

The Amended Articles of Incorporation in Section 7.9.3 and 7.9.4 of the Purchase Agreement to adopt the amendment restated by law, these exhibits are separately listed on the Town’s website. She disputes the remark that the Purchase Agreement does not include these sections.

Today, we are being asked to transfer our vote to the Select Board, giving the Select Board the authority to execute these documents. This transfer is an extremely complex process. Julia Griffin has been particularly helpful and patient in answering my questions. When I asked her if the documents were finalized, Julia replied on October 19th that the finalized documents would come to the Select Board for discussion later in the coming spring, with a public hearing and adoption by the Select Board. She said the Select Board hearing is when we would have a chance to discuss the final documents, and she specifically said that we would not discuss the documents at today's Town Meeting. I believe that this is the time to discuss them, so that we get things right for the Town's future. A vote by the Select Board is very different from a vote by Town Meeting.

There seems to be some great urgency about going forward with the Municipalization, but if the transfer documents are not to be finalized until next spring, why not have the Select Board bring them to Town Meeting at that time?

Ms. McIlroy went onto her second point which is 'What is wrong with the Documents on the Town's Website?'

If we adopt the proposed version of the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, this is what they currently say about how the matters of importance may come to the town's attention:

- The purpose of the new company, as stated in the Articles of Incorporation has no responsibility towards water supply (as Town Meeting just heard, this has been changed and it is wonderful).
- The land can be transferred or sold with the approval of the new Board of Directors, and the votes of the shareholders.
- I have been told that the Select Board will 'vote the town's shares', but this is not specified in the Articles of Incorporation.
- We (the voters) have been told at several public meetings that the sale or transfer of any of this land would come to Town Meeting for approval, but this is not specified in the Articles of Incorporation.
- Thus, the proposed Articles of Incorporation, as they now stand, may authorize the Select Board to dispose of property, without a Town vote (as now is required). This wasn't a concern while the property was attached to the water supply.

Here are still other questions about the documents that describe the governance of the new company:

1. Appointments to the new Board: We have been told that the Select Board would appoint the town's three directors to the Board of the new company. If the Select Board is to appoint these directors, then the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws should state this.
2. How would these appointees operate in the Town's interest? There is no specificity in the documents that director's appointment would be dependent on taking direction from the Selectmen. If this is so, it should be stated in the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.
3. Public review of the new corporation: The bylaws propose that there is an opportunity for the public to review the company's operations by attending an annual meeting that is open to the public, sometime between July 1 and September 30th. That period covers the vacation time of many residents.

4. Ms. McIlroy's third concern is that the Town does the right thing.

To be certain that the documents are written with specific and clear guidance for future town leaders, today we should amend Article Three as I propose, with this motion before you. To reject it means we will have lost a lot of bargaining power in hammering out the critical documents that govern the new land-holding company.

Hanover is not the only party to this negotiation. In view of the Warrant Article last May, Dartmouth could argue that approval of an unamended Article Three today is tantamount to accepting the documents as posted now on the website. Then the Select Board may not be able to insert the promised revisions, despite their best intentions.

Ms. McIlroy stated that it is her desire that the residents vote with full information on the finalized transfer document in May.

Selectman Christie responded to the proposed amendment to the motion. He noted that the Select Board welcomes this motion to give Town Meeting the opportunity to decide if they had enough information to proceed to a yes or no vote or whether they wished to delay. He stated that the Board feels that they have lived up to the proposal made at Town Meeting.

Kim Perez spoke in support of the amendment. She looked at the Minutes from the May Town Meeting and noted that there was discussion about having all of the final documents ready for the vote because they felt the devil is in the details. There are specific things not included such as the requirement of a Town Meeting vote for the land sale; changes in the Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws which should be brought to Town Meeting; the new company is not going to be a public company and therefore not subject to Right-to-Know laws. She wanted to speak regarding transparency of the governance. Process matters and she can think of no good reason why the meetings need to be done in private. The only way the public knows what is happening is by having access to the meetings and the Minutes. These laws require that notice of meetings be held and the Minutes be made available. As the documents are currently written, it is unclear whether the land-holding company would be subject to Right-to-Know laws. Ms. Perez stated that the watershed land would be the largest asset of the company. The Company should be required to operate in the open.

Elsa Garmire asked what the options would be if Town Meeting did not vote in favor of this. She was disturbed to hear that the proposed changes were not on the website yesterday. She would like to know what they are actually voting on, if Town Meeting decides to vote.

Selectman Christie responded by stating that they are voting first on the amendment. He stated that the purpose of the Hanover Water Works Company changes were made a while back. The proposed changes to ensure that any sale of the land would come before Town Meeting is before the Town's attorney awaiting an opinion and any changes made will not be material.

Arthur Gardiner stated that he is not only a Hanover resident but an attorney and noted that having reviewed the website and documents, he was surprised at how very complete they are. There are several documents there and from his point of view, it gives the Town a lot of protection that the Town does not currently have. Today, the Hanover Reservoirs and forests are owned by a private company controlled by Dartmouth College and not the Town of Hanover. If, for reasons associated with their financial needs, Dartmouth College wanted to sell 1,000 acres around the reservoir, the Town could not currently stop this. Under the proposal negotiated, the Town can stop it. The Town would have veto power over the distribution of the land. Mr. Gardiner stated that the Board of Selectmen will be in the position to elect 3 members of the land-holding company; therefore the Town can stop any action that it wishes to stop. No action can be taken by this company without having both sides of this partnership agree to do so. He was a bit surprised that the Board felt that they needed to tie up the knot about control over the land by adding a new provision to the By-Laws because in reading the Articles of Incorporation on the website, you could not sell the land under the Articles of Incorporation. The Articles do not have the normal clause that states the corporation is empowered to take action which is consistent with the laws in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. Gardiner read the Purpose listed in the Articles of Incorporation:

“The purposes of the Company are to hold certain lands within the Town of Hanover, New Hampshire, a portion of which is within the watershed of the three reservoirs that supply the Town of Hanover with water for drinking, domestic, fire and other purposes; to regulate and manage the use of such watershed land; and to protect and promote the sustainable growth and management of the forest on said lands for timber production.”

Under the Law of New Hampshire, if the Board of Directors of the Corporation did something other than permitted in that language, they would be personally liable for the consequences of those acts. This charter is a very carefully drawn and narrow statement, and it protects absolutely the environmental objective which

is to have the watershed protected over the long term. In order to change that, the Town would have to take action to amend the Articles of Incorporation and the only way to amend them is by a shareholder's voting, and there cannot be a majority vote without the Town agreeing to it.

Mr. Gardiner stated that the question has been raised about how the Town is going to control what the Directors are doing. The way to control them is through the Board of Selectmen. Their duty is to represent the interest of the shareholders who vote them in. The mechanism established is a wonderful way to make absolutely sure the Town's interest is protected and he congratulated the negotiating team, and he hopes that the residents move forward with this.

Monte Clinton supports Article Three and presented a petition to speak to the manner in which the vote will take place by request for a written ballot on the amendment. Moderator Bird received the petition with five names of voters present and confirmed them as being Kim Perez, Marilyn Hunter, Elsa Garmire, Bob Russell, and Augusta Prince.

Dipankar Choudhury would like everyone to keep their eye on the big picture and ask whether the residents are trying to do the job that they have tasked the elected officials to do. He views that the residents govern through the Select Board. He has not heard any argument that negates the goal of the Board as presented by Selectman Christie. He asked how the residents are worse off with the proposal than they are today. He felt this has been an interesting process to watch.

Hilary Pridgen felt that this amendment would provide an opportunity to re-write the By-Laws. She noted that she heard some excellent changes which have not been included on the website and would like to know what she is voting for. She would support the amendment. She would like to see the final version of the documents before the final vote.

John Hochreiter spoke on behalf of the Finance Committee. He felt it was important to note that the Finance Committee has worked on this and have reviewed all of the audit information. There are savings involved and benefits to this transaction. The Finance Committee unanimously supports the transaction.

Martha Solow supports the Select Board's proposal however, she would be unhappy to see it defeated by those who don't understand what's going on or those who may be confused about what has been presented tonight. She felt that there would be more voters tomorrow. She clarified that the amendment is to delay the vote by 6 months and the particulars would be the same and more information would be made available to the public.

Dick Podolec agrees that the "devil is in the details" but they have the majority of the details, and he trusts the Select Board to do their job and work out the final details. He doesn't understand why they need final documents 7 months before the closing of the agreement. There are a lot of reasons why they can't delay this process unless they want to go through this again two years from now. He would like to see this go forward and take advantage of the savings.

Bob Russell remarked that the prospect of the Town drawing up the agreement and not the Select Board would have this meeting go on forever. He would like to have the written ballot for the amendment so as not to influence people to vote based on others.

Winnie Stearns stated that in her opinion, the deal to save \$100,000 a year in taxes is a very poor tradeoff for taking on the responsibility of the water supply. She understands that no decisions can be made with regard to the land until it comes back before the Select Board. The only way to be sure the land could be saved is if it is placed in conservation. She also expressed her appreciation for all of the hard work done by the Board. She felt that the land would be developed if it is not protected which is the part that worries her the most. When these votes are taken to Town Meeting, all of the information is encapsulated in very few words, in one sentence asking for approval. Ms. Stearns also takes issue with the fact that the Minutes of the Planning Board are woefully inadequate so the residents are not aware of all of the issues. She also felt that it was very interesting that the Town approached the College about this issue. She thanked the Board for their work, but she is unable to accept the proposal as it stands.

Ms. McIlroy wanted to respond to the gentleman who suggested that the residents would be asking to amend or draft the documents. She stated that if the land-holding company operated with noticed meetings open to the public and made their Minutes available, perhaps there wouldn't be the confusion here today. Those Minutes would clear up the confusion. She feels that the meetings should be open to the public which would eliminate some of the suspicion.

Ian Simm stated that he supports the proposal. He recalls that at Town Meeting that State Law requires two votes: one at Town Meeting and one 6 months later. If the Town voted no, it is his understanding that the next vote would be in 2 years. He wanted to know if the amendment vote would place the Town in violation of that law. Moderator Bird's understanding is that the vote on the amendment would not violate the law or be subject to delay the main vote for 2 years. Town Attorney Walter Mitchell was in agreement with the Moderator's answer.

Nancy Carter stated that this is an extraordinary opportunity for Town/Gown relations and wanted to point out that there are a lot of players in this and there are additional approvals. She requests that the body defeat the amendment and allow voters to go to the polls with the wording that has been well noticed. She truly believes that this is an idea whose time has come.

Kim Perez stated that if the amendment fails, they have identified 3 important changes which the Select Board may or may not wish to include 1) requiring Town Meeting vote for any sale of land 2) requiring a Town Meeting vote for any changes to the Articles of Incorporation or By-Laws and 3) there is some evidence to require the company to follow the Right-To-Know laws. If the amendment is rejected, are they adopting the Articles as written? Can they make any of these changes?

Town Attorney Walter Mitchell addressed some of the concerns brought forward.

1. The fact that the documents are labeled draft; this is a very paper intensive transaction and in these types of transactions, there is always some tweaking done as they get closer to the closing of the agreement. In this transaction, when Mr. Christie said there would be no substantive changes, there will not be any changes that change the nature of the transaction.
2. The land will not be able to be sold without the approval of the Town. If Dartmouth wanted to sell the land today, they have the power to do that. The College has agreed to increase the Town's ownership to 50% and allow them to stalemate any desire to sell the land.
3. He also wanted to address the concern of the Right-To-Know law. The appeal was made to have transparency in the governance. This company is private now and in the future and is not subject to the Right-To-Know laws. The company could choose to do so but they are not held to it. Dartmouth College is currently the majority stockholder and is not inclined to agree to it. The issue has been brought up, and they have already agreed to some more openness. When Town representatives sit on the Board, they will obtain papers by the company. If those papers are turned over to the Town Manager, they become open to the public.

Doug McIlroy asked if the changes that have been described in the Articles of Incorporation have been approved by the negotiating team. Selectman Christie stated that the changes have been discussed and agreed to by the negotiating team.

Linda Fowler is aware of the tradeoffs between having the citizens make laws or elected officials. She stated that if they defeat the amendment, the Town has received the message to continue tweaking the agreement. Since that is the case, she is prepared to vote against the amendment and she appreciated everyone's input and effort into the discussion of this proposal.

Moderator Bird asked if Town Meeting was ready for the question. Town Meeting agreed to vote on the amendment at this time. Paper ballots were handed out and tallied.

Moderator Bird called the meeting back to order.

RESULTS: YES 31 NO 134 AMENDMENT FAILED

Moderator Bird asked for a vote on the main motion by Selectman Christie.

TOWN MEETING VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO END DISCUSSION ON ARTICLE THREE AND PROCEED TO VOTE BY SECRET BALLOT (AT THE END OF THE EVENING'S FULL DISCUSSION AS DETERMINED EARLIER).

TOWN MEETING UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED THE MOTION TO ALLOW ARTICLES ONE, TWO AND THREE TO BE VOTED ON BY PAPER BALLOT.

Moderator Bird noted that the polls would be open for a minimum of one hour. Town Meeting discussion ended at 8:50 p.m., and the polls remained open for at least one hour after the vote.

Moderator Bird closed the polls at 9:50 p.m. and asked for a motion.

Chairman Walsh MOVED to suspend the Special Town Meeting until the following day, Wednesday, October 28th, for the sole purpose of re-opening the polls at 7:00 am until 7:00 pm so that voters may continue to vote on the business of this meeting. The meeting will be adjourned on Wednesday evening after the polls close, the votes are counted and the results are announced by the Moderator. Vice Chairman Connolly SECONDED the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moderator Bird re-opened the polls at 7:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 28, 2009 at the Hanover High School.

Voting ensued throughout the day.

Moderator Bird closed the polls at 7:00 p.m.

The results of the vote were tabulated by ballot clerks in attendance and announced by Moderator Bird:

ARTICLE ONE

**RESULTS: YES 389 NO 30 (1 BLANK)
TOTAL BALLOTS CAST 420
REQUIRED TO PASS 280
ARTICLE ONE PASSED**

ARTICLE TWO

**RESULTS: YES 380 NO 31 (1 BLANK)
TOTAL BALLOTS CAST 412
REQUIRED TO PASS 275
ARTICLE TWO PASSED**

ARTICLE THREE

**RESULTS: YES 383 NO 38
TOTAL BALLOTS CAST 421
SIMPLE MAJORITY TO PASS
ARTICLE THREE PASSED**

Vice Chairman Connolly MOVED to permanently dissolve the Special Town Meeting. Selectman Doherty SECONDED the motion.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Moderator Bird dissolved the meeting at 7:35 p.m. on Wednesday, October 28, 2009.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles E. Garipay, Town Clerk

Minutes prepared by Elizabeth S. Rathburn

Notes...