

Get out and **VOTE** Tuesday, March 14, 2017



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

RESIDENT  
Town of  
Raymond

Read this guide *before you vote!* • Updates available at [RaymondVIP.org](http://RaymondVIP.org)

RAYMOND

# *Voter Information*

PROJECT

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

~ Raymond VIP Bylaws

# 2017

RAYMOND

welcome to *Voter Information* PROJECT

**Board of Directors: 2017-2018**

**President**  
Susan Hilchey

**Vice President**  
Joyce Wood

**Treasurer**  
John Beauvilliers

**Secretary**  
Yvonne D'Iorio

**Members-at-Large**  
Dana Zulager  
Sue Roundy

**Editorial Board 2017**  
Sue Roundy  
Kathy Mayo  
Stephen Mather-Lees

**Production**  
Printed by:  
Seacoast Media Group  
111 New Hampshire Ave.  
Portsmouth NH 03801  
603-570-2171

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

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

**This guide is provided** as a tool for RAYMOND VOTERS for use during the 2017 Town and School District Election Cycle. Please see our website at [WWW.RAYMONDVIP.ORG](http://WWW.RAYMONDVIP.ORG) for updates and new information as it becomes available.

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

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

**To comment** or to provide additional information for Editorial Committee review on any warrant article, you may contact us at [info@raymondvip.org](mailto:info@raymondvip.org) or PO Box 813, Raymond NH 03077. To speak to the VIP President, please call 895-4030. We value your feedback and are always striving to improve.

*See you at the polls at Iber Holmes Gove Middle School.*  
*Tuesday, March 14, 2017 7AM to 7PM*

**For the latest information on any article, check our website at**  
[WWW.RAYMONDVIP.ORG](http://WWW.RAYMONDVIP.ORG)

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

**SCHOOL WARRANT****School Article 1: 2017 Raymond School District Candidates**

One (1) School Board Member for a 3-year term:  
(No Candidates)

One (1) School Board Member for a 2-year term:  
Janice Arsenault

**School Article 2: LRES Bond: Elementary School Building Addition**

This article authorizes the Raymond School Board to raise nine million four hundred twenty five thousand dollars (\$9,425,000) by issuing a bond for constructing, furnishing and equipping an addition to Lamprey River Elementary School (LRES). The School Board would also be authorized to apply for, obtain and accept federal, state or other aid, if any, which may be available.

The Raymond School District currently rents three detached 15 year old portables (containing six classrooms) for \$36,000 per year and owns two attached over 33 year old portables (containing four classrooms) at Lamprey River Elementary School. The proposed project replaces both sets of portables with a two story, twelve classroom addition, with elevator access. The project also includes building a middle school sized gymnasium, relocating the main entrance and front office spaces to an area between the existing building and addition, improving Nurse, Guidance and Special Education Spaces, creating a turning lane and repaving the front of the building, installing Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approved flood proofing to the existing building, replacing the old septic system and installing an underground 10,000 gallon oil tank.<sup>1</sup>

The Lamprey River Elementary School Building Committee considered three proposals. The School Board chose the proposal with a design that provided a construction plan in which the entire addition would be constructed above the 100 year floodplain with an energy efficient heating and cooling system. This proposal was also the lowest bid received.<sup>2</sup> The School Board intends to secure a 20-year bond at approximately 3.25% at an estimated average yearly cost to taxpayers of approximately \$0.26 (twenty six cents) per thousand of tax valuation in the first year, which would be \$52.00 on a \$200,000 home. For the second year, the estimated yearly cost would be approximately \$.84 per thousand or \$168 on a \$200,000 house. For the subsequent nineteen years, the estimated yearly cost decreases by approximately \$.02 (two cents) per thousand per year down to an estimated \$.52 (fifty two cents) per thousand in year twenty one or \$104 on a \$200,000 house.<sup>4</sup>

**A YES vote** will authorize the School Board to negotiate a \$9,425,000 bond for the construction, furnishing and equipping of an addition to Lamprey River Elementary School.

**A NO vote** means the School Board is not authorized to negotiate a bond for the construction, furnishing and equipping of an addition to Lamprey River Elementary School.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To replace the existing portables.<sup>5</sup>
- To build a gymnasium to be used by students for physical education.<sup>6</sup>
- To add space to accommodate after-school and community extracurricular events.
- To make the existing elementary school building flood proof.
- To provide two additional classrooms.<sup>7</sup>

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To save rather than bond for an addition.

- To continue to use and maintain the portable classrooms.
- Disagreement with any or all components of the project.
- Prefer to not add onto a school near the floodplain.
- Prefer to shift grades to existing available school space.<sup>8</sup>

**References:**

1. Information received from Ellen Small, Superintendent, Todd Ledoux, Facilities Director and Ron Brickett, Business Administrator, Raymond School District.
2. Proposal selected by the Raymond School Board was submitted by Meridian Construction, Gilford, N.H. and SMP Architecture, Concord, N.H.
3. PowerPoint Presentations presented at the Bond Public Hearing can be viewed at: Raymond School District website: [www.sau33.com](http://www.sau33.com) and RCTV.
4. Ron Brickett, Business Administrator, Raymond School District
5. The portable temporary buildings are not energy efficient, have become costly to maintain and are impractical for children who must go outdoors and walk to the main building for bathroom, cafeteria and library use. The attached portables need new windows and doors. See PowerPoint presentations presented at the Bond Public Hearing on the School District's web site ([www.sau33.com](http://www.sau33.com)) under the Voter Information tab.
6. LRES does not currently have a gym. The cafeteria, used daily as a gym, is 3,431 sq. ft. with approximately ¼ of the room filled with tables and other equipment. The cafeteria cannot be used for physical education classes at the same time that students are eating meals. As a result, numerous physical education classes have to be held in classrooms filled with desks, tables and storage cabinets. ([www.sau33.com](http://www.sau33.com)).
7. LRES has 510 students and 10 portable classrooms. The District plans to use the first floor of the addition for 3rd grade and the second floor for 4th grade classrooms. Depending on the number of students in each grade every year, either 5 or 6 classrooms are needed. In order to keep all 3rd and 4th grade classrooms together on the same floor of the addition, 12 classrooms are needed. ([www.sau33.com](http://www.sau33.com)).
8. Public comments at School Deliberative Sessions, 02/04/2017.

**School Article 3: Operating Budget**

This article will raise \$23,893,248 to fund the School District Operating Budget, or, in the event that this article fails, will raise \$23,864,888 to fund the School District Default Budget. These amounts do not include other money warrant articles that will be voted on separately on this year's school ballot. If the Operating Budget fails and the Default Budget is in place, the School Board may revisit its Operating Budget and call one special meeting following the March elections so voters can vote on the revision.<sup>1</sup>

The proposed budget is an increase of \$365,447 (1.6%) over the current year's Operating Budget and is \$28,360 (0.1%) more than the Default Budget. The proposed budget includes funds for continuing the afterschool program, provided that the School District is successful in receiving another Century 21 grant. The proposed budget accounts for decreases in out-of-district student tuitions, bond principal and interest, salaries and benefits (other than health and retirement), and other decreases. The proposed budget also includes the following increases in spending: student services; NH retirement and health insurance; bus transportation, maintenance, and rental contracts; equipment and furniture; books and software; food service contribution; and electricity and oil.<sup>2</sup>

Tax cost for the School Operating Budget net of Estimated Revenues is estimated at \$15.24 per thousand of valuation or \$3,048 for a house valued at \$200,000, which is an increase over last year of \$0.53 per thousand of valuation or \$106 for a house valued at \$200,000. Tax cost for the School Default Operating Budget net of Estimated Revenues is estimated at \$15.21 per thousand of valuation or \$3,042 for a house valued at \$200,000.

**Summary:** The 2015 NH Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) Local School Tax Rate for Raymond was \$14.29 per thousand of valuation. The School District's Finance Office estimates that the total cost to taxpayers for the proposed School Operating Budget less estimated revenues (\$15.24),

plus all recommended warrant articles voted separately (\$0.585), less estimated surplus to be returned to taxpayers at the end of the current school year (\$0.595), may be about \$15.23. This would result in an estimated Local School Tax Rate increase of about \$.94 per thousand of tax valuation, or about \$188 for a house valued at \$200,000, provided that all school recommended warrant articles pass.<sup>3</sup>

**A YES vote** raises \$23,893,248 to fund the School District Operating Budget.

**A NO vote** raises \$23,864,888 to fund the School District Default Budget and gives the School Board the option of revising its Operating Budget and calling a special meeting for voter action.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To fund the District's Operating Budget
- To avoid allowing the School Board the option of revising its Operating Budget and calling a special meeting for voter action

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

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

**References:**

1. As defined by state law, the School District's Default Budget is the current year's budget plus or minus any contractual obligations or required increases and less one time expenditures. The Default Budget is automatically in place if the proposed Operating Budget fails (RSA 40:13 IX b) and if the School Board opts not to revise its proposed budget and call a special meeting. (RSA 40:13 X and XVI).

2. Proposed staffing adjustments: Eliminations: one middle school teacher; Reallocations: 40% high school Spanish teacher reassigned to the middle school; Other Changes: decreasing the ELL teacher from 40% to 20%, and increasing the maintenance tech from 50% to 75%. For details, see [www.sau33.com/voterinformation](http://www.sau33.com/voterinformation) or visit the School District Office at Raymond High School.

3. The current tax rate is an estimate made by the School District. It is based on estimated revenues and also on the 2016 DRA town assessed value of \$923,356,261, which rose by \$78,795,791 over last year. In October 2017, when DRA recalculates Raymond's tax rate, Raymond's assessed value may have changed, and revenue estimates may also have changed. Both changes would change the tax rate for the school.

---

## School Article 4: RESS Contract

This article will approve a two year collective bargaining agreement reached between the Raymond School Board and the Raymond Educational Support Staff (RESS), fund the first year of the contract, and approve funding for the 2018-2019 school year. Currently 109 support staff positions will be affected by this contract.<sup>1</sup>

Cost of living increases for support staff will be 3.25% in year one and 3.25% in year two. Employee contributions for health insurance will increase from 2% in year one to 2.5% in year two.<sup>2</sup>

Tax cost for 2017-2018: Cost increases are: salaries: \$80,959; certification and longevity: \$11,550; sick day severance: \$5,820; Social Security and NH retirement: \$11,334; and flexible spending accounts: \$3,270. Cost decrease is for health insurance: \$26,819. The net estimated cost of the Collective Bargaining Agreement for year one is \$86,114. This represents an estimated increase of \$.095 per thousand of valuation or \$19 on a \$200,000 house.

Tax cost for 2018-2019: Cost increases are: salaries: \$65,099; longevity: \$4,850; sick day severance: \$5,820; Social Security and NH retirement: \$9,544. Cost decrease is for health insurance: \$6,785. In year two this represents an estimated increase of \$78,528 or \$.085 per \$1,000 of valuation

or \$17 on a \$200,000 house.<sup>3</sup>

**A YES vote** approves a two year contract between Raymond School Board and Raymond Educational Support Staff, funds the first year, and commits the School Board to funding the second year.

**A NO vote** means that support staff continues to work under the current contract.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- Agreement with the cost items of the collective bargaining agreement
- To eliminate the need for any special meeting to address a revised agreement

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Objection to any or all terms of the collective bargaining agreement

**References:**

1. RESS includes para-educators, food service workers, financial assistants, secretaries / receptionists, custodians, and nurse's aides.
2. Additional terms of the contract include that holidays, approved paid absences and approved rest periods will no longer be counted as time worked for purposes of computing overtime, a Medical Flexible Spending Account will be established, certification stipends will increase \$100 in year one, and longevity stipends will increase \$100 in year one and \$50 in year 2.
3. The RESS contract is available for review at the School District office.

Note: For year two, tax increase/decrease estimates per thousand of tax valuation are based on Raymond's most recent net assessed valuation. Ron Brickett, Business Administrator, Raymond School District.

---

## School Article 5: RESS Special Meeting

If the collective bargaining agreement identified in Article 4 fails, this article gives the School Board the authority to call one special meeting, at its option, to address cost items in the collective bargaining agreement between the School Board and the Raymond Education Support Staff. (RESS).<sup>1</sup>

**A YES vote** allows the School Board to call one special meeting to address cost items in Article 4.

**A NO vote** means there can be no special meeting.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

To give the School Board the opportunity to renegotiate the contract and then present it to the voters without having to petition the court.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

To avoid the cost of a special meeting (about \$1200 if a simple ballot is used, more if a printed ballot is used).

**References:**

1. RSA 32:20, Municipal Budget Law; Ron Brickett, Business Administrator, Raymond School District.

---

## School Article 6: Capital Improvement Plan

This article raises \$214,000 to be deposited in four School Capital Reserve Funds (CRFs) to support the School's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).<sup>1</sup>

The following CRFs will be funded: Equipment, Facilities Maintenance and Replacement CRF: \$156,232 to convert 24 Lamprey River Elementary School (LRES) cameras to digital and add 16 digital cameras, upgrade 2 bathrooms at LRES, upgrade the air conditioning system in the guidance, nurse and administrative offices at Raymond High School (RHS), pave and make the RHS kitchen entrance area Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant, and add to savings for future projects; Technology CRF: \$13,768 to upgrade the wireless system at Iber Holmes Gove Middle School (IHGMS); Textbook CRF: \$34,000 to fund algebra textbooks for grades

8 and 9, and science textbooks for grades 5 and 6; Food Service CRF: \$10,000 to replace the outside walk-in-freezer box at RHS. There is no increase in this amount over last year.

Tax cost: \$.23 per thousand of valuation or \$46.00 on a \$200,000 home.

A **YES vote** raises \$214,000 to fund four School CRFs in the CIP this year.

A **NO Vote** raises no money to fund CRFs in the School CIP this year.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- Saving gradually can help avoid spikes in the tax rate that could occur if the total cost of a necessary purchase or repair must be paid in one year.
- CRF savings avoid the cost in interest when capital improvements must be bonded (borrowed).
- Failure to fund the CIP every year causes the plan to fall further behind projected needs.
- Establishing a Capital Improvement Plan gives the town the authority to collect impact fees from developers to help pay school costs that would otherwise be paid out of taxes. Impact fees can be applied to bond payments for school buildings.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To finance high cost items with voter approved bonds
- To bond (borrow) and pay for items as a project is built/purchased and used
- Disagreement with some or all of the items to be funded

#### References:

1. A CRF is a savings account for scheduled School CIP purchases that cost more than \$10,000 and have a life expectancy of at least five years.

### School Article 7 Undesignated Fund Balance

This Article would allow the School Board to place unspent money at the end of the fiscal year, not to exceed \$50,000, into the Equipment, Facilities Maintenance, and Replacement Capital Reserve Fund (CRF).<sup>1</sup> Anticipated uses for this CRF include upgrades to safety and security, bathrooms, flooring, driveways, fencing, and air conditioning at the schools.<sup>2</sup> The Raymond School Board must approve any request to spend money from the CRF.

A **YES vote** means the School Board may transfer up to \$50,000 of the year-end fund balance into the CRF.

A **NO vote** means that all the year-end surplus, other than any amount retained per RSA 198:4-b, must be returned to the taxpayer.<sup>3</sup>

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To save some year-end funds beyond the fiscal year for the stated CRF.
- To plan ahead for higher cost repairs for such items as described above.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To return the year end surplus to the taxpayers, other than any amount retained pursuant to RSA 198:4-b.<sup>3</sup>
- The anticipated CRF balance at the end of this school year is estimated to be approximately \$315, 000.<sup>2</sup>

#### References:

1. RSA 35:1 allows the School District to raise and appropriate money for the establishment of a Capital Reserve Fund.  
2. Ron Brickett, Raymond School District Business Administrator.  
3. RSA 198:4-b states that a contingency fund may be established by the District annually to meet the cost of unanticipated expenses that may arise during the year.

### School Article 8: Easement for Town Well

This Article asks the voters to authorize the School Board to negotiate the terms and conditions of an agreement with the Town to drill a well on high school property and to install the necessary infrastructure. This easement relates to Well #4, described in Town Warrant Article #15.<sup>1</sup> Drilling tests on high school property have shown the water is ample and of good quality<sup>2</sup>, requiring less treatment. The easement would include drilling an artesian well, installing water lines under the existing road & other equipment, and constructing a pump house.

Currently there are 3 wells in Raymond. They are all located in one field and draw from one source of water that must be processed through the water treatment plant that is now near maximum capacity. This easement for this well would allow an addition to connect to the Town water system.<sup>4</sup> There will be a 400-foot radius for sanitary protection at the well site, which abuts the Flint Hill conservation land.<sup>4</sup> There is no cost to the town for the easement.

A **YES vote** supports the easement.

A **NO vote** denies the easement.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To increase the Town's water supply.
- To allow access to a different aquifer.<sup>3</sup>
- To have additional water for new residential and commercial use.<sup>4</sup>

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To prevent Town access to high school property.

#### References:

1. Craig Wheeler, Raymond Town Manager  
2. SAU 33 PowerPoint presentation on Article #8  
3. Jonathan Wood, Raymond Board of Selectmen  
4. Steve Brewer, Raymond Director of Public Works, at School Deliberative Session 02/04/2017.

### School Article 9: School Outsourcing Food Service Program

This Article asks the voters to advise the School Board that they approve making a contract with Fresh Picks Café to provide the food services program. The School Board sent out a Request for Proposals to identify a food management company to save money for the District and to have more food options available, particularly for Middle and High Schoolers. Fresh Picks Café presented a proposal based on market wages and a modified staffing structure guaranteeing a maximum District contribution of \$8,795 in the first year. Currently, the school district employs 15 Food Services workers and has 1 vacancy. Fresh Picks proposes 12 positions, which current employees could apply for at Raymond schools.<sup>1</sup>

This Article is advisory only. The School Board will make the final decision.

A **YES vote** supports contracting with Fresh Picks Café

A **NO vote** supports continuation of the current Food Services Program

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To make the District's food services cost predictable through a guaranteed maximum annual District contribution
- District employees will have the opportunity to interview for positions in the District as Fresh Picks' employees
- Fresh Picks Café emphasizes fresh and whole wheat foods that are locally grown and produced.<sup>2</sup>

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To continue the current local food service program and avoid potential reduction of current support staff.

**References:**

- Ron Brickett, Raymond School District Business Administrator had indicated that it has been difficult to keep meal prices at a reasonable level and cover costs, while meeting increased federal restrictions placed on what foods can be served and sold in schools. The management company, Fresh Picks, has run programs in other local School Districts for many years that have been run better financially and have sold more meals to the students than what the in-district programs could do. Last school year's loss was \$35,542 and a similar loss is anticipated by the end of this school year.
- <http://www.FreshPicks.com/>“Our Philosophy”

**School Article 10: Citizen Petition**

The Citizens' petition states: “Shall the voters vote to direct the Raymond School Board not to outsource/contract out jobs that are provided by the cafeteria workers/cafeteria managers in the Raymond School District and SAU 33?”<sup>1</sup>

This article is the opposite of School Article 9.

A **YES vote** advises the School Board to not outsource food service jobs.

A **No vote** does not advise the School Board not to outsource or contract out food service jobs.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- Prefer that the School Board continue to have full control over hiring of food service workers.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Prefer to advise the School Board to outsource or contract food service jobs.

**Reference:**

- Mary DeFlumeri, petitioner.

**TOWN WARRANT****Article 1: 2017 Town Of Raymond Candidates**

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

Two (2) Selectmen for 3-year terms:

Robin Jordan  
Bernie Garland Peer  
George Plante  
Carol Watjus  
Jack S. Barnes, Jr.  
William A. Hoitt

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

Elizabeth McGovern

One (1) Budget Committee Member for a 2-year term:

Joshua Mann

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

(no candidates)

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

Brad Reed  
Alissa Welch

One (1) Ethics Committee Member for a 2-year term:

Sue Roundy

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

Susan Hilchey  
Joyce Wood

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

Kevin S. Woods

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

Sabrina L. B. Maltby

One (1) Supervisor of the Checklist for a 1 year term:

Gail Ernst

One (1) Supervisor of the Checklist for a 5-year term:

Kathleen McDonald

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

Edward French

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

Sharon E. Walls

**Article 2: Zoning Amendment 1: Accessory Dwelling Units**

This amendment updates and replaces Raymond's “conversion apartment” zoning provision (13.1.19) with an “accessory dwelling unit (ADU)” zoning provision, to bring the town into compliance with a new state law that takes effect June 1, 2017 (RSA 674:72). The new state law mandates that all single family homes, whether existing or new construction, shall allow at least one attached or internal accessory dwelling unit in any zone where single family homes are allowed. The new law also gives towns the authority to set standards for these units. Gone from our old “conversion apartment” ordinance is the (now illegal) five year wait to add an ADU and the limit to have only one ADU bedroom. All other standards are retained in the new ADU ordinance, such as owner-occupancy of the primary residence and requirements that the ADU fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

A **YES Vote** allows one accessory dwelling unit in any detached single family home in Raymond, as long as it meets required standards.

A **NO Vote** allows one accessory dwelling unit in any zone where single family homes are allowed, subject only to the restrictions in RSA 674:72 (building permit, adequate water supply and sewer disposal, and an interior door).

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To bring our ordinance into compliance with state law to avoid potential legal challenge(s).
- To add to Raymond's housing inventory, without further land development, additional buildings, increased roads and/or town infrastructure.
- To give every detached single family homeowner an option for providing separate and independent living space for their extended families, caregivers or others, including the option of rental income.
- To allow local control, to the extent enabled by RSA 674:72, to provide consistency with Raymond's present standards for conversion apartments (adequate parking, only one ADU per single family dwelling, etc).

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Disagreement with one or more standards set by the planning board.
- Prefer to allow ADUs without requiring any standards.

**References:**

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 3: Zoning Amendment 2: IRC Update

This article amends Raymond's Zoning Ordinance (8.3.2) to require use of the current version of the International Residential Code (IRC) for single and two-family dwellings.

A **YES vote** removes an obsolete code.

A **NO vote** leaves an inaccurate reference in place.

This amendment is considered a housekeeping item.

#### References:

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 4: Zoning Amendment 3: Special Exception Criteria

This amendment redefines one of five criteria that the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) uses to decide whether or not to grant a property owner a Special Exception to a section of the Zoning Ordinance. Four criteria will remain the same: appropriate location, no nuisance or hazard, adequate facilities and utilities, and no new costs to the town. One criterion (9.2.2.2) will change. The zoning designation of the proposed location will be added to the analysis of whether a proposed use will unreasonably impact the quality of life, character, or public health, safety and welfare of the area. Further analysis of the impact on property values will be removed. The Planning Board believes that these items, taken together, more clearly define potential adverse effects on property values.

A **YES Vote** expands one Special Exception criterion to include the additional specific consideration of the zoning designation (residential, commercial, etc.) and removes the phrase "property values" from that criterion.

A **NO Vote** leaves the Special Exception criterion for effect on property values unchanged and retains the phrase "property values."

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To clarify that analysis of life, character, or public health, safety or welfare of an area will include consideration of the zoning designation.
- To rely on the analysis defined above to determine the impact on property values.
- To make the ZBA property value decision less subjective

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Do not agree that zoning designation (residential, commercial, etc.) of the location of a development project should be considered along with other quality of life issues.
- Do not agree that a determination of impact to property values can be determined using the criteria in the introduction when evaluating the potential effect on property values.
- To retain the phrase "property values" in this criterion for a Special Exception

#### References:

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 5: Zoning Amendment 4: Permit Cost Update

This article amends Raymond's Zoning Ordinance (8.1.5) to eliminate an obsolete minimum payment amount for permits obtained after construction has begun.

A **YES vote** removes the obsolete \$10 minimum cost for permits obtained after construction has begun.

A **NO vote** leaves the obsolete minimum charge in place.

This amendment is considered a housekeeping item.

#### References:

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 6: Zoning Amendment 5: Impact Fee Review

This amendment requires that the planning board review the Impact Fee Assessment Schedule once every five years instead of once every year. The Town employs a consultant to do this review.

A **YES Vote** decreases the frequency of reviewing the Impact Fee Assessment Schedule to once every five years.

A **NO Vote** continues to mandate an annual review of the Impact Fee Assessment Schedule.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To allow review when community changes necessitate a need for review of impact fees, and to mandate this review only once every five years.
- To avoid consulting costs when community factors that affect the review have not changed.
- The Impact Fee Assessment Schedule is not currently being reviewed every year.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To continue to ensure that the Impact Fee Assessment Schedule is updated every year.

#### References:

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 7: Zoning Amendment 6: Accessory Building Update

This amendment cleans up the definition of Accessory Building or Use (13.1.1) to eliminate the words "or use" and to permit accessory buildings in all districts with review.

A **YES Vote** eliminates "or use" from the definition of Accessory Building.

A **NO Vote** leaves an obsolete definition in place.

This amendment is considered a housekeeping item.

#### References:

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 8: Zoning Amendment 7: Delete Definition

This amendment eliminates the definition for USE, RESIDENTIAL LOW DENSITY (13.8.82) because the term is not used in the Zoning Ordinance.

A **YES Vote** eliminates the definition.

A **NO Vote** continues to leave an obsolete definition in place.

This amendment is considered a housekeeping item.

#### References:

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 9: Zoning Amendment 8: Rezone 3 Parcels

This amendment changes the zoning for three parcels of land (8.87 acres) near the intersection of Chester Road (Route 102) and Fremont Road (Route 107), at the request of the owners of these parcels.

A **YES Vote** changes the zoning designation from Zone D Industrial to Zone C.1 Commercial for Raymond Tax Map 17, Lots 62, 63 and 64.

A **NO Vote** retains the current designation of these parcels as Zone D Industrial.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- These three parcels are located among commercially zoned parcels. Rezoning them to be commercial lots would make them more compatible with neighboring lots.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Prefer not to lose any industrially zoned parcels.

**References:**

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 10: Zoning Amendment 9: Rezone 1 Parcel

This amendment changes the zoning for one parcel of land (1/4 acre) located in the Exit 5 business area, on the south side of Essex Drive at the intersection of Freetown Road (Route 102/107) and Essex Drive.

A **YES Vote** changes the zoning designation from Zone A Residential to Zone C.1 Commercial for Raymond Tax Map 29.3, Lot 43.

A **NO Vote** retains the current designation of this parcel as Zone A Residential.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- This parcel is located among commercially zoned parcels. Rezoning it to be commercial would make it compatible with neighboring lots.
- This parcel cannot currently be developed for residential use without obtaining variances from the minimum lot size and setback distances.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To retain the parcel's current zoning

**References:**

For complete text of the proposed amendment see the Planning Office or [http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e\\_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf](http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2e37e_3d2f15059a7248fbb37cab3400d0141b.pdf)

### Article 11: Citizen Petition: Multi-Family Housing

The citizens' petition states: "Are you in favor of the adoption of an amendment for the town zoning ordinance as follows: To prohibit Multi-Family Housing within the C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts by Amending Article 14, entitled ALLOWED USES TABLE from P and P<sub>500</sub> respectively, to X and X respectively."

The C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts are located on either side of Route 102 just past the intersection with Fremont Road. P means permitted. P<sub>500</sub> means permitted 500 feet from Rt. 102. X means not permitted.

A **YES vote** would remove multi-family housing from the table of allowed uses within the C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts.

A **NO vote** would continue to allow multi-family housing within the C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- Concern that multi-family housing is not the best use of this commercially zoned area.
- Concern that multi-family housing would change the nature and character of the existing residential neighborhoods that border the district.
- Concern about potential traffic congestion, density and/or impact on school enrollment.

**Reasons why some voters may vote no:**

- Concern that Raymond may not achieve and maintain its goal for workforce housing.<sup>1</sup>

- Concern that removing multi-family housing from this zone defeats the intent to add a mixed use zoning district to Raymond's commercial area at Exit 5.<sup>2</sup>
- Prefer the flexibility of allowing multi-family housing by use of Special Exception rather than prohibiting it entirely

**References:**

1. Town of Raymond Master Plan 2010: Chapter III Goals, Objectives and Recommendations, D. Housing, Goal 1: Diversify and Balance Housing Options for All Raymond Residents, page 14.
2. Town of Raymond Master Plan 2010: Chapter II Vision for Raymond, A. Land Use, Goal 2: Land Use 8, page 9.

### Article 12: Citizen Petition: Hotel/Motel

The citizens' petition states: "Are you in favor of the adoption of an amendment for the town zoning ordinance as follows: Prohibit Hotel/Motel within the C.3 West zoning district by Amending Article 14, entitled Allowed Uses Table from P to X respectively."

The C.3 West Zoning District is located on the west side of Route 102 just past the intersection with Fremont Road. P means permitted. X means not permitted.

A **YES vote** would remove hotel/motel from the table of allowed uses within the C.3 West Zoning Districts.

A **NO vote** would continue to allow a hotel/motel within the C.3 West Zoning Districts.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- Concern that a hotel or motel would change the nature and character of the existing nearby residential neighborhoods
- Concern that traffic congestion and transient population may increase in Raymond

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Raymond and its immediate area lacks lodging alternatives for visitors: such as family, friends and business associates.
- Prefer the flexibility of allowing a hotel or motel by use of Special Exception rather than prohibiting it.

### Article 13: Citizen Petition: C.3 Density

The citizens' petition states: "Are you in favor of the adoption of an Amendment for the town zoning ordinance as follows: Amend Ordinance 6.5.5, where multi-family is a permitted use within the C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts, it shall comply with all requirements of Section 6.5 by amending specifically (6.5.5), in no case shall density exceed three (3) bedrooms per acre of Developable land."

Note: The commercial C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts are located on either side of Route 102 just past the intersection with Fremont Road.

A **YES vote** will reduce the number of bedrooms allowed per acre in multi-family housing within the C.3 East and C.3 West Zoning Districts from eight (8) bedrooms per acre of Developable land to three (3) bedrooms per acre of Developable land.

A **NO Vote** will keep the density requirement in these zones as is

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes**

- If the petition to remove multi-family use from Zones C.3 East and C.3 West fails, and this article passes, the Zoning Code will allow fewer multi-family housing units per acre.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Prefer to keep zoning code density allowances for multi-family use at the current level.



## Article 14: Bond Article - Police Department

This article authorizes the Board of Selectmen to raise Six Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$6,800,000) by issuing a 20-year bond for building a new Police Station. In addition, the article asks to raise an additional sum of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the bond issuance and bond counsel costs. This article requires a 3/5 majority vote to pass.

The Raymond Police Department is inside a combined public safety facility that is shared with the Raymond Fire Department and Raymond Ambulance Inc. The facility is two stories on one side with a single upper level used for the Fire & Ambulance apparatus bays and offices. The Police Department occupies 4,320 square feet on the lower level. The facility was constructed in 1990. Building systems, such as mechanical and electrical, are antiquated and do not meet current standards for fresh air, ventilation of evidence areas, and electrical load needs. The facility is not Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant.<sup>1</sup> The exterior shell offers little protection from a potential attack with a firearm or a vehicle, etc.. The lower level parking lot has an insufficient number of spaces to account for current staff's private vehicles, department vehicles, and visitors. There is no exterior lighting in the parking lot. There are only two doors to the police facility. Both are on the same wall, leading to the lower level parking lot. There is no access to the second floor of the building from the lower floor. A fire or other emergency emanating from the side of the building closest to the parking lot would leave limited options for escape.<sup>2</sup> The new facility would be built on the existing safety complex property.

Raymond's population has grown from 8,713 in 1990 to an estimated 10,500 in 2016.<sup>3</sup> The current Police Station was built when the police and dispatch departments had 16 personnel. It now has 17 full-time officers, a full-time prosecutor, 5 part-time officers, 6 full-time dispatchers, 2 part-time dispatchers, 1 full-time secretary and 2 part-time secretaries. Two of the current station's original bathrooms have been converted to other uses. The locker rooms are inadequate for supporting male and female officers.<sup>4</sup> There are numerous life safety issues including no secure prisoner holding area, no juvenile holding area, and no safety barriers in the parking lot to protect the building. The lobby size only allows for two people at a time and is not appropriately secured. The sally port has become a storage area for equipment and large evidence items, so it cannot accept vehicles, as intended. The ventilation system unsafely re-circulates evidence room air.<sup>5</sup>

The Board of Selectmen intends to secure a 20-year level debt bond at approximately 3.25% interest rate. This amounts to an estimated 2017 tax impact of \$0.027 per thousand of tax valuation or \$5.40 for a \$200,000 home for the bond issuance and counsel costs. The 2018 estimated tax impact is \$0.525 per thousand of tax valuation or \$105 on a \$200,000 house. Because this would be a level debt bond, the payments would remain constant over the life of the bond. Delaying the bond by one year is estimated to increase costs by \$408,000.<sup>6</sup>

A **YES vote** will authorize the Selectmen to negotiate a \$6,800,000 bond for the construction, furnishing, expanded parking and equipping of a new Police Station.<sup>7</sup> It will also raise the \$25,000 for the bond issuance and counsel costs.<sup>7</sup>

A **NO vote** means the Selectmen are not authorized to negotiate a bond for the construction, furnishing and equipping of a new Police Station.

### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The current building does not meet the safety needs of the occupants.
- The current building does not meet the space needs of the department.
- The current building is not ADA compliant.
- To avoid the estimated \$408,000 added cost of delaying the project.

### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To save rather than bond for a new police station.
- To continue to use and maintain the current police station.
- Disagreement with any or all components of the project.

### References:

1. [https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/harriman-final-space-](https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/harriman-final-space-needs-assessment1.pdf)

[needs-assessment1.pdf](https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/harriman-final-space-needs-assessment1.pdf).

2. <https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/01/report-raymond-nh-police-department-facility-safety-review-final-to-client-11-08-16.pdf>.
3. <https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/new-police-facility-current2.pdf> (slide 78) population.
4. <https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/new-police-facility-current2.pdf> (slide 104) staff.
5. <https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/new-police-facility-current2.pdf> (slide 8) life safety and International Association of Property and Evidence standards.
6. <https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/new-police-facility-current2.pdf> (slide 100) cost increase.
7. <https://raymondnhpolice.files.wordpress.com/2016/11/new-police-facility-current2.pdf>.

## Article 15: Design and Construct New Well #4:

This article asks the voters to authorize up to \$500,000 as supplemental funding to design and construct a new well on Raymond High School property. If approved, this Article also allows the Town to issue bonds or notes as allowed by the State of NH<sup>1</sup> and to seek & accept federal or state aid. It is intended that the repayment of the principal and interest would be funded through revenues from users of the public water system; however, the Town of Raymond will be under the general obligation should the cost exceed what is available through the water revenues. This Town Article relates to School Warrant Article 8, requesting an easement for the Town of Raymond to drill an artesian well and install water infrastructure at the high school campus.

Currently, there are three wells in Raymond. Well #1, installed in 1963, is in the process of being replaced by a new well. When the new well is operating, the old well will be decommissioned. Well #2 was installed in 1989 and Well #3 was installed in 2003. All three existing wells are gravel-packed wells, within 300 feet of each other, within the Cider Ferry Well Field and they share the same aquifer. One of the key factors in the production of water at the treatment plant is the level of iron and/or manganese in the raw water. These naturally-occurring minerals increase with time and, as they get higher, the plant must work harder and must perform more frequent backwashes. These backwash activities reduce the amount of drinking water produced.<sup>2</sup>

This Article seeks authorization to create Well #4 to be located 1.5 miles away from the current well field, on the land at Raymond High School. It will be a bedrock well and it will access a different aquifer from that already in use.<sup>2</sup> Because increased costs related to rock excavation and road paving are anticipated, the maximum of \$500,000 requested would provide a "cushion," which may be needed during the Bidding Phase.<sup>3</sup> There is no tax impact. It is to be paid with revenues from users of the public water system.

A 3/5 majority vote is required.

A **YES vote** would allow the Town of Raymond to seek funding and to spend up to \$500,000 to construct a new well

A **NO vote** would not allow the design and construction of a new well

### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To access a different aquifer and have more sources for safe drinking water.
- Concern for the uninterrupted supply of town water, particularly considering the 2016 drought conditions.
- Desire to see the town plan ahead to meet demand for water as the population increases.
- The new well will allow for the addition of new users for the future.<sup>2</sup>

### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To avoid spending up to \$500,000 of the water revenues.
- Uncertainty about construction costs and repayment, if the project exceeds \$500,000.

**References:**

1. RSA 33 Municipal Finance Act
2. Craig Wheeler, Raymond Town Manager; Donna McFarland, Raymond Finance Officer 2/1/17
3. Steve Brewer, Director of Public Works at Board of Selectmen's meeting 1/9/17

**Article 16: Operating Budget/Default Budget**

This article will raise \$8,527,969 to fund the Town's Operating Budget, or if this article fails, will raise the \$8,300,144 to fund the Default Budget.<sup>1</sup> The amounts above do not include other money warrant articles on this year's ballot that may pass. These amounts do include the Water Department Budget, which is self-funded by water users, has no tax impact, and is not included in the information that follows.<sup>2</sup>

The proposed Town Operating Budget (without the Water Budget) is \$7,637,732 which is an increase of \$209,303 (or 2.82%) over last year's actual operating budget.<sup>3</sup>

**Cost increases this year include:** Salaries for all town employees will increase 2.25%. Most of the budget increases include salaries/wages and retirement expenses as well as longevity dividends, and vacation buy-outs. The Fire, Police, and Public Works Departments include expenditures under \$15,000 that were previously covered by the Capital Reserve Funds per the Capital Improvements Plan. The Town Office/Executive: Salary & Wages are \$18,241 and Computer Maintenance & Licenses are \$15,456. Also the Town Clerk/Tax Collector: \$6,962; Police Department: \$46,089; Fire Department: \$32,857; Admin-Public Works: \$21,944; Highway Department: \$32,116; Building Inspector: \$15,878; Library: \$17,590; Parks: \$12,304; and Recreation: \$ 9,567.

**Cost decreases this year include:** Decreased fuel costs while gallon usage is the same; decreased road salt costs. Elections: \$9,937 (there is no presidential election in 2017); General Government Bldg.: \$6,572; Decreased need for Operating and Maintenance Supplies; Decreased legal expense: \$20,500; Dispatch staffing reduction: \$14,522; Solid Waste: \$2,547 decrease in Household Hazardous Waste Day expense.

The annual tax cost of the proposed 2017 Operating Budget (without the self-funded Water Budget) is \$5.953 per thousand of tax valuation or \$1,190 for a \$200,000 house. The annual tax cost of the Default Operating Budget is \$5.770 per thousand of tax valuation or \$1,154 for a \$200,000 house. The total Annual tax cost of all additional warrant articles, should they pass, will be an additional \$1.12 per thousand of tax valuation, or \$224 for a \$200,000 house, and this amount would be added to whichever budget passes.

**Summary:** The 2016 NH Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) Municipal (Town) Tax Rate for Raymond was \$ 6.28.<sup>4</sup> Based on this tax rate and last year's revenues staying the same, Raymond's Finance Office estimates that the total Annual cost to taxpayers for the proposed Operating Budget (less estimated revenue), plus all proposed additional warrant articles, may be about \$7.07. This would be an annual tax increase of about \$.79 per thousand of tax valuation, or about \$158 (\$79.30 in the December 2017 tax bill and \$79.30 in the June 2018 tax bill) for a house valued at \$200,000.<sup>5</sup>

**A YES vote** raises \$8,527,969 to fund the town's Operating Budget and the Town's Water Budget

**A NO vote** raises \$8,300,144 to fund the Town's Default Budget and the Town's Water Budget.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To fund the proposed Town's Operating Budget

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To fund the Town's Default Operating Budget

**References:**

1. The Town's default budget is defined by state law. It includes the previous year's budget plus any contractual obligations, and plus or minus any one time expenses. The default budget is automatically in place if the proposed operating budget fails. RSA 40:13 IX (b)
2. The Water Budget is self-funded by all users of town water according to a rate schedule set by the Selectmen. The Water Rate Schedule can be found at Town Hall (Bylaw #213).
3. The 2017 Proposed Operating Budget only includes appropriations based on a thorough review of historical expenditures and upcoming needs of the departments. It does not include any other March 2016 warrant articles.
4. Department of Revenue Administration (DRA), Municipal - Property Tax Rates & Related Data; <http://www.revenue.nh.gov/mun-prop/municipal/documents/16-final-rates.pdf>
5. The current tax rate is an estimate made by the Town. It is based on 2016 approved warrant articles less 2016 estimated revenues and also on the 2016 DRA town assessed value of \$923,356,261, which rose by \$78,795,791 or 9.3% over last year. In October 2017 when DRA recalculates Raymond's tax rate, Raymond's assessed value may change, and revenue estimates may also change. Both changes will change the tax rate.

**Article 17: Town Scholarship Fund**

This article will raise \$2,000 for the Town of Raymond Scholarship Capital Reserve Fund for Raymond High School graduating seniors and Raymond residents attending their first year of college. Recipients are chosen by the Board of Selectmen who also determine the amount of each scholarship.<sup>1</sup>

Tax cost: \$.002 per \$1,000 of tax valuation (same as last year) or about forty cents (\$.40) on a \$200,000 house.

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

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

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To build the Scholarship fund

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To spend down the Scholarship Fund balance<sup>2</sup>

**References:**

1. Raymond awarded two \$1000 scholarships in 2016. The Scholarship Fund currently has a balance of \$4913.96, as verified at the Town Deliberative Session, 2/11/2017. Scholarship funds are released from the Capital Reserve Fund after recipients have completed their first semester at college and have submitted documentation to that effect.
- 2 The Selectmen do not currently intend to build the fund to the point that interest income can support the annual scholarship costs.

**Article 18: Social Service Agencies**

This article will raise \$72,372 for twelve (12) Social Service agencies that provide services to Raymond residents.<sup>1</sup> All agencies were interviewed by the Board of Selectmen. The board chose to increase funding over last year's rate in recognition of stated agency needs and services provided to Raymond citizens.<sup>2</sup> Tax cost is \$.078 per \$1,000 of tax valuation or \$15.60 for a \$200,000 house.

**A YES vote** will provide funding to the listed Social Service agencies that serve Raymond residents.

**A NO vote** will not provide any funding from Raymond to any Social Service agency.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- All the Social Service agencies contribute significantly more in services and financial support than they receive from the town.
- Some Social Service Agencies provide assistance that the Town Welfare Department would otherwise be required to fund according to RSA 165:1 Aid to Assisted Persons.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Personal objections to any or all of the agencies
- Personal objections to town funding of any or all social service agencies

**References:**

1. The following agencies are funded at the same amount as in 2016: HAVEN \$4,175; American Red Cross \$1,850; Area Homecare and Family Services \$4,000; Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) \$500; Lamprey Health Care \$6,500; Retired Seniors Volunteer Program \$600 and Rockingham Community Action \$36,000; Rockingham County Nutrition Program \$3,747. The following agencies are funded at increases: Child Advocacy Center \$1,500 (up \$403); Child and Family Services \$6,000 (up \$403); Richie McFarland Children's Center \$4000 (up \$342); Seacoast Mental Health \$3,500 (up \$403).
2. See Board of Selectmen (BOS) Minutes from August 22, 2016 at [www.raymondnh.gov](http://www.raymondnh.gov) or watch on RCTV for details from the interviews.

---

**Article 19: Mosquito Spraying**

This article raises \$40,000 to fund the mosquito control program in Raymond. The mosquito program monitors and controls mosquitoes carrying West Nile Virus, Eastern Equine Encephalitis (EEE), and Zika Virus primarily by larvicide and emergency spraying, and on-request spraying of public assembly areas including playgrounds and the Common. 156 sites are routinely sprayed and the Selectmen receive regular updates on results. The state will no longer provide testing of submitted samples at no cost to the town. The funds requested are the same as last year. Tax cost is \$.043 per \$1,000 of tax valuation or \$8.60 for a \$200,000 home.

**A YES vote** funds the mosquito control program in Raymond.

**A NO vote** eliminates the mosquito control program in Raymond.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To reduce risk of exposure to West Nile Virus, EEE and Zika infection.
- Raymond tested negative last year, as of August 2016, per report from Dragon Mosquito Control.<sup>1</sup>

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Does not guarantee prevention of infection.<sup>2</sup>
- Do not want a mosquito control program in Raymond.

**References:**

1. Dragon Mosquito Control, Inc., August 2016 report to town.
2. Former Town of Raymond Health Officer Richard Mailhot

---

**Article 20: Capital Improvements**

This article contains 14 items which are previously established CIP accounts. Seven (7) of these accounts are funded in this Article for 2017 and 7 are not funded. The total funding of the Article is \$285,000, which is an increase of \$35,000, or 14%, over 2016's funding of \$250,000. Funding for items 2 and 3 are increased over year 2016. Items 4, 12 and 14 are at the same level as year 2016. Item 1 and 11 are less than year 2016. Items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13 are not funded for 2017.

Item 1: General Government Buildings Maintenance and Improvement - \$15,000.

Item 2: Highway Department Vehicle Replacement - \$85,000.

Item 3: Highway Department Heavy Equipment - \$50,000.

Item 4: Bridge Maintenance - \$25,000.

Item 5: Sidewalks - \$0.

Item 6: Town Office Technology - \$0.

Item 7: Revaluation - \$0.

Item 8: Master Plan Updates - \$0.

Item 9: New Town Facilities - \$0.

Item 10: Library - \$0.

Item 11: Police Department & Dispatch Equipment and Vehicle - \$35,000.

Item 12: Fire Department Equipment and Vehicles - \$50,000.

Item 13: Recreation Department Equipment, Vehicles and Facilities - \$0.

Item 14: Parks Equipment, Vehicles and Facilities - \$25,000.

Adding funds to these accounts is the same as putting money in a savings account. When funds are needed for a large expense that meets the established purpose of the fund, funds can be withdrawn from that account for that purpose.<sup>1</sup>

Estimated 2017 tax impact: \$0.309 per \$1,000 of value or \$61.80 on a \$200,000 home.

**A YES vote** will add the stated amounts to each of the above CIP accounts.

**A NO vote** will add nothing to any of these CIP accounts.

**Reasons why some would vote yes:**

- This enables a large expense to be met without coming up with it all in one year, lessening the impact.
- If a repair or purchase comes up unexpectedly, having some or all of the funding in place could speed up the process.

**Reasons why some would vote no:**

- Disagreement with some or all of the items to be funded.
- To finance high cost items with voter approved bonds and/or to bond (borrow) and pay for items as a project is built/purchased and used.

**Reference:**

1. Donna McFarland, Raymond Finance Director

---

**Article 21: Capital Reserve Funds (Water Revenues)**

The article includes raising funds for the Capital Reserve funds listed: \$14,000 to Construct, Repair and Maintain Town Water Treatment Facility, \$14,000.00 for the Clean Water Wells fund, \$1,500.00 for the Paint Water Tank Towers fund and \$500 for Water Department Utility Replace Vehicle funds, totaling \$30,000.00.

The first three items build up funding for maintaining the proper operation and upkeep of the Town's Water Treatment Facility, cleaning the wells and painting the water towers. The fourth item builds a fund for replacing the Water Department Utility Vehicle when it becomes necessary.

There is no tax impact from this article. It is to be paid with revenues from users of the public water system.

**A YES vote** will add funds to the above accounts as described in the Article.

**A NO vote** will add no funds to any of the items in the Article.

**Reasons why some would vote yes:**

- The Water Treatment Facility needs to be properly maintained to ensure a safe water supply.<sup>1</sup>
- The wells need to be cleaned and towers painted on a regular basis.<sup>1</sup>

**Reasons why some would vote no:**

- Some may feel not all the items are necessary.

**References:**

1. Raymond Director of Public Work Steve Brewer in 2016 public presentations.

## Article 22: Road Reconstruction

This article funds \$300,000 for road reconstruction projects, as determined by the Director of the Public Works Department. This appropriation can be held for two years, or until the road reconstruction work has been completed, whichever comes sooner.<sup>1</sup>

This past summer STREETSCAN scanned all 70+ miles of Town owned paved roads to collect pavement condition data and it was determined that 16 miles (22%) of the paved roads have deteriorated and require reconstruction.<sup>2</sup>

The town has provided \$149,000 each year for the last ten years. Keeping the road reconstruction fund at the \$149,000 level would not meet the requirements for making the most necessary repairs.<sup>3</sup>

Tax cost: \$.325 per \$1000 of tax valuation or about \$65 on a \$200,000 house.

A **YES vote** allows the town to continue some road reconstruction projects.

A **NO vote** delays road reconstruction projects.

### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To enable the Public Works Department to reconstruct some roads rather than continue to make repairs to those roads<sup>2</sup>
- To try to decrease the percentage of road miles in need of repair<sup>3</sup>

### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Disagreement with using fund for road projects.
- Wish to fund road repairs with state money only (see Article 24).

### References:

1. RSA 32:7: VI gives towns the authority to create non-lapsing funds.
2. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer at Board of Selectmen Meeting 11/21/16 and at Town Deliberative Session, 2/11/2017.
3. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer at Board of Selectmen Meeting 11/21/16.

## Article 23: To Purchase Two Public Works Vehicles

This article asks voters to authorize the Town to raise and appropriate \$290,000 for the purchase of vehicles for the Department of Public Works (DPW).<sup>1</sup> The two vehicles, equipped for winter maintenance, would be a Ford one ton dump truck and an International 6-wheeler dump truck. These two purchases would replace existing vehicles which are over 17 years old.<sup>2</sup> Tax cost: \$0.314 per \$1000 of tax valuation or about \$62.80 on a \$200,000 house.

A **YES vote** will authorize the Department of Public Works to purchase the replacement vehicles named above.

A **NO vote** means the Department of Public Works is not authorized to purchase the DPW vehicles listed above during 2017 by any other means.

### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The trucks in need of replacement were scheduled on the 2010 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2011 to 2014, and replacement has been repeatedly delayed. These two trucks are the oldest of the DPW fleet.<sup>2</sup>
- The DPW dump trucks have such significant rotting and corrosion that they are no longer able to carry the load they are designed to carry.<sup>3</sup>
- Much of the DPW equipment exceeds its own value to repair.<sup>3</sup>
- The NH Department of Transportation (DOT) Replacement Program calls for all state trucks to be replaced after 10 years (to recover some residual value, avoid costly repairs, and for safety).<sup>3</sup>
- Unsafe vehicles and equipment put staff and those who use the roads at risk.<sup>3</sup>

### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Disagreement with the planned purchases
- To purchase the vehicles next year through bonding

### References:

1. RSA 32:7: VI gives towns the authority to create non-lapsing funds.
2. Department of Public Works Director Steve Brewer at Budget Committee Meeting 01/17/17
3. Capital Improvement Committee minutes at [www.raymondnh.gov](http://www.raymondnh.gov); RCTV coverage of the DPW Tour (6/2/15) at [www.rctv.com](http://www.rctv.com), and "Top Five Highway Division Trucks in Need of Replacement" (6/6/15 by Raymond Department of Public Works; 01/26/17 Director Steve Brewer).

## Article 24: Road Shim/Overlay SRF

This Special Revenue Fund (SRF) was created to hold funds that can be saved year to year and used as needed when Raymond town roads need to be rehabilitated with gravel shim and with asphalt overlay.<sup>1</sup> This authorizes funding and withdrawal of \$244,014 from the Department of Public Works Shim and Overlay SRF.<sup>2</sup>

There is no net impact to the Town's Operating Budget because NH State Highway Block Grant revenue funds this SRF.

Tax cost: zero (\$0.0) per thousand of tax valuation.

A **YES vote** authorizes the Department of Public Works to withdraw \$244,014 from its Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund and requires use of the money prior to December 31, 2019.

A **NO vote** means that the Department of Public Works will not be able to withdraw and use Shim and Overlay Special Revenue Fund money this year.

### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- To reduce the number of roads in need of rehabilitation in Raymond.

### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Disagreement with the project(s) that the money will be spent on

### References:

1. The main project worked on during 2016 was the Onway Lake culvert (bridge) project. This culvert was downgraded by the state to carry a maximum load of six tons which means that fire trucks, fuels trucks and other heavy trucks could not enter Onway Lake Road from Scribner Road.
2. Since Raymond's annual Operating Budget cannot accumulate funds year to year, Special Revenue Funds (SRF) must be used when the town needs to complete a project over several years. Voters must approve all withdrawals.

## Article 25: Vacation & Sick Leave Union Fund

This article raises and appropriates \$10,000 to be deposited into the Vacation and Sick Leave Union Expendable Trust Fund for Union employees.<sup>1</sup> This fund was established by voters in 2004 to ensure that the town would have the money to pay for accrued sick and vacation leave when union (AFSCME and Teamsters) employees retire. The pay-out amount is determined in the Town of Raymond Personnel Policy.<sup>2</sup> Annual Tax cost: \$.011 per thousand of tax valuation or \$2.20 for a \$200,000 house.

A **YES vote** raises \$10,000 for the Vacation and Sick Leave Union Expendable Fund.

A **NO vote** raises no money for the Vacation and Sick Leave Union Expendable Fund.

### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The Union Vacation and Sick Leave fund is currently under-funded.<sup>3</sup>

### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- Prefer to fund in the Operating Budget

### References:

1. See RSA 31:19-a. An "expendable" fund is a municipal trust fund created for maintenance and operation purposes.
2. Inquire at Town Hall to view the complete policy. Employees can accrue up to 90 days of sick leave for some union town employees, and up to 60

days for police. Payout percentage is based on years employed. Vacation accrual can be up to 1.5 times their annual accumulation for some union town employees and up to 80 hours specifically for police. Vacation payout is based upon their unused accumulated balance at the time of resignation.

3. The Union Vacation and Sick Leave Expendable Trust Fund currently has about \$24,546.27. Using a formula of taking the average pay-out expense compared to expected retirements, the Union Vacation and Sick Leave Fund is under-funded. Two to Three Union employees are expected to retire over the next five to seven years according to Raymond Town Manager Craig Wheeler

### **Article 26: Vacation & Sick Leave Non-Union Fund**

This article raises and appropriates \$10,000 to be deposited into the Vacation and Sick Leave Non-Union Expendable Trust Fund for Non-Union employees.<sup>1</sup> This fund was established by voters in 2002 to ensure that the town would have the money to pay for accrued sick and vacation leave when employees retire. The pay-out amount is determined in the Town of Raymond Personnel Policy.<sup>2</sup> Annual tax cost: \$.011 per thousand of tax valuation or \$2.20 for a \$200,000 house.

**A YES vote** raises \$10,000 for the Vacation and Sick Leave Non-Union Expendable Fund.

**A NO vote** raises no money for the Vacation and Sick Leave Non-Union Expendable Fund.

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- The Non-union Vacation and Sick Leave fund is currently under-funded.<sup>3</sup>

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- Prefer to fund in the Operating Budget

#### **References:**

1. See RSA 31:19-a. An “expendable” fund is a municipal trust fund created for maintenance and operation purposes
2. Inquire at Town Hall to view the complete policy. According to The Raymond Finance Director, the payout percentage is based on years employed. Employees can accrue up to 90 days of sick leave for some union town employees, and up to 60 days for police. Payout percentage is based on years employed. Vacation accrual can be up to 1.5 times their annual accumulation for some union town employees and up to 80 hours specifically for police. Vacation payout is based upon their unused accumulated balance at the time of resignation.
3. The Non-Union Vacation and Sick Leave Expendable Fund has about \$121.41. Using a formula of taking the average pay-out expense compared to expected retirements, the Union Vacation and Sick Leave Fund is markedly under-funded. One employee is retiring this year and the Town expects 2-3 more employees to retire over the next five years according to Raymond Town Manager Craig Wheeler.

### **Article 27: To Discontinue the Air Handling System Highway Capital Reserve Fund**

This article asks voters to eliminate the Air Handling System Highway (AHS) Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) and move the funds plus interest earned to the general fund. This CRF was established at the 2001 Town Meeting and currently contains \$9,231.00. This is the remaining balance after the AHS was replaced. The AHS should not need replacing for about another decade.<sup>1</sup>

The Capital Improvement Plan Committee’s (CIP) work this year focused on recommending that monies in small, rarely used CRF’s be moved to other funds and be available to cover a wider variety of needs.<sup>2</sup> Capital Reserve Funds are intended for large expenditures and to avoid sharp spikes in the tax rate when expensive payments or purchases are made. The CIP Committee advises that the CRF be dedicated to items with a useful life of 5 or more years and at a minimum cost of \$20,000.<sup>3</sup> Items costing less than

\$20,000 could be paid from operating budget. Future costs related to the Air Handling System for the Highway Department could come from the General Government Building Fund.<sup>4</sup> Previously the recommended amount for CRF spending was \$15,000.<sup>5</sup> This is paired with article 28, as the first step to put these funds to different use. There is no tax impact. A majority vote is required.

**A YES vote** means that these Capital Reserve Funds will be moved to the general fund.

**A NO vote** means that this Capital Reserve Fund will remain unchanged.

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To end this CRF and move the funds plus interest to the general fund.

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To continue the current purpose of the fund

#### **References:**

1. Steve Brewer, Director-Department of Public Works (DPW); at Board of Selectmen Meeting 11/21/2016 and Town Deliberative Session 2/11/2017.
2. Colleen West-Coates, Chair-CIP
3. Capital Improvement Plan Committee presentation to the Board of Selectmen (BOS) 11/7/16
4. Steve Brewer, Director DPW
5. Capital Improvement Plan Committee presentation to the BOS 11/7/16

### **Article 28: To Appropriate to General Government Building Capital Reserve Fund from Fund Balance**

This article asks voters to place the fund balance from the Air Handling System (AHS) Highway Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) into the General Government Building (GGB) Capital Reserve Fund (CRF). The AHS has been repaired, so this CRF is not expected to be needed for another ten years or so.<sup>1</sup> By moving the unused funds, they could be used for other purposes when moved to the GGB CRF.

There is no tax impact. A majority vote is required.

**A YES vote** means that these funds will be moved to the General Government Building CRF.

**A NO vote** means that funds will remain in the current CRF.

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote yes**

- To make the funds available for a broader purpose.

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote no**

- To maintain the purpose of the funds.

#### **References:**

1. Steve Brewer, Raymond Director of the Department of Public Works

### **Article 29: Change the Purpose of the Clean Wells Capital Reserve Fund**

This article asks the voters to change the title and intention of the Clean Wells Capital Reserve Fund (CRF), originally set up in 2003.<sup>1</sup> The CRF would be renamed the Water System Infrastructure CRF to allow broader application of the funds. Items such as water lines, pump stations, meters, valves, hydrants and engineering services would be included, following the recommendations of the Capital Improvement Plan. There is currently approximately \$21,000 in this fund.<sup>2</sup> There is no tax impact. A 2/3 majority vote is required.

**A YES vote** would rename and the possible uses of the current CRF.

**A NO vote** would maintain the current name and purpose of the CRF.

#### **Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To broaden the CRF for elements of the water distribution system.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To maintain the original purpose of the fund.

**References:**

1. RSA 35:16-a Discontinuing Fund; RSA 35 Capital Reserve Funds of Counties, Towns, Districts, and Water Departments
2. Steve Brewer, Director-Department of Public Works (DPW); Town Deliberative Session 2/11/2017

**Article 30: Change the Purpose of the Paint Water Tank Towers Capital Reserve Fund**

This article asks voters to change the name and intent of the Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) established in 2003. At that time, it the CRF was dedicated to "Paint Water Tank Towers." The new purpose of the Fund would be to allow additional work by renaming the fund to "Water Storage Facilities" CRF. The additional services include upgrading, replacing, repairing and maintaining water storage per the policies of the Capital Improvement Plan and given approval by the Board of Selectmen. Specifics could also include engineering, painting, replacing pumps, and replacing control panels.<sup>1</sup> There is no tax impact. A 2/3 vote is required for this Article to pass.

**A YES vote** means that the Capital Reserve Fund will be available for a variety of repair/maintenance/improvements in Raymond's water storage facilities

**A NO vote** means that the Capital Reserve Fund will continue to be used only for painting the town's water tank towers

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To broaden the purpose of this fund

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To continue the current purpose of the fund

**References:**

1. Capital Improvement Plan Committee Minutes 10/11/16

**Article 31: Change the Purpose of the Bridge Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund**

This article asks voters to change the title and intention of a previously established Capital Reserve Fund (CRF), originally set up in 1993 to address maintenance/repair of the Pecker Bridge on Main Street. In 2002, that Capital Reserve Account was changed to "Bridge Maintenance" Capital Reserve Fund, in order to expand the use of those capital reserve funds to other bridges in town<sup>1</sup>. Currently, the voters are asked to decide whether this Bridge Maintenance account could be renamed to the "Bridge and Culvert" Capital Reserve Fund. The purpose of the name change is to allow the Town to use funds, not only for the maintenance of all town bridges, but also for culverts, which allow water to pass under roads.

There is no tax impact. A 2/3 ballot vote is required for this Article to pass.

**A YES vote** means that the CRF will change the name and purpose, to include culverts.

**A NO vote** means the CRF remains the same, in terms of name and purpose

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To expand the purpose of the CRF to include culverts.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no**

- To keep the CRF concentration on bridges.

**References:**

1. Warrant Article 15 as written in the 2001 Town Report

**Article 32: Change the Purpose of the Police and Dispatch Equipment and Vehicle Fund Capital Reserve Fund:**

This article asks the voters to change the title and intention of a previously established Capital Reserve Fund (CRF), originally set up in 2007, to address equipment needs for the Police and Dispatch departments and for vehicles.

Currently, the voters are asked to consider expanding that CRF to include needs related to maintaining and improving facilities for the Police, Dispatch and Animal Control Departments. The fund would be renamed "Police and Dispatch Equipment, Vehicle and Facilities Fund." There is no tax impact. A 2/3 majority vote is required.

**A YES vote** would expand the possible uses of the current CRF.

**A NO vote** would maintain the current purpose of the CRF.

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To broaden the CRF for equipment, vehicles and facilities improvements and repair.

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To maintain the original purpose of the fund for equipment and vehicles.

**Article 33: Collection of Motor Vehicle Additional Fee**

This article asks the voters to authorize the Town to collect an additional motor vehicle registration fee of \$5.00 and to establish a new Raymond Municipal Transportation Capital Reserve Fund (CRF).<sup>1,2</sup> It is anticipated that this fee could raise \$50,000-\$60,000 annually.<sup>3</sup> This money would be used for local or regional transportation improvements including roads, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, parking facilities, and public transportation.<sup>3</sup> These funds would be spent upon approval of the Board of Selectmen. All-terrain vehicles, antique motorcycles and antique motor vehicles will be exempt from this fee pursuant to State law.<sup>4,5,6</sup> If approved, motor vehicle registrations on or after May 1 of 2017 would include the additional fee. Tax impact: There is no tax impact, as this is a fee proposal.

**A YES vote** will approve establishing the Raymond Municipal Transportation CRF and collecting an annual \$5.00 motor vehicle registration fee

**A NO vote** will not approve the new CRF and motor vehicle registration fee

**Reasons why some voters might vote yes:**

- To create a new CRF for local/regional transportation
- To save for long-term local/regional transportation projects

**Reasons why some voters might vote no:**

- To avoid paying a new fee
- Preference for using other means to fund local/regional transportation improvements

**References:**

1. RSA 261:153, VI (a) Beginning on July 1, 1997, in addition to the motor vehicle registration fees, a municipality may vote to collect an additional fee to support a municipal and transportation improvement fund, which shall be a capital reserve fund. Of the amount collected, up to 10 percent, but not more than \$0.50 of each fee paid, may be retained by the local official designated by the municipal government or by the town or city clerk for administrative costs. The maximum fee charged shall be \$5. The additional fee shall be collected from all vehicles, both passenger and commercial, except all-terrain vehicles as defined in RSA 215-A:1, I-b and antique motorcycles and vehicles, as defined in RSA 259:4: "Antique motor vehicle or motorcycle" shall mean any motor vehicle, including a truck regardless of its weight, over 25 years old which is maintained for use in exhibitions, club activities, parades, and other functions of public interest, but not for use in commerce. For the purposes of this section, "maintained for use" shall mean a motor vehicle or motorcycle in its original condition or restored to original or better condition and not intended for daily use."
2. 35:1 Establishment of Reserves Authorized; this statute allows raising and appropriating money for a CRF for Municipal and regional transportation improvement projects including engineering, right-of-way acquisition and construction costs of transportation facilities, and for operating and capital costs for public transportation as well as other purposes

3. Stephen Brewer, Raymond Public Works Director
4. RSA 261:153 VI (b) The additional fee shall be collected from all vehicles, both passenger and commercial, with the exception of all terrain vehicles as defined in RSA 215-A:1, I-b and antique motor vehicles or motorcycles, as defined in RSA 259:4.
5. RSA 215-A I-b. "All terrain vehicle (ATV)" means any motor-driven vehicle which is designed or adapted for travel over surfaces other than maintained roads with one or more non-highway tires, having capacity for passengers or other payloads, not to exceed unladen dry weight of 1,000 pounds, and not to exceed 50 inches in width.
6. 259:4 Antique Motor Vehicle or Motorcycle. "Antique motor vehicle or motorcycle" shall mean any motor vehicle, including a truck regardless of its weight, over 25 years old which is maintained in original condition or better for use in exhibitions, club activities, parades, and other functions of public interest, but not for use in commerce or for daily use.

### Article 34: Allocate the Land Use Change Tax to the Conservation Fund

This Article asks that 50% of the Land Use Change Tax (LUCT) be allocated to the Conservation Fund instead of to the General Fund. The LUCT is a tax that encourages the maintenance of open space by allowing owners of qualified open space to pay a reduced tax rate based on the value of the current use of the land.<sup>1,2</sup>

A LUCT is collected only when undeveloped forest or farm land is taken out of its "current use" and developed.<sup>3</sup> For some of the past 10 years, no LUCT was collected.<sup>4</sup> In 2005 and 2008, Raymond voters allocated 50% of the LUCT revenue to the Conservation Fund. In 2011, voters decided to allocate 100% of the LUCT to the General Fund (as voted under 2011 Article 14).

**A YES vote** increases future LUCT allocations from 0% to 50% to the Conservation Fund

**A NO vote** maintains the current allocation of future LUCT revenue of 100% to the General Fund.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes:

- The LUCT is a major source of revenue to the Conservation Fund and can maintain a flow of revenue for mandated responsibilities including protection of natural resources and watershed resources.<sup>5,6</sup>
- To build up Conservation Fund through revenue paid by developers
- To avoid meeting Raymond's conservation needs through special warrant articles and directly impacting property taxes
- To provide revenue towards the maintenance and improvements of Town owned land managed by the Conservation Commission for trails and parking on Dearborn, Cassier, Flint Hill and Robinson Hill.<sup>7</sup>
- To support conservation initiatives, as noted in the Town's Master Plan and Open Space Plan.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no:

- To spend down the Conservation Fund balance
- To increase revenue available in the General Fund
- To require Raise and Appropriate warrant article(s) to fund conservation commission's activities once the current fund is exhausted.

#### References:

1. RSA79-A:1 Declaration of Public Interest. States that it is in the public interest to encourage preservation of open space to provide a "healthful and attractive outdoor environment for work and recreation," maintaining the character of the state's landscape, and conserving the land, water, forest, agricultural and wildlife resources. It states to be in the public interest to prevent the loss of open space due to property taxation at values incompatible with open space usage. "Open space land imposes few if any costs on local government and is therefore an economic benefit to its citizens."
2. RSA79-A:7 Land Use Change Tax. - I. Land which has been classified as open space land and assessed at current use values on or after April 1, 1974, pursuant to this chapter shall be subject to a land use change tax when it is changed to a use which does not qualify for current use assessment.
3. RSA 79-A"1 The LUCT is a penalty tax that is 10% of the full market value of the land when removed from current use due to development. When

a developer takes land out of current use, the developer pays the penalty fee at the rate of 10 percent of the full and true value determined without regard to the current use value of the land.

4. Over the last 10 years, the total LUCT collected was \$17,580; Totaled LUCT Collected Last 10 years – Finance Director Town of Raymond. Note: LUCT revenue is not available every year. 2016-\$0, 2015-\$0, 2014-\$0, 2013-\$0, 2012-\$0, 2011- \$5,000, 2010-\$6,000, 2009-\$0, 2008-\$3,380, 2007-\$3,200.

5. RSA 36-A-2 Conservation Commission: —... for the proper utilization and protection of the natural resources and for the protection of watershed resources of said city or town.

6. RSA 36-A:5 Appropriations authorized – I. A town or city, having established a conservation commission as authorized by RSA 36-A:2, may appropriate money as deemed necessary for the purpose of this chapter. The whole or any part of money so appropriated in any year and any gifts of money received pursuant to RSA 36-A:4 may be placed in a conservation fund and allowed to accumulate from year to year. Money may be expended from said fund by the conservation commission for the purposes of this chapter without further approval of the town meeting. Town-owned land managed by Conservation Commission – Conservation Commission minutes.

7. The Conservation Fund has a balance of \$215,931 as of the end of 2016 - Finance Director Town of Raymond.

### Article 35: Citizen Petition: Orchard Street Drainage Problem

This article states: "Shall the Town of Raymond vote to raise the appropriate sum for the purpose of repairing a drainage problem at the top of Orchard Street. This is an ongoing issue and safety concern."

"The owner of tax parcel 028-003-018 would like the town to raise the appropriate amount to fund the drainage problem on a public road. This drainage problem a safety concern and has existed for years. Single family homes are affected from this water run-off problem." The petitioner has asked the town to fix the issue. "The water issue at times is approximately 15 to 20 foot radius, its depth at times is between 3 to 6 inches of water. Throughout the year it is a safety concern for the residence."<sup>1</sup>

This proposed repair is a complex issue that would require proper engineering studies, design, addressing of right of way issues and funding in order to be accomplished.<sup>2</sup> The cost of this article is unknown. Currently this article, as written, would raise no funds for this project.<sup>3</sup>

**A YES vote** approves of this article.

**A No vote** does not approve this article.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote yes

- Agree with proposal and request for repair.

#### Reasons why some voters might vote no

- Cost is undetermined.
- Prefer to pay for this cost through the Town's operating budget.

#### References:

1. Adam Brackett, owner of tax parcel 028-003-018, petitioner.
2. Steve Brewer, Director-Department of Public Works (DPW); Town Deliberative Session: 2/11/2017.
3. Walter Mitchell, Esq., Town Counsel, Town Deliberative Session: 2/11/2017.

The 2017 Guide is brought to the Raymond Community free of charge by the Raymond Voter Information Project, donations from Raymond citizens, and our Business Donors:

**Ace Ben Franklin Hardware**

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

**Affordable Auto Repair and Sales**

322 Route 27, Raymond NH 03077  
603-895-1533 and [facebook.com/Affordableauto2](https://www.facebook.com/Affordableauto2)

**D.F. Richard Energy**

P.O. Box 669, Dover NH 03821-0669  
603-742-2020

**Edward Jones Investments**

Dustin R. Ramey  
Cozy Corner Plaza  
61 Route 27, Suite 17, Raymond, NH 03077  
603-895-4942

**Jambs Jewelry**

Jewelry, Repairs, Watch Service, Design-Your-Own & More  
17 Freetown Road, #8, Raymond, NH 03077  
[www.jambsjewelry.com](http://www.jambsjewelry.com)  
603-244-3680

**Judy Williams Real Estate**

Residential/Commercial: Judy Williams Broker/Owner  
P.O. Box 352, Raymond NH 03077  
603-895-9718  
[JudyWilliamsRE.com](http://JudyWilliamsRE.com) [Judy@JudyWilliamsRE.com](mailto:Judy@JudyWilliamsRE.com)

**Natural or Not Salon & Spa**

37 Harriman Hill Road, Raymond, NH 03077  
[www.naturalornot.com](http://www.naturalornot.com)  
603-895-5161  
and

**Langford's Laundromat formerly Raymond Coin-Op Laundromat**

45 Route 27, behind Hannaford, Raymond, NH  
603-895-3157

**People's United Bank**

55 Main Street, Raymond NH 03077  
603-895-9032

**Raymond Area Chamber of Commerce**

P.O. Box 425, 64 Freetown Road, Raymond, NH 03077  
603-895-2254  
[www.raymondareachamberofcommerce.com](http://www.raymondareachamberofcommerce.com)

**Raymond Area News**

[www.raymondareanews.com](http://www.raymondareanews.com)  
Cheryl Killam, Owner  
603-679-8656

**Riverbend Realty Group**

Residential/Commercial: David P. Turcotte, Broker Owner  
64 Freetown Road, Raymond, NH 03077  
603-303-7044 (cell) 603-895-4500 x 206 (office)  
[Davidturcotte@comcast.net](mailto:Davidturcotte@comcast.net)

**Universal Electric**

P.O. Box 151, 64 Deerfield Road, Raymond, NH 03077  
603-895-6512

**Vernet Properties - 978-744-4272**

Raymond Shopping Center, Raymond, NH 03077  
and

**Tuckaway Tavern & Butchery - 603-244-2431**

58 Route 27, Raymond, NH 03077

Please remember to thank our business donors!

To support continuation of the Guide, citizens may donate by PayPal at [www.raymondvip.org](http://www.raymondvip.org) or by mail to Raymond VIP at Box 813, Raymond, NH 03077.

All donations are tax deductible. Thank you!

*Make your selections and bring your list to the polls*

**Town Warrant**

1	Candidate Choices.....		
2	Zoning: Accessory Dwelling Units.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Zoning: International Residential Code.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Zoning: Special Exception Criteria.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
5	Zoning: Minimum Permit Fee.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
6	Zoning: Impact Fee Assessment Schedule.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
7	Zoning: Accessory Buildings.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Zoning: Delete Definition not in Ordinance.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
9	Zoning: Change Industrial to Commercial.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
10	Zoning: Change Residential to Commercial.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
11	Citizen Petition Zoning: Multi-Family Housing.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
12	Citizen Petition Zoning: Hotel/Motel.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
13	Citizen Petition Zoning: C.3 Density.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
14	Police Station Bond.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
15	Well #4.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
16	Town Operating/Default Budget.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
17	Scholarship Fund.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
18	Social Service Agencies.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
19	Mosquito Spraying.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
20	Capital Improvements.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
21	CRF-Water Revenues.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
22	Road Reconstruction.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
23	Purchase Public Works Vehicles.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
24	Shim and Overlay.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
25	Vacation/Sick Leave - Union Fund.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
26	Vacation/Sick Leave - Non-Union Fund.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
27	Discontinue Air Handling System CRF.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
28	CRF-General Government Building.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
29	Change Purpose of Clean Wells CRF.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
30	Change Purpose of Paint Water Tank Towers CRF.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
31	Change Purpose of Bridge Maintenance CRF.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
32	Change Purpose of Police/Dispatch Equipment and Vehicle CRF.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
33	Motor Vehicle Fee.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
34	Land Use Change Tax.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
35	Citizen Petition re: Orchard Street Drainage.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

**School Warrant**

1	Candidate Choices.....		
2	Elementary School Building Addition.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
3	School Operating Budget.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Support Staff Contract.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
5	Support Staff Special Meeting.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
6	School Capital Improvement Funds.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
7	School Undesignated Fund Balance.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Easement for New Town Well and Infrastructure.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
9	Outsource Food Service Program.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
10	Citizen Petition not to Outsource Food Services.....	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

**SEE YOU AT THE POLLS!**

Iber Holmes Gove Middle School

Epping Road at School Street

Tuesday, March 14, 2017 7 AM to 7 PM

For the latest on any article, Check [www.raymondvip.org](http://www.raymondvip.org)