This handout has been prepared to assist you in making informed
voting decisions prior to walking into the voting booth on March 11th.
It contains a Warrant Summary Sheet that you can bring with you on Election Day.

GUIDE TO THE SECOND SESSION OF THE TOWN MEETING
IN ACCORDANCE WITH SENATE BILL 2
RINDGE MEMORIAL SCHOOL
MARCH 11, 2014

Polls open at 7:00 a.m. and close at 7:00 p.m.
You may register to vote at the polls with proper ID,
such as a driver’s license or an invoice indicating residence.

If you have questions or need additional information,
please call the Selectmen’s Office at 899-5181 x 100.
1. To choose all necessary Town Officers for the year ensuing.

**SELECTMEN – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Samuel R. Seppala
- Robert A. Hamilton
- Write-in ____________________________

**TOWN MODERATOR- 2YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- David M. Tower
- Write-in ____________________________

**TREASURER- 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Helene Rogers
- Write-in ____________________________

**TAX COLLECTOR- 3YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Carol E. Donovan
- Carol M. Cersosimo
- Write-in ____________________________

**TOWN CLERK- 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Nancy A. S. Martin
- Write-in ____________________________

**PLANNING BOARD – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than two*
- Holly B. Koski
- Samuel Bouchie
- Tim Halliday
- Jonah Ketola
- Write-in ____________________________

**BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than two*
- Sharon Rasku
- Andrew Alajajian
- Write-in ____________________________

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- William W. Thomas
- Martin Kulla
- Write-in ____________________________

**LIBRARY TRUSTEES – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Robert Carney
- Write-in ____________________________

**TRUSTEES OF TRUST FUNDS – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Jeannette G. Gutteridge
- Write-in ____________________________

**SUPERVISOR OF THE CHECKLIST- 6 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Roberta T. Letourneau
- Write-in ____________________________

**CEMETERY TRUSTEES – 3 YRS**
*Vote for no more than one*
- Write-in ____________________________

2. Are you in favor of the adoption of amendment No. 1 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: to create an optional overlay zoning district, known as the Crossroads Overlay, at the northwest, southwest, and southeast corners of the intersection of US-Route 202 and NH Route 119. The Crossroads Overlay district is intended to allow mixed use, higher-density development in a limited area with the goal of serving as the primary center for local commerce and community activity around the Route 202 and 119 intersection. The Crossroads Overlay district is proposed to allow a specific set of uses, with specific frontage, yard, and area requirements for those uses. Participation in the Crossroads Overlay district is intended as an option for respective landowners. Lots that are covered by the proposed “Crossroads Overlay” include, at respective corners of Routes 202 & 119: NW corner (Map 6, Lot 19 [20-acres]); SW
Corner: Map 6, Lot 18-1 [6.2 acres]; Map 6, Lot 18-2 [9.3 acres]; SE Corner: Map 6, Lot 17-1 [2.5 acres]; Map 6, Lot 17-2 [2.7 acres]; and a portion of Map 6, Lot 14 (from the NH 119 right of way south to the center of Cheshire Market Place driveway [estimated at 20 acres]) .
(Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would establish a new overlay district that would allow smaller lot sizes in an area of the Gateway Central Zoning District. This would potentially create more compact development in the area of the so-called “four corners” at the intersection of Route 119 and Route 202. This would be an optional district and the present, underlying zoning district would still be in effect.

3. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No.2 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Within the Village zoning district, Article VI, to amend Section C.1. Frontage, to read: Every lot shall have a minimum frontage of one hundred (100) feet as defined in Article XX, Number 17 and further amend Section C.3. Area, to read, in its entirety: Lot area for all permitted uses shall be at least one acre in size provided the state of New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services well and septic system requirements are complied with. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 5 in favor, 1 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would mean that more lots in the Village Districts would be considered “conforming” and some other lots could possibly be subdivided.

4. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 3 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Within the College zoning district, Article VII, to amend Section B.3. Area, to read, in its entirety: Lot area for all permitted uses shall be at least one (1) acre in size provided the state of New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services well and septic system requirements are complied with. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 5 in favor, 1 opposed.)

A “yes” vote means that the required lot area for all permitted uses in the College District would be reduced. The frontage requirement of 250 feet will not change.

5. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 4 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Within the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance, to permit detached ADUs provided they meet specified requirements. Requirements include, but are not limited to: 1) Detached ADUs shall be subordinate in mass, scale and height to the primary residence; 2) Detached ADUs shall have compatible architectural character and style to the primary residence; 3) Detached ADUs shall in no case exceed 1,200 square feet in gross floor area; and 4) Detached ADUs located above otherwise detached structures (i.e. garages) are preferred relative to detached dwelling structures. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would allow accessory dwelling units (‘apartments’) to be detached from the primary residence. Under current zoning, only attached ‘apartments’ are allowed.
6. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 5 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Amend the Aquifer Protection District Ordinance to 1) designate a new Water Resources/Aquifer Base Map; 2) clarify internal appeal provisions where the location of an aquifer is uncertain; 3) update conditional uses; 4) clarify prohibited uses; 5) clarify legal appeal provisions; and 6) add select definitions. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would allow the very old Aquifer Map to be updated, protect potential aquifers and reduce the area of lots affected within the Aquifer District.

7. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 6 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Amend the Wetlands Conservation District Ordinance by 1) listing enabling authority for the Ordinance; 2) combining authority and purpose provisions 3) modifying Section 4.G. of the Ordinance by changing a portion of the first sentence to read: “if essential to a permitted use of the land. . .” instead of (existing) “if essential to the productive use of land” and 4) update/clarifying select definitions. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would add authority language, clarify uses and add definitions.

8. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 7 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Amending Article III, General Provisions, by adding a new letter “S” to read as follows: “The rental of all or any portion of Single Family Dwelling, Two Family Dwelling, or Multi-Unit Dwelling, with the exception of Bed and Breakfast Facilities, by the property owner thereof, to any other person or group, shall be a valid, permitted, Accessory Use of said dwelling under this ordinance. Acceptable rentals shall include rentals for wedding parties and receptions, bachelor parties, corporate or institutional meetings, seminars, workshops, religious retreats, and events or activities for which attendance is not expected to exceed 25 people.” (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would make certain changes to the Zoning Ordinance that were suggested by the Court in its decision in the “Hunt Castle” lawsuit.

9. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 8 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Amending Article XX, Definitions, by 1) modifying the definition of Bed and Breakfast Facility to read as follows: “An owner-occupied residence or a portion thereof in which rooms are available for rent, including a daily breakfast meal, to transient guests on a temporary basis for compensation. It does not include hotels, motels, boarding houses, food service establishments, or similar businesses”; and 2) removing the definition for Tourist Homes. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would make certain changes to the Zoning Ordinance that were suggested by the Court in its decision in the “Hunt Castle” lawsuit.

10. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 9 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Zoning
Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Amending the Impact Fee Ordinance, Assessment Schedule, to set all Residential Impact Fees to zero ($0.00) for any building permits issued after January 1, 2014. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would reduce the Residential Impact Fee to $0. The Commercial Impact Fee will remain the same.

11. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 10 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Map as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: Amending the Zoning Map such that all of Map 2, Lot 41-5A lies within the Business-Light Industry Zoning District. Currently, the latter parcel is bisected by the Business-Light Industry and Residential-Agricultural Zoning Districts; the goal is to include the parcel exclusively into the Business-Light Industry District. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 4 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.)

A “yes” vote would place all of Lot 41-5A in the Business-Light Industry Zoning District.

12. Are you in favor of the adoption of Amendment No. 11 to the Town of Rindge Zoning Ordinance as proposed by the Planning Board and generally described as follows: by amending the Zoning Ordinance in order to renumber and reorder sections, correct cross references and make typographical corrections and clerical revisions as necessary. (Recommended by the Planning Board, 6 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would allow “housekeeping” corrections to be made to the Zoning Ordinance.

13. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling Three Million, Seven Hundred and Six Thousand, Five Hundred ($3,706,500) Dollars? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be Three Million, Seven Hundred and Fifty Two Thousand, Nine Hundred and Ninety One ($3,752,991) Dollars which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town or by law, or the governing body may hold one special meeting in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only. Note: This warrant article (operating budget) does not include appropriations in ANY warrant article. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would approve the operating budget of $3,706,500. The operating budget is $500 less than last year’s budget.

14. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Seventy Four Thousand and Eleven ($74,011) Dollars for the third of five lease payments on the fire truck lease approved by the voters at the 2012 Annual Town Meeting? This lease agreement contains an escape clause. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 6 in favor, 1 opposed.)
A “yes” vote would authorize the expenditure of $74,011 for the third of five lease payments on the fire truck that was put into service in 2012. The Town will own the fire truck at the end of the lease term. Last year the Town raised and expended $76,000 for this purpose. Since the amount this year is $1,989 less, there is no increased tax impact. The proposed appropriation of $74,011 represents approximately $26 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

15. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Eighteen Thousand ($18,000) Dollars to be added to the Wellington Road Bridge Replacement Capital Reserve Account? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would deposit $18,000 into the account established in 2012 for replacement of the Wellington Road Bridge. This bridge is on the State’s list of bridges which must be replaced, the cost of which is estimated to be $730,000. The Town has applied for State Bridge Aid which would cover 80% of the cost, if approved. The Town must save $146,000 (its 20% portion of the cost) between now and 2020. The Town appropriated $18,000 into the account in 2012 and $18,000 in 2013. This year’s appropriation would bring the total amount in the account to $54,000. Since the amount of the proposed appropriation this year is the same as last year, there is no increased tax impact. The proposed appropriation of $18,000 represents approximately $6 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

16. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty Eight Thousand ($28,000) Dollars and to discontinue a 480 foot portion of Converseville Road which includes the bridge that spans Millers River? This appropriation will fund construction of a new 80 foot portion of Converseville Road that will provide alternative access to and egress from NH Route 119 and includes road materials and rental equipment, including but not limited, to loam, gravel, bituminous pavement, drainage, barriers and signage in order to construct the new portion of the road and to limit access to the bridge to pedestrian traffic only. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

The Converseville Road bridge is on the State’s list of bridges which must be replaced. The cost of such replacement is estimated to be $700,000. By discontinuing a small portion of Converseville Road, including closing the bridge to vehicular traffic, the Town would avoid the substantial expense of replacing the bridge in the future. The bridge would continue to be open to pedestrian traffic. This is a new appropriation and represents an increased tax impact of approximately $10 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

17. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Hundred and Sixty One Thousand ($161,000) Dollars for the purpose of replacing the 18 year old 1996 Highway Department 6 wheel dump truck and equipping the truck with items such as radio, emergency lights and plow attachments? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Not recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 2 in favor, 5 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would authorize the purchase of a 6 wheel dump truck to replace the 18 year old truck which has serious mechanical and rust problems that take it out of service and it is increasingly expensive to repair. The trade-in value of this truck was recently estimated to be $4,500. The repair and maintenance costs for this vehicle this year will exceed its value. Last year the Town raised and appropriated $55,000 for a Public Works Department vehicle. Since the proposed appropriation this year represents an increase of $106,000, there is an increased tax
impact. The proposed appropriation of $161,000 represents approximately $58 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

18. Shall the Town raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty Five Thousand ($25,000) Dollars to be added to the Meetinghouse Maintenance Expendable Trust Fund? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would add $25,000 to the account for the Meeting House for the repair and maintenance of this historic building. This is a new appropriation and represents an increased tax impact of approximately $9 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

19. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Sixty Four Thousand ($64,000) Dollars for the purpose of funding a portion of the measuring and listing of property for the 2015 Revaluation and to authorize the withdrawal of Thirty Seven Thousand ($37,000) Dollars from the Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund previously established for this purpose with the remaining balance of Twenty Seven Thousand ($27,000) Dollars to come from taxation? This will be a non-lapsing appropriation per RSA 32:7 VI and will not lapse until the work is completed or by December 31, 2015, whichever is sooner. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would authorize the expenditure of $64,000 to continue and complete the measuring and listing of property for the 2015 Revaluation. Of this total amount, $37,000 will be withdrawn from the Capital Reserve Account and $27,000 will be raised from taxation. Last year the Town raised and appropriated $39,200 for this purpose. Since the amount to be raised by taxation this year is $12,200 less, there is no increased tax impact. The proposed appropriation of $27,000 represents approximately $10 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

20. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty Five Thousand ($25,000) Dollars for the purpose of replacing the 13 year old Recreation Department van with a used 15 passenger minibus or similar vehicle and lettering and equipping this vehicle with a radio? (recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 6 in favor, 1 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would authorize the replacement of the 13 year old Recreation Department van with a newer minibus in order to expand and improve programs for Rindge residents, especially teens and seniors. The current van is difficult for small children and seniors to enter and exit. The Recreation Department has been advised that the current van may not pass State inspection this year. A newer replacement vehicle will substantially reduce maintenance costs. This is a new appropriation and represents an increased tax impact of approximately $9 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

21. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Eighteen Thousand ($18,000) Dollars to fund municipal energy projects as approved by the Board of Selectmen? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)
A “yes” vote would authorize the expenditure of $18,000 for the Town’s Energy Commission to reduce fuel and electricity consumption at the Fire Station, the Town Offices and the Town Common. Last year the Town raised $17,300 for this purpose. Since the amount this year is $700 more, there is an increased tax impact. The proposed appropriation of $18,000 represents approximately $6 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

22. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum Five Thousand ($5,000) Dollars to be spent for body repair, rust removal, painting and re-lettering of Hose Truck # 1 and to authorize the withdrawal of said amount from the Fire Department Equipment Capital Reserve Fund previously established for this purpose? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would authorize the repair of Hose Truck #1, including body work (rust repair), painting and re-lettering. By doing these repairs, the Fire Department estimates that the truck’s life span will be extended by 10 years. Since this amount will be withdrawn from the Fire Department Equipment Capital Reserve Account, there is no increased tax impact.

23. Shall the Town vote to add to the purposes of the Police Detail Revolving Fund, which was established by Town Meeting in 2006, the purposes of repair and replacement of police vehicles? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor 0 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would expand the purpose of the Police Revolving Fund to allow the Town to repair and replace police vehicles thereby offsetting the cost to the taxpayers.

24. Shall the Town vote to establish a revolving fund, pursuant to RSA 31:95-h, for the purpose of public safety details? All revenues received for fire special details, fire alarm ordinance fees, and judgments of the court for safety response services provided under RSA 153-A:24 will be deposited into the fund and the money in the fund shall be allowed to accumulate from year to year, and shall not be considered part of the Town’s general fund balance. The Town Treasurer shall have custody of all moneys in the fund, and shall pay out the same only upon order of the governing body and no further approval is required by the legislative body to expend. Such funds may be expended only for the purpose for which the fund was created, namely to pay fire personnel wages and benefits associated with details, costs of fire prevention materials and maintenance and replacement of fire equipment, vehicles and apparatus. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 4 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.)

A “yes” vote would establish a revolving fund for the Fire Department allowing fees collected in connection with Fire Details, fire alarm ordinance fees and restitution ordered by the court to be used to fund fire personnel wages and benefits associated with details, and maintenance, repair and replacement of fire equipment, vehicles and apparatus, thereby offsetting the cost to the taxpayers.

25. Shall the Town vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Twenty-Five Thousand ($25,000) Dollars to be added to the Library’s Facilities Capital Reserve Fund? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 3 in favor, 0 opposed. Recommended by the Budget Advisory Committee, 7 in favor, 0 opposed.)
A “yes” vote would add $25,000 to the Library Facilities Capital Reserve Fund for the purpose of future library expansion, including adding a meeting room to the lower level, increasing floor area on the main level and extending the elevator and stairway to the third floor. This is a new appropriation and represents an increased tax impact of approximately $9 on the tax bill for a $200,000 house.

26. To see if the Town of Rindge voters will approve the following: No Town official elected or appointed shall have the authority to apply for any federal grant, that may result in a zoning change; unless approved at the annual town election, in March. (By Petition.) (Not recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 0 in favor, 3 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would prevent the Town from applying for federal funds for planning activities if such planning activities might result in a zoning change. It should be noted that all zoning changes are reviewed by the Planning Board, subject to public hearings and must be voted on by the townspeople.

27. Shall the Town of Rindge vote to require approval of the legislative body in order to accept all grants associated with the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. (By Petition.) (Not recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 0 in favor, 3 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would prevent the Town from accepting HUD grants. Without HUD funds, the Payson Village Senior Housing Development would not have been built and New Hampshire FastRoads would not be providing high speed internet services in Rindge.

28. Shall the Town of Rindge vote to terminate and cease all memberships, affiliations and dealings with the Southwest Regional Planning Commission, and, in addition, to prohibit the Town from requesting or accepting paid or unpaid advice from the Southwest Regional Planning Commission, or any other regional planning commission, or any project or initiative sponsored by any regional planning commission. (By Petition.) (Not recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 0 in favor, 3 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would prevent the Town from communicating in any way with the Southwest Regional Planning Commission (“SWRPC”) or any of the eight other Regional Planning Commissions in New Hampshire on any matter including developments of regional impact which could adversely affect the Town. This year the Board of Selectmen decided not to renew the Town’s membership in the SWRPC. This decision was based on budgetary considerations. However, as a non-member community, the Town will still benefit from the valuable work that SWRPC does on transportation, economic, industrial and commercial development in the region.

29. Shall the Town of Rindge vote to request that the Planning Board delete and remove the entire contents of the “Plan NH” Charrette from the Rindge Master Plan. (By Petition.) (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen, 2 in favor, 1 opposed.)

A majority of the Board of Selectmen felt that the Master Plan was not the appropriate location for the Plan NH Charrette.

30. Are you in favor of Amending the Town of Rindge Wetlands Conservation District Ordinance Section 5.F to read as follows: “No underground or above ground storage of Hazardous Materials shall take place in or within 125 feet of the Ordinary High Water Mark of Surface Waters or within
125 feet of Vegetated Wetlands.” (By Petition.) (Recommended by the Planning Board, 4 in favor, 3 opposed.)

A “yes” vote would reduce the required wetland setback from 250 feet to 125 feet for storage of hazardous materials. Currently, the Department of Environmental Services has a 75 foot setback requirement, but does not address the setback to vegetative wetlands.

31. Are you in favor of Amending the Town of Rindge Conservation District Ordinance Section 5.D to read as follows: “No net increase in peak flow of storm water runoff into Surface Waters or Vegetated Wetlands as a result of any development shall be allowed. Calculations to be based on a 25 year storm event.” (By Petition.) (Recommended by the Planning Board, 5 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.)

A “yes” vote would remove a conflict between the Wetlands Conservation District Ordinance and the Town’s Site Plan Review Regulations.

32. To see if the Town will urge: That the New Hampshire State Legislature join nearly 500 municipalities and 16 other states, including all other New England states, in calling upon Congress to move forward a constitutional amendment that guarantees the right of our elected representatives and of the American people to safeguard fair elections through authority to regulate political spending, and clarifies that constitutional rights were established for people, not corporations.

That the New Hampshire Congressional Delegation support such a constitutional amendment.
That the New Hampshire State Legislature support such an amendment once it is approved by Congress and sent to the State for ratification.
That the record of the vote approving this article shall be transmitted by written notice to New Hampshire’s Congressional Delegation, and to New Hampshire’s state legislators, and to the President of the United States informing them of the instructions from their constituents by the selectmen within 30 days of the vote. (By Petition.)
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Vote for no more than one
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TOWN MODERATOR- 2YRS
Vote for no more than one
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crossroads Overlay District</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>18 Meetinghouse Maintenance</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Village District Frontage and Lot Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19 Revaluation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>College District Lot Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 Recreation Department Minibus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21 Energy Efficiency Projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aquifer Protection District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22 Fire Hose #1 Repair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wetlands Conservation District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23 Police Detail Revolving Fund</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rental of Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24 Fire Detail Revolving Fund</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bed and Breakfast Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25 Library Facilities Fund</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Impact Fee Assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26 Federal Grants (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Zoning Map Amendment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27 HUD Grants (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Minor Corrections of Zoning Ordinances</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>28 Regional Planning (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29 Plan NH Charrette (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fire Truck Lease Payment 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30 Storage of Hazardous Materials (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wellington Bridge Fund</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31 Storm Water Runoff Volume (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Converseville Bridge Fund</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32 Safeguard Fair Elections (by Petition)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Highway Department 6 Wheel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>