

WEVD Commission 2024 Warrant Article Hearing and Meeting APPROVED Minutes

February 15, 2024 – 6:00 PM

Approved as amended on February 29, 2024.

Attendees: Commissioners Maureen Patti, Gerry Panuczak, and David Spinney. General Manager Ron Beard and Water Department Administrator Allison Smith.

Attendees via Zoom: Mark Canfield, Keith Barnes, OPD, Linda Ivers, Jaime Oldmixon, Rob Diefenbach, Denise Bujalski, William Mitchell, Jim Cahill.

Call to order: Commission Patti called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Pledge of Allegiance: The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call of Commissioners: Ms. Patti, Mr. Panuczak, and Mr. Spinney were present in person.

Ms. Patti asked Mr. Panuczak to help her conduct the Waterville estates village district warrant article public hearing

PUBLIC HEARING: Waterville Estates Village District 2024 Warrant Articles Public Hearing

Mr. Panuczak opened the public hearing at 6:01 PM.

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #1 into the record as follows:

Article 1 - To Choose One Commissioner, Clerk, and Treasurer To choose one Waterville Estates Village District (WEVD) Commissioner for a three-year term, a WEVD Clerk for the ensuing year, and a WEVD Treasurer for a three-year term.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically. No Commission recommendation necessary.

2. Special Warrant Article 2 - Purchase of Excavator & Accessories read Warrant Article #2 into the record as follows:

"To see if the District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Ninety-Two Thousand, One Hundred Forty-Two Dollars and No Cents (\$92,142.00) for the purpose of purchasing an excavator and accessories, including a trailer, bucket, teeth, and coupler, at a cost of no more than Ninety-Two Thousand, One Hundred Forty-Two Dollars and No Cents (\$92,142.00) and to



authorize the issuance of no more than Ninety-Two Thousand, One Hundred Forty-Two Dollars and No Cents (\$92,142.00) of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33) and to authorize Waterville Estates Village District officials to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and to determine the rate of interest thereon. Furthermore, to raise and appropriate the first year's payment of Twenty-Two Thousand, One Hundred Ten Dollars and No Cents (\$22,110.00). This special article is a special warrant article per RSA 32:3 VI (d) and RSA 32:7 V."

Three-fifths (3/5) ballot vote required. The estimated tax rate for the Waterville Estates Village District, if it were a single taxing district, would total \$0.21 per \$1,000 of valuation if a payment were to be due in 2024. This amount will be apportioned between Campton and Thornton by NH Department of Revenue.

The discussion opened with a recognition of the need for equipment enhancement to improve roadside maintenance and streamline water system repairs. The preference for an excavator over a backhoe, that the District already owns, stemmed from its superior maneuverability and efficiency, facilitating quicker responses to system issues like leaks and repairs.

Emphasized throughout the conversation was the desire for self-reliance, reducing dependence on third-party contractors, and ensuring timely maintenance.

Also discussed was a used option which may have been more cost-effective initially, but the risks associated with its unknown history and potential wear and tear outweigh the benefits. Investing in a new skid steer was justified by the need for reliability and the assurance of a manufacturer's as well as extended warranty totaling four years.

The importance of proper equipment maintenance was underscored with assurances that the new skid steer will be well cared for to maximize its longevity and efficiency. The decision to invest in extended warranties further reflects a commitment to safeguarding taxpayers' money and minimizing future repair costs.

The conversation then delved into the intricacies of financing the excavator acquisition, considering potential payment timelines and the implications for the budget. It was noted that it mattered whether the first payment would fall in the current fiscal year or the next, as the latter would be a more expensive option due to a larger amount of interest to be paid. Clarifications were sought regarding the flexibility provided by the financing language, should the District decide to pay it out next year in full. It was also noted that the payment for the John Deere backhoe already owned by the District would be completed next year, thus freeing up budgetary resources for the excavator if it were approved. Comparisons were made between the costs of the two pieces of equipment, highlighting the potential savings and efficiency gains associated with the excavator's versatility and capabilities.

The conversation also touched on the unpredictability of maintenance needs and the potential cost savings that the excavator could bring by addressing issues promptly. However, the exact financial

WEVD Commissioners 02/15/2024 APPROVED Warrant Article Hearing and Meeting minutes.

impact was uncertain due to the unpredictable nature of maintenance requirements.



Ms. Patti asked whether the Commissioners wanted to consider using unreserved fund balance to purchase this piece of equipment outright rather than incur any interest payments.

Mr. Panuczak suggested opening up the floor to the public before discussing Ms. Patti's option.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, expressed a sentiment similar to Miss Patti's, emphasizing the importance of utilizing available funds for equipment acquisitions rather than burdening taxpayers. He echoed the notion that even if the tax impact seems minimal, it would be preferable to utilize existing funds for such purchases. This approach reflects a desire to prioritize financial responsibility and minimize the reliance on taxpayer contributions for such expenses.
- William Mitchell, via Zoom, had an inquiry pertaining to a \$150,000 allocation for paving in the budget, which was removed last year but reinstated in the current budget. He was curious if this allocation is connected to the excavator acquisition and also seeks information on the tax impact of this allocation.

Mr. Panuczak thanked Mr. Mitchell for his question and noted that this issue would be discussed during Warrant Article 5 review.

- Rob Diefenbach, via Zoom, reiterated a point made earlier about the importance of fiscal planning during budget meetings. The emphasis was on setting aside funds for future capital improvement needs rather than depleting the fund balance. This approach was seen as crucial for maintaining financial stability and preparing for anticipated expenses.

An overview of the current fund balance was provided, indicating that it stood at \$1,309,455. It was noted that some commitments had been made, including \$188,000 to true up the REC fund and \$255,104 for previous warrant articles outstanding, totaling \$886,351 left in the unreserved/unassigned fund balance.

The importance of maintaining a healthy fund balance was emphasized, with reference to the auditors' recommendation of having at least 50% of the budget in unreserved/unassigned funds for financial stability. Based on the organization's budget of \$2,107,183, this translated to roughly \$1,053,600. After subtracting the committed amounts from the total needed for a healthy fund balance, it was calculated that the organization was approximately \$187,000 short. Caution was suggested in committing more fund balance at that time, noting that the interest to finance the excavator would not exceed \$18,400.

The possibility of revisiting the funding approach at the end of 2024 was discussed, with potential to allocate additional funds if the unreserved fund balance increased. The conversation touched on the flexibility of financing terms and the importance of negotiating prepayment penalties.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, said that he understands that cash flow is very important in this discussion. He continued to say that given the recent tax payments and the status of audits, it would be reasonable to view those receipts as assets that contribute to the operational balance. While it is prudent to aim for a fund balance of at least 50%, this calculation typically assumes



no immediate cash flow. Considering the current revenue stream, which includes tax revenues, albeit not all received yet, it is important to factor in these receivables when assessing the financial position and planning for the future.

Then the discussion revolved around whether to recommend Warrant Article 2, with considerations given to the District's financial position, budgetary planning, and potential prepayment penalties for borrowing if it is discovered at the end of 2024 that the District is in a position to pay it out in full. There was a back-and-forth exchange regarding the benefits of borrowing versus utilizing existing funds, with points made about the need for careful financial management and reassurances sought about potential penalties.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #2 for Purchase of Excavator & Accessories as written. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

3. Warrant Article 3 - WEVD Operating Budget.

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #3 into the record as follows:

"To see if the Waterville Estates Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Two Million, One Hundred Seven Thousand, One Hundred Eighty-Three Dollars and No Cents (\$2,107,183.00) for the general municipal operations of the Waterville Estates Village District. This article does not include appropriation(s) contained in special or individual articles addressed separately."

Majority vote required. The estimated tax rate for the Waterville Estates Village District, if it were a single taxing district, would total \$12.88. This amount will be apportioned between Campton and Thornton by NH Department of Revenue.

The discussion delved into the details of the budget, with comparisons made between last year's figures and the current proposed budget. It was noted that while the budget has increased by \$160,000, various factors have contributed to a reduction in the tax rate impact from \$14.77 to \$12.88 per thousand.

One significant factor in this reduction was an increase (to a total of \$600,000 for calendar year 2024) in revenue, including a \$200,000 increase in the Homeowners Association's contribution to the District through the RMA, \$15,000 in bank interest after moving the accounts to the new bank, and \$110,000 of CIF commitments from the Association. These contributions have helped offset the budget increase and lessen the tax impact on residents.

There was recognition and appreciation for the collaborative efforts between WEA (homeowners association) and the governing body, particularly in allocating CIF funds towards various projects as anticipated revenue, which has positively impacted the estimated tax impact of the proposed '24



District budget. Gratitude was expressed towards the WEA Board and its former president Frank Marshall for their role in facilitating this collaboration.

Ms. Patti made a motion to amend Warrant Article #3 for WEVD Operating Budget to insert at the end of the first sentence, after the depiction of the total amount \$12.88 the following words "per \$1000 of valuation." Mr. Panuczak

duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Mr. Panuczak opened the floor to the public.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, raised a question regarding the disparity in tax impacts between Campton and Thornton, despite both communities benefiting from the same level of services and amenities. He expressed a desire for a better explanation of this difference and suggested that further clarification be sought from the Department of Revenue or relevant authorities.

Ms. Patti responded, sharing her insight based on her experience as a commissioner. She mentioned a previous analysis conducted by Ms. Donaldson which was shared through various communication channels with the community. Ms. Patti explained that while concerns have been raised with the NH Department of Revenue at least four times, there is little influence the District has over the matter. She acknowledged the frustration surrounding the issue and shared her own efforts to seek clarification and understanding. Despite historical differences in tax rates between the two towns, Ms. Patti emphasized the Commission's commitment to advocating for the best interests of the entire community, including both Thornton and Campton.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #3 for WEVD Operating Budget as presented and amended. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

4. Warrant Article 4 - Water Department Operating Budget

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #4 into the record as follows:

"To see if the Waterville Estates Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Six Hundred Twenty-Two Thousand, Five Hundred Fifty-Four Dollars and No Cents (\$622,554.00) for the purpose of interdepartmental water department operations, said funds to come from Water Fees, Rates, and other charges to the WEVD Water Fund. This article does not include appropriation(s) contained in special or individual articles addressed separately." Majority vote required. This article will have an estimated tax rate impact of \$0.00 per \$1,000 of valuation as it will be funded by income to the Water Fund.



The commissioners delved into a detailed discussion regarding the water department budget, covering several key points. First, they examined the reduction in the budget compared to the previous year, noting that it had decreased from \$668,000 to \$622,500. Ms. Smith attributed this reduction to the diligent efforts of Steve Baert who is doing a great job in staying within budget lines and also putting off some projects. Mr. Beard highlighted how recent improvements in the District accounting, including better allocation of expenses among various departments, had contributed to the lower budget figure as well.

Furthermore, the Commissioners discussed the potential impact of these improvements and other improvements in how the water system is being operated on the current budget numbers. They acknowledged that while the department had budgeted conservatively in the past, sometimes leading to surpluses, there was a need to initiate budget planning earlier in the year to avoid last-minute adjustments and reliance on fund balances to offset the water rates.

The conversation then turned to the use of fund balance and surplus in the water department. There was a consensus that the surplus should be used strategically for future projects or returned to ratepayers. However, concerns were raised about the unpredictability of expenses, such as leak repairs, which could necessitate keeping a portion of the fund balance for emergencies.

The commissioners also considered the implications of rate setting on ratepayers and emphasized the importance of providing stable and predictable rates. They discussed the challenges of accurately forecasting expenses and balancing the budget to ensure that rates remain reasonable for residents.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, noted that the language of the Warrant Article used "interdepartmental" whereas it should be intradepartmental.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion to amend Warrant Article #4 for Water Department Operating Budget to use the word "intradepartmental" instead "interdepartmental." Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, articulated two central concerns regarding Article 3 and Article 2 which are both operational budgets. Firstly, he underscored that such budgets primarily cater to routine operational expenses without earmarking funds for crucial long-term investments, particularly in infrastructure areas like the water system. This operational focus might not adequately address the pressing need for system upgrades and improvements. Secondly, he advocated for a shift towards a more strategic budgeting approach that prioritizes allocating surplus funds towards long-term investments rather than allowing them to remain unused. By reinvesting surpluses into infrastructure enhancements, the community can ensure the sustainability and resilience of vital systems over time.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.



Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #4 for Water Department Operating Budget as presented and amended. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

5. Warrant Article 5 – Road Infrastructure – Paving.

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #5 into the record as follows:

"To see if the Waterville Estates Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars and No Cents (\$150,000) for the purpose of paving Waterville Estates Village District roads. This appropriation is not included in the main operating budget."

Majority vote required. The estimated tax rate for the Waterville Estates Village District, if it were a single taxing district, would total \$1.40 per \$1,000 of valuation. This amount will be apportioned between Campton and Thornton by NH Department of Revenue.

Mr. Panuczak and Mr. Beard provided context regarding the previous year's budget allocation of \$150,000, explaining that only \$18,000 of it was utilized. The majority of the unspent funds were attributed to the extended duration of the Pegwood project and the subsequent need to repave Pegwood Road. The current \$150,000 allocation is intended for improvements along Bell Valley to Richardson Trail, and the top part of Weetamoo Road. Additionally, they noted that the tax impact of last year's \$150,000 allocation was \$1.43 per thousand, whereas the current allocation is projected to have a tax impact of \$1.40 per thousand.

Ms. Patti made a motion to amend Warrant Article #5 for Road Infrastructure – Paving by adding ".00" to the amount in the parenthetical portion. Mr. Panuczak duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Discussion ensued about the importance of consistently earmarking funds for road upgrades through yearly appropriations was underscored, emphasizing the efficacy of this method in stabilizing the tax rate while attending to infrastructure requirements. It was advocated for a systematic process of raising and allocating funds for roads, affording voters a voice and ensuring that the allocated resources are specifically earmarked for road enhancements. Additionally, it was noted that unutilized funds from an approved budget could be carried over into the next year, provided that there is a project already lined up and a contract has been signed.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.



Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #5 for Road Infrastructure – Paving as presented and amended. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

6. Article 6 - ADA Project Funding

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #6 into the record as follows:

"To see if the Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Thirty Thousand Dollars and No Cents (\$30,000) for the purpose of improvements to the Community Center and Campton Mountain public facilities to make them more accessible as outlined in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This article is non-lapsing until December 31, 2028. This article is a special warrant article per RSA 32:3 VI (d) and RSA 32:7 VI."

Majority vote required. The estimated tax rate for the Waterville Estates Village District, if it were a single taxing district, would total \$0.28 per \$1,000 of valuation. This amount will be apportioned between Campton and Thornton by NH Department of Revenue.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion to amend Warrant Article #6 for ADA Project Funding by adding ".00" to the amount in the parenthetical portion. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

The discussion revolved around various accessibility upgrades, some of which area the installation of automatic door openers, ADA-compliant basins and fixtures in bathrooms, delineating the handicapped seating area at the mountain, call buttons with cameras at the pool / hot tub ADA lifts, lifts for the hot tubs, remote buzz in feature for the gate on the deck and back hall door and the door to the back lawn, etc. It was mentioned that only the elevator or alternative accessibility solutions for individuals with mobility issues, such as chair lifts, were not part of the current package. It was noted that there was already funds set aside, and these would be in addition, allowing the District to finish all the above noted projects. These upgrades aim to enhance accessibility throughout the facility, ensuring compliance with ADA regulations and improving security measures. The allocation of funds for these projects was highlighted as a prudent investment in maintaining compliance and addressing long-standing accessibility issues.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, suggested exploring CIF funds or other alternative sources to fund ADA compliance upgrades instead of solely relying on taxpayer funds. He questioned why other funding options have not been considered and emphasized the importance of addressing ADA compliance without solely burdening taxpayers.

Commissioners acknowledged that they had not considered requesting CIF funds for ADA compliance upgrades previously, primarily because they were still in the process of understanding the full scope of



needed improvements. They expressed regret for the oversight and agreed that exploring alternative funding options, such as CIF funds, was a valid suggestion. They also emphasized the importance of addressing ADA compliance issues promptly and expressed commitment to rectifying the oversight moving forward.

- Mark Canfield, via Zoom, suggested that the request for CIF funds could be presented to WEA at any of their regular meetings, emphasizing that it meets multiple times a year. He stressed the importance of utilizing all available means to secure funding for necessary upgrades to the District's physical facilities, considering the intended use of CIF funds.

It was suggested that Mr. Spinney, who is the liaison to the WEA board, could bring it up at their next meeting. It was also noted that the Warrant Article could be pulled at the Annual Meeting should WEA decide to contribute funds to the ADA projects. The process that involves spending CIF money on a project was explained, where the District would expend its own money first and complete the project, only then accepting the corresponding CIF money from WEA. This ensures transparency and compliance with auditing standards. A public hearing needs to be held to finalize the acceptance of revenue.

Ms. Patti noted that in some Articles' wording they have the word "impact" after the words "estimated tax rate" and in some they do not.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.

Ms. Patti made a motion to amend Warrant Article #6 for ADA Project Funding paragraph 3 by inserting the word "impact" after the words "estimated tax rate". Mr. Panuczak duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #6 for ADA Project Funding – Paving as presented and amended twice. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion to amend Warrant Article #2 for Purchase of Excavator & Accessories paragraph 3 by inserting the word "impact" after the words "estimated tax rate". Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Ms. Patti made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #2 for Purchase of Excavator & Accessories as newly amended. Mr. Panuczak duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.



Mr. Panuczak made a motion to amend Warrant Article#3 for WEVD Operating Budget paragraph 3 by inserting the word "impact" after the words "estimated tax rate". Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Ms. Patti made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #3 for Purchase of Excavator & Accessories as newly amended. Mr. Panuczak duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion to amend Warrant Article#5 for Road Infrastructure – Paving paragraph 3 by inserting the word "impact" after the words "estimated tax rate". Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article #5 for Road Infrastructure – Paving as newly amended. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

7. Warrant Article 7 – Well Cleaning

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #7 into the record as follows:

"To see if the Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Eighteen Thousand and No Cents (\$18,000.00) for the purpose of cleaning well number two (2) with said amount to come from the unassigned fund balance."

Majority vote required. The estimated tax rate impact of \$0.00 per \$1,000 of valuation as it will be funded by unassigned fund balance in the Water Fund.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion to amend Warrant Article#7 for Well Cleaning inserting the word "dollars" after the words "Eighteen Thousand". Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

The discussion revolved around the need to clean well #2, which had been underperforming compared to well #1. The cost for well #1 was well over \$40 or \$50 thousand dollars due to a lot of other related work needed to access the well, which should not be a factor for the well #2. The importance of this project was highlighted, especially considering the previous significant expenses incurred for well #1. Despite the significant cost, it was deemed necessary to maintain water quality and ensure an adequate supply.

Then the discussion centered on the change in terminology from "surplus" to "unassigned fund" in the Warrant Article. This adjustment was suggested by a representative from NH DRA. It was clarified that the decision was essential to ensure clarity regarding the source of funds. The surplus in the water



department fund, which is an enterprise fund, rolls over from year to year and does not reverts to the District Operating Fund unreserved/unassigned funds, if there is money left at the end of the year.

Mr. Beard spoke about the cleaning process which involves pulling out the pump, inspecting the well with a camera, pumping it down, applying chemicals, surging to loosen debris, and then repeating treatment. This downtime was estimated to be about 48 hours to allow for recovery. However, it was anticipated that significant capacity could be restored once infiltration improved. Regarding previous maintenance, there were no records indicating that the screens in well #2 had been cleaned. Both wells were estimated to have been installed in the mid to late 1980s, and while both well pumps were replaced last year, the cleaning of well #2's screens was postponed due to technical difficulties.

It was emphasized that the decision to present this as a Warrant Article rather than a direct action by the Commissioners was made to solicit input and involvement from the community in the decision-making process. It was important to demonstrate transparency and ensure that the community had a say in important matters concerning the water system's maintenance and improvement. Therefore, presenting it as a warrant article allows for community engagement and reinforces the commitment to moving forward with necessary actions to improve the system.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.

Mr. Panuczak made a motion that WEVD Commission recommends Warrant Article#7 for Well Cleaning as amended. Ms. Patti duly seconded. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

8. Warrant Article 8 - Conflict-of-Interest Ordinance

Mr. Panuczak read Warrant Article #8 into the record as follows:

"To see if the District will vote, pursuant to RSA 31:39-a, to adopt the Conflict-of-Interest Ordinance approved by the District Commissioners on February 13, 2024, copies of which are available at the Community Center, Ski Area, and on the District's website."

It was noted that the decision to adopt the Conflict of Interest Ordinance has been recommended by the auditors, and it aligns with New Hampshire law. The ordinance, which restates provisions of RSA 31:39-a, is available on the District website, posted at the community center, and will be provided at the Annual Meeting. The commissioners want to ensure transparency by making the full policy accessible to everyone.

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.



Mr. Panuczak closed the Warrant Article hearing at 7:39 PM.

Adoption of Agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Treasurer's Report

The Treasurer's Report was available in the packet and was reviewed.

Manifests

Ms. Patti made a motion to approve the manifests contained in the meeting handout. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Ms. Patti made a motion to approve the Treasurer's Report contained in the meeting handout. Motion carried with a 3:0 roll call vote: Ms. Patti – aye, Mr. Panuczak – aye, Mr. Spinney – aye.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 @ 4:00 PM

Public Comment

After checking with Ms. Smith, it was determined that there was no one willing to address the Commission at the physical location, on the phone, or electronically.

Adjournment: *Ms. Patti made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Spinney duly seconded. Motion passed with a unanimous roll call vote.*

Meeting adjourned at 07:43 PM.

Prepared by Alvina Snegach