

Committee Report

REGULAR CALENDAR

March 8, 2021

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The Majority of the Committee on Municipal and County Government to which was referred HB 67-LOCAL,

AN ACT relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.

Having considered the same, report the same with the following amendment, and the recommendation that the bill OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT.

Rep. Richard Tripp

FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMITTEE

MAJORITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee:	Municipal and County Government
Bill Number:	HB 67-LOCAL
Title:	relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.
Date:	March 8, 2021
Consent Calendar:	REGULAR
Recommendation:	OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT 2021-0553h

STATEMENT OF INTENT

This bill addresses a recurring issue with petition warrant articles being amended at SB2 deliberative sessions. Oftentimes citizens will submit a petition article which addresses a particular issue only to have it amended at the deliberative session to either negate or otherwise make the intent of the warrant article ineffective. This bill amends RSA 40:13 to prohibit amendment of the warrant article such that its specific intent is altered. This bill ensures citizens are provided the opportunity to vote on the warrant article's intended purpose.

Vote 10-7.

Rep. Richard Tripp
FOR THE MAJORITY

Original: House Clerk
Cc: Committee Bill File

REGULAR CALENDAR

Municipal and County Government

HB 67-LOCAL, relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings. **MAJORITY: OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT. MINORITY: INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.**

Rep. Richard Tripp for the **Majority** of Municipal and County Government. This bill addresses a recurring issue with petition warrant articles being amended at SB2 deliberative sessions. Oftentimes citizens will submit a petition article which addresses a particular issue only to have it amended at the deliberative session to either negate or otherwise make the intent of the warrant article ineffective. This bill amends RSA 40:13 to prohibit amendment of the warrant article such that its specific intent is altered. This bill ensures citizens are provided the opportunity to vote on the warrant article's intended purpose. **Vote 10-7.**

Original: House Clerk
Cc: Committee Bill File

REGULAR CALENDAR

March 8, 2021

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The Minority of the Committee on Municipal and County Government to which was referred HB 67-LOCAL,

AN ACT relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.

Having considered the same, and being unable to agree with the Majority, report with the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that it is INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.

Rep. Jim Maggiore

FOR THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE

MINORITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee:	Municipal and County Government
Bill Number:	HB 67-LOCAL
Title:	relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.
Date:	March 8, 2021
Consent Calendar:	REGULAR
Recommendation:	INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

STATEMENT OF INTENT

This bill as amended seeks to amend NH RSA 40:13 IV to prohibit residents from amending the intent of petitioned warrant articles. The authority of town meeting voters to amend warrant articles has been recognized at least as far back as 1875 when the New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Pittsburg v. Danforth*, 56 N.H. 272, “No doubt the subject-matter being plainly referred to, may properly include authority to act upon minute specifications and particulars included and necessarily involved in that ‘subject-matter,’ and which need not be in particular terms enumerated.” In other words, once the subject matter of the article is stated, the town meeting has authority to add to the article or delete from it “minute” details and “particular terms.” Depending upon the population of a community, as few as 10 residents can submit a petitioned warrant article. If HB 67 passes as amended, as few as 10 residents can submit a petitioned warrant article affecting the prudent management of a community without the recourse that has been available for nearly 150 years. The minority of the committee believe that residents will be disenfranchised if their rights to openly discuss and potentially amend petitioned warrant articles at town meeting is prohibited by law. It would be also be unjust to permit the legislature to enjoy the full prerogative to amend the intent of drafted legislation while the people who elected us are denied the same right in their own elections. Therefore, the minority are opposed to the Ought to Pass motion.

Rep. Jim Maggiore
FOR THE MINORITY

Original: House Clerk
Cc: Committee Bill File

REGULAR CALENDAR

Municipal and County Government

HB 67-LOCAL, relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings. **INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.**

Rep. Jim Maggiore for the **Minority** of Municipal and County Government. This bill as amended seeks to amend NH RSA 40:13 IV to prohibit residents from amending the intent of petitioned warrant articles. The authority of town meeting voters to amend warrant articles has been recognized at least as far back as 1875 when the New Hampshire Supreme Court ruled in the case of *Pittsburg v. Danforth*, 56 N.H. 272, “No doubt the subject-matter being plainly referred to, may properly include authority to act upon minute specifications and particulars included and necessarily involved in that ‘subject-matter,’ and which need not be in particular terms enumerated.” In other words, once the subject matter of the article is stated, the town meeting has authority to add to the article or delete from it “minute” details and “particular terms.” Depending upon the population of a community, as few as 10 residents can submit a petitioned warrant article. If HB 67 passes as amended, as few as 10 residents can submit a petitioned warrant article affecting the prudent management of a community without the recourse that has been available for nearly 150 years. The minority of the committee believe that residents will be disenfranchised if their rights to openly discuss and potentially amend petitioned warrant articles at town meeting is prohibited by law. It would be also be unjust to permit the legislature to enjoy the full prerogative to amend the intent of drafted legislation while the people who elected us are denied the same right in their own elections. Therefore, the minority are opposed to the Ought to Pass motion.

Original: House Clerk

Cc: Committee Bill File

Rep. Tripp, Rock. 6
March 1, 2021
2021-0553h
11/04

Amendment to HB 67-LOCAL

1 Amend the bill by replacing section 1 with the following:

2

3 1 New Subparagraph; Government of Town Meeting; Official Ballot Referenda; Warrant
4 Articles. Amend RSA 40:13, IV by inserting after subparagraph (c) the following new subparagraph:

5 (d) No petitioned warrant article shall be amended to change its specific intent.

Amendment to HB 67-LOCAL
- Page 2 -

2021-0553h

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill prohibits the amendment of a petitioned warrant article when such amendment would change the specific intent of a petitioned warrant article.

Voting Sheets

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

EXECUTIVE SESSION on HB 67-LOCAL

BILL TITLE: relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.

DATE: March 3, 2021

LOB ROOM: Hybrid

MOTIONS: OUGHT TO PASS WITH AMENDMENT

Moved by Rep. Piemonte Seconded by Rep. Pauer AM Vote: 10-7

Amendment # 2021-0553h

Moved by Rep. Piemonte Seconded by Rep. Pauer Vote: 10-7

CONSENT CALENDAR: NO

Statement of Intent: Refer to Committee Report

Respectfully submitted,

Rep John MacDonald, Clerk



2021 SESSION

Municipal and County Government

Bill #: HB 67-LOCAL Motion: ~~PP~~ Amended AM #: 20210553H Exec Session Date: 3/3/21

<u>Members</u>	<u>YEAS</u>	<u>Nays</u>	<u>NV</u>
Dolan, Tom Chairman	10		
Piemonte, Tony Vice Chairman	1		
MacDonald, John T. Clerk	2		
Tripp, Richard P.	3		
Guthrie, Joseph A.	4		
Lascelles, Richard W.	5		
McBride, Everett P.	6		
Melvin, Charles R.	7		
Ayer, Paul F.	8		
Pauer, Diane	9		
Porter, Marjorie A.		1	
Treleaven, Susan GS			
Gilman, Julie D.		2	
Maggiore, Jim V.		3	
Stavis, Laurel		4	
Mangipudi, Latha D.		5	
Vann, Ivy C.			
Klee, Patricia S.		6	
Gallager, Eric B.		7	
TOTAL VOTE:	10	7	



2021 SESSION

2021-0553H

Municipal and County Government

Bill #: HB67-LOCAL Motion: OTP-A

AM # 20210553H Exec Session Date: 3/3/21
 20210553H

<u>Members</u>	<u>YEAS</u>	<u>Nays</u>	<u>NV</u>
Dolan, Tom Chairman	10		
Piemonte, Tony Vice Chairman	1		
MacDonald, John T. Clerk	2		
Tripp, Richard P.	3		
Guthrie, Joseph A.	4		
Lascelles, Richard W.	5		
McBride, Everett P.	6		
Melvin, Charles R.	7		
Ayer, Paul F.	8		
Pauer, Diane	9		
Porter, Marjorie A.		1	
Treleaven, Susan GS			
Gilman, Julie D.		2	
Maggiore, Jim V.		3	
Stavis, Laurel		4	
Mangipudi, Latha D.		5	
Vann, Ivy C.			
Klee, Patricia S.		6	
Gallager, Eric B.		7	
TOTAL VOTE:	10	7	

Rep. Tripp, Rock. 6
March 1, 2021
2021-0553h
11/04

Amendment to HB 67-LOCAL

1 Amend the bill by replacing section 1 with the following:

2

3 1 New Subparagraph; Government of Town Meeting; Official Ballot Referenda; Warrant

4 Articles. Amend RSA 40:13, IV by inserting after subparagraph (c) the following new subparagraph:

5 (d) No petitioned warrant article shall be amended to change its specific intent.

UNAPPROVED

2021-0553h

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill prohibits the amendment of a petitioned warrant article when such amendment would change the specific intent of a petitioned warrant article.

UNAPPROVED

Public Hearing

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

PUBLIC HEARING ON HB 67-LOCAL

BILL TITLE: relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.

DATE: February 9, 2021

LOB ROOM: Hybrid **Time Public Hearing Called to Order:** 10:55 a.m.

Time Adjourned: 11:15 a.m.

Committee Members: Reps. Dolan, Piemonte, J. MacDonald, Tripp, Guthrie, Lascelles, McBride, Melvin, Ayer, Pauer, Porter, Treleaven, Gilman, Maggiore, Stavis, Mangipudi, Vann, Klee and Gallager

Bill Sponsors:

Rep. Marsh
Rep. M. Pearson

Rep. Edwards
Rep. Lang

Rep. J. MacDonald
Rep. Yokela

TESTIMONY

* Use asterisk if written testimony and/or amendments are submitted.

***Rep. William Marsh** - Prime sponsor of the bill. Petition to bring warrant articles before SB 2. Citizens do not have the right to redress. Will require both versions of the warrant article to appear on the ballot.

Rep. Guthrie: How would identify the amended article from the original article? ANS: It would be up to the selectman.

***Diane Smith** - Read her testimony that has been submitted to the committee by email on 2/5/21. Endorses HB 67 as a compromise.

Rep. Porter: SB 2 was passed because under the old town meeting, people couldn't make the town meeting. Have you considered the method that the district uses for voting? ANS: I don't as a citizen have any influence in changing the school board members. I don't believe it is possible to change or go back.

***Cordell Johnston, NH Municipal Association** - Opposed to the bill. Sent a letter to the committee opposing. Once the motion is submitted, you would then go back to vote again. There is no difference between SB 2 and town meeting. Both can be amended. Local problem asking the legislature to resolve the problem.

Rep. Tripp: Petition article cannot nullify the intent of the warrant article? ANS: The amendment cannot change the subject matter of the original warrant article.

Respectfully submitted,

Rep. John MacDonald
Clerk

House Remote Testify

Municipal and County Government Committee Testify List for Bill HB67 on 2021-02-09

Support: 4 Oppose: 9 Neutral: 1 Total to Testify: 2

<u>Name</u>	<u>Email Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Testifying</u>	<u>Signed Up</u>
Smith, Dianne	bestsunsets2@gmail.com	603.630.5293	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	Yes (6m)	2/5/2021 3:40 PM
Johnston, Cordell	cjohnston@nhmunicipal.org	603.748.4019	A Lobbyist	NH Municipal Association	Oppose	Yes (3m)	2/8/2021 12:50 PM
ROBERTS, KELLY	tw@townofdeerfieldnh.com	603.463.8811	An Elected Official	Myself	Oppose	No	2/8/2021 1:37 PM
DeMark, Richard	demarknh114@gmail.com	603.520.5582	A Member of the Public	Myself	Oppose	No	2/8/2021 1:49 PM
Aronson, Laura	laura@mlans.net	603.432.1603	A Member of the Public	Myself	Oppose	No	2/8/2021 10:30 PM
Rathbun, Eric	ericrathbun@gmail.com	860.912.3751	A Member of the Public	Myself	Neutral	No	2/9/2021 12:14 AM
Ward, Tyler	tyward1198@gmail.com	603.315.5134	An Elected Official	Myself	Oppose	No	2/5/2021 6:44 PM
Kudlik, Cindy	cindykudlik@protonmail.com	7804511	An Elected Official	Myself	Oppose	No	2/5/2021 9:21 PM
Fordey, Nicole	nikkif610@gmail.com	516.318.2296	A Member of the Public	Myself	Oppose	No	2/7/2021 11:05 AM
Larson, Ruth	ruthlarson@msn.com	603.364.4003	A Member of the Public	Myself	Oppose	No	2/8/2021 12:22 AM
Christina, Barrett	bchristina@nhsba.org	603.228.2061	A Lobbyist	New Hampshire School Boards Association	Oppose	No	2/8/2021 11:26 AM
Potucek, John	potucek1@comcast.net	603.432.9049	An Elected Official	Myself	Support	No	2/3/2021 5:41 PM
Pearson, Mark	canonpearson@yahoo.com	603.571.0205	An Elected Official	Myself	Support	No	2/4/2021 4:49 PM
Lord, Kit	kitlord@yahoo.com	603.942.5374	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No	2/5/2021 12:17 PM

Testimony

Archived: Monday, April 19, 2021 9:52:03 AM

From: [Cordell Johnston](#)

Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 9:34:06 AM

To: ~House Municipal and County Govt

Subject: HB 67

Importance: Normal

Attachments:

[LTR-HB-67-MCG.pdf](#) 

Dear Committee Members:

Please see the attached letter regarding HB 67, which the committee is hearing this morning.

Thank you.

Cordell Johnston
Government Affairs Counsel
New Hampshire Municipal Association
25 Triangle Park Drive
Concord, NH 03301
603-230-3323

HB 67

Good morning Mr Chair and members of Municipal and County:

For the record I am Rep. William Marsh, Carroll 8, representing Brookfield, Wakefield, Ossipee, Effingham, Moultonborough, Tuftonboro and Sandwich. Despite my mailing address, I do not represent the town of Wolfeboro, in which the deliberative sessions of the Governor Wentworth Regional School District are held.

I am pleased to bring to you today HB1105 on behalf of my constituents who feel their right of redress by bringing petition warrant articles before the voters has been compromised by the SB2 process.

My constituent, Dianne Smith, (testified before this committee last year – HB1105) is here today to tell you what happened a year and a half ago in the Governor Wentworth Regional School District, and I do not want to steal her thunder. But very briefly, her petition warrant article was rendered moot by amendment at a poorly attended deliberative session, held in Wolfeboro, an hours drive away for some of my constituents.

In bodies operating under traditional rules, per RSA 39:3, petition warrant articles must appear on the warrant without any change in the intended effect of the petitioned article.

In bodies operating under SB2, citizens do not have this right of redress. A petition warrant article may be rendered moot by amendment at a poorly attended deliberative session, which may be scheduled at a time and place inconvenient for certain citizens. This is exactly what happened in the Governor Wentworth Regional School District.

HB1105 would restore the right of redress to citizens in SB2 districts by requiring both the original and the amended warrant article to appear on the ballot. If both pass, the amended version would take effect.

My constituents ought to be able to bring their concerns before the voters. I urge you to restore my constituents right to redress by voting HB67 OTP. I will be glad to take questions.

Archived: Monday, April 19, 2021 9:49:47 AM

From: [William Marsh](#)

Sent: Tuesday, February 9, 2021 8:02:21 AM

To: [~House Municipal and County Govt](#)

Subject: HB67

Importance: Normal

Attachments:

[HB67 - Marsh.pdf](#) 

Attached find my testimony to introduce this bill.

Rep. Marsh

Archived: Monday, April 19, 2021 9:49:47 AM

From: [Dianne Smith](#)

Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 3:49:41 PM

To: ~House Municipal and County Govt

Cc: [Dr. William Marsh](#)

Subject: HB67 Supporting Testimony

Importance: Normal

Attachments:

[TestimonyHB67SmithDianne2021.pdf](#) 

Hello...

Attached is a PDF of the testimony I expect to give to the Committee on Tuesday, Feb 9 at 10:30am.

However, since I don't have high speed internet at my home, I have never used Zoom. I will have to go somewhere else and try via my laptop.

I'm submitting this in the event that I am unsuccessful in my efforts to testify via Zoom.

Thank you
Dianne Smith
Brookfield NH



February 9, 2021

Hon. Tom Dolan, Chairman
House Municipal & County Government Committee
Legislative Office Building
Concord, New Hampshire

Via Electronic Mail Only

Re: HB 67, relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings

Dear Chairman Dolan:

I write to express the New Hampshire Municipal Association's opposition to HB 67. This bill will distort the legislative process in towns, cause confusion, and lead to anomalous consequences.

Almost every year for the last 10-15 years, bills have been filed relative to petitioned warrant articles in official ballot referendum (SB 2) towns. All have been found inexpedient to legislate, including a bill last year, HB 1105, that was identical to the current bill.

The genesis for all of these bills is the expectation of some voters that if they submit a petitioned warrant article, it will go on the ballot exactly as submitted, without amendment by the deliberative session. Some bills have tried to prevent any amendments at all, while others have tried to prohibit amendments that change the "intent" of a petitioned article. HB 67 would allow amendments, but would then require that both the original article and the amended article go on the ballot.

These bills disregard how a normal legislative process works. In any legislative body, once a motion is made—or a bill is filed—it is subject to amendment by the body. For example, in the New Hampshire House of Representatives, once a bill is filed, any member may move to amend the bill; the only limitation is that the amendment must be germane to the subject matter. If the motion to amend is adopted, the House votes on the bill as amended—not on the original, un-amended bill. Similarly, at a town meeting, any voter may move to amend a warrant article. If the motion is adopted, the meeting votes on the article as amended—not as originally submitted.

The deliberative session in an SB 2 town is a legislative body, and is designed to function like one. It simply makes no sense that once an article is amended, the original article would still go on the ballot. If the petitioners do not want to see their article amended, they need to muster the votes to prevent an amendment.

NEW HAMPSHIRE MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

25 Triangle Park Drive • Concord, NH 03301 • Tel: 603.224.7447

NHMAinfo@nhmunicipal.org • governmentaffairs@nhmunicipal.org • legalinquiries@nhmunicipal.org

www.nhmunicipal.org

A complaint often heard is that only a small number of voters attend the deliberative session, and they should not be able to control what goes on the ballot. But HB 67 would leave an even *smaller* number of voters—the 25 who submitted the petitioned article—in control of what goes on the ballot.

Apart from the distortion of the legislative process, HB 67 would cause confusion and unfortunate results. Voters, of course, will wonder why they are voting on two articles that deal with the same subject but say different things. Further, there are any number of situations where this could work against everyone's interest, including the voters who submitted the article in the first place.

- Example: Petitioners submit an article to appropriate \$100,000 to renovate the library. After the article is submitted but before the deliberative session, they do more research and conclude that the renovation can't be completed for less than \$200,000. At the deliberative session, one of the petitioners moves to amend the appropriation to \$200,000, and the amendment passes *with all of the petitioners supporting it*. Nevertheless, under HB 67, both the original article and the amended article must go on the ballot. The voters, presented with one article for \$100,000 and another for \$200,000, vote for the lower amount and reject the higher one. The town has now appropriated \$100,000—which must be included in the tax rate—but because it is not nearly enough to pay for the renovation, it does not get spent. Everyone's taxes go up, with nothing to show for it.
- Example: Petitioners submit an article to appropriate \$10,000 to a capital reserve fund, but a typo turns it into a \$100,000 appropriation. Everyone agrees that it's a mistake, and there is a unanimous vote to amend it at the deliberative session; but under HB 67 the town would now be required to include both a \$10,000 and a \$100,000 appropriation on the ballot.

This list could go on forever. Petitioned articles need to be treated the same as any other warrant articles: they are subject to amendment by a majority vote of those in attendance, and the final amended article is what gets voted on. The petitioners can influence this at the deliberative session. If they do not have the political support locally to achieve their goals, it is not the state legislature's job to intervene. We ask the committee to find HB 67 inexpedient to legislate.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Cordell A. Johnston
Government Affairs Counsel

cc: Committee members

TO: NH House Municipal & County Government Committee
FROM: Dianne Smith, PO Box 645, Brookfield, NH
RE: Testimony for HB67 Hearing February 9, 2021

Good morning, Chairman Dolan, Vice Chairman Piemonte & Committee members

I'm Dianne Smith, a registered voter and taxpayer in Brookfield, and I support HB67.

In 2019 I submitted two petition warrant articles to the Governor Wentworth Regional School District - the first petition articles I'd submitted to the District. Brookfield is the smallest of the 6 towns within the School District, which is spread over nearly 300 square miles.

These articles (one for a tax cap on the annual increase of the local taxes supporting the School District and one to establish an elected Budget Committee per RSA 195:12-a) were reviewed at the District's Deliberative Session held, as usual, in Wolfeboro, where roughly 40% of the District voters reside. There was larger-than-normal attendance, with a large percentage of voters present being current or former School District employees, family members of same, or parents of enrolled children. Not surprisingly, amendments were offered to both petition warrant articles and subsequently accepted:

- The Tax Cap article had one simple amendment: to modify the cap from "2%" to "25%", thus rendering the warrant article meaningless.
- The Budget Committee article was amended by wholesale changes so as to make the Budget Committee *advisory, appointed* by the School Board, and with fewer members - thus nullifying the article's intent to have an elected body other than the School Board to create the budget.

The Jan/Feb 2013 issue of the NHMA's Town & County magazine, under the "Legal Q&A" section, offered the following assessment regarding amendments to warrant articles for SB2 towns and districts:

"One of the obvious consequences of this system is that it gives opponents of any issue a strategic advantage. Those who want to say "no" only have to do it once, either by altering the article at the first session, or by voting "no" at the second session. Those who are in favor of an article, on the other hand, must attend both sessions and say "yes" twice. The traditionally low attendance at deliberative sessions creates some additional tension about the deliberative sessions' power to amend articles." *{emphasis added}*

Unlike a urban area organized under SB2, in large rural SB2 Regional School Districts where the larger town (like Wolfeboro) is the hub and the location of the annual Deliberative Session, often the majority of voters live outside of that town and have greater impediments to participation in the Deliberative Session due to greater travel distances and/or through inclement weather. As such, there is a much greater risk that fewer of the District's voter majority will be present to address proposed amendments to warrant articles.

TO: NH House Municipal & County Government Committee
FROM: Dianne Smith, PO Box 645, Brookfield, NH
RE: Testimony for HB67 Hearing February 9, 2021

Page 2 of 2

Further, I would add that petition warrant articles are further disadvantaged in that they must surmount the SB2 institutional opposition as well as risk amendments to the article which may render it moot or so twisted as to become the opposite of the presented article's intent. In my 2019 experience, District voters recognized both of my articles had been amended so as to be moot and neither passed. But it is my understanding that in at least one other NH School District, where smaller member-towns wished to change the cost allocation formula to be weighted more heavily to allocation via "equalized valuation" through a petition warrant article, the article was amended to have the exact opposite effect and subsequently was adopted, to the dismay of the towns already disadvantaged by the formula. Although a similar sentiment regarding the cost distribution formula exists in the smaller towns of my School District, no one dares submit a petition warrant article for fear of a similar reversal of intent via amendment from the majority at the Deliberative Session held in Wolfeboro.

The current statutes and case law regarding citizen petition warrant articles poses notable disadvantage and disincentive to voter influence on local government. When I realized the futility of effecting change in my School District, I stopped all my involvement and advocacy and now just pay my taxes. In the current environment, institutions win and democracy loses.

I would *prefer* legislation that disallows any amendments to *citizen's* petition warrant articles. Nonetheless, I heartily endorse HB67 as an excellent compromise that will allow voters the choice to support either the original or the amended petition warrant article.

I respectfully urge this Committee to support this bill and to recommend HB67 as "Ought To Pass".

Thank you for your time and attention.

Bill as
Introduced

HB 67-LOCAL - AS INTRODUCED

2021 SESSION

21-0007

11/10

HOUSE BILL

67-LOCAL

AN ACT relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.

SPONSORS: Rep. Marsh, Carr. 8; Rep. Edwards, Rock. 4; Rep. J. MacDonald, Carr. 6; Rep. M. Pearson, Rock. 34; Rep. Lang, Belk. 4; Rep. Yokela, Rock. 33

COMMITTEE: Municipal and County Government

ANALYSIS

This bill requires that original warrant articles be placed on the official ballot at certain meetings even if such articles have been amended during the first session of the meeting.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics***.
Matter removed from current law appears ~~[in brackets and struckthrough.]~~
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

HB 67-LOCAL - AS INTRODUCED

21-0007

11/10

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty One

AN ACT relative to warrant articles in official ballot town, school district, or village district meetings.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 1 New Subparagraph; Government of Town Meeting; Official Ballot Referenda; Warrant
2 Articles. Amend RSA 40:13, IV by inserting after subparagraph (c) the following new subparagraph:

3 (d) If a petitioned warrant article is amended at the first session, then the original
4 article shall also be placed on the official ballot preceding the amended article. In the event both
5 articles are adopted, the amended article shall supersede the original article.

6 2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.