

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

**SB52**

Bill as  
Introduced

SB 52 - AS INTRODUCED

2021 SESSION

21-0860  
06/10

SENATE BILL

**52**

AN ACT

relative to city charter provisions for tax caps.

SPONSORS:

Sen. Avard, Dist 12; Sen. Giuda, Dist 2; Rep. Pauer, Hills. 26; Rep. Homola, Hills.  
27

COMMITTEE:

Election Law and Municipal Affairs

---

ANALYSIS

This bill requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a supermajority vote.

-----  
Explanation:

Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics***.

Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struck through.~~]

Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

*In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty One*

AN ACT                   relative to city charter provisions for tax caps.

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

1           1 City Charters. Amend RSA 49-C:33, I(d) to read as follows:

2                   (d) A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes  
3 under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override  
4 threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as  
5 determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions  
6 for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or  
7 revenue from sources other than local taxes.

8                   ***(1) If a city charter has an exclusion provision that requires a supermajority***  
9 ***vote it shall be considered equivalent to an override threshold for the purposes of meeting***  
10 ***the requirement that a tax cap shall provide for such an override threshold or for the***  
11 ***purposes of defining an override threshold in subparagraphs (2)-(4).***

12                   ***(2) When an exclusion is enacted for the purpose of, or has the effect of***  
13 ***redistributing budget items from within the limits of the tax cap to outside the limits of the***  
14 ***tax cap it shall be construed as the functional equivalent to an override and shall require***  
15 ***the same supermajority vote as an override threshold.***

16                   ***(3) When an ordinance is enacted that has the effect of redistributing budget***  
17 ***items from within the limits of the tax cap to outside the limits of the tax cap it shall be***  
18 ***construed as the functional equivalent to an override and shall require the same***  
19 ***supermajority vote as an override threshold.***

20                   ***(4) When accounting practices that change the organization of a budget***  
21 ***have the effect of redistributing budget items from within the limits of the tax cap to***  
22 ***outside the limits of the tax cap it shall be construed as the functional equivalent to an***  
23 ***override and the budget shall require the same supermajority vote as an override***  
24 ***threshold.***

25           2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

SB 52 - AS AMENDED BY THE SENATE

03/18/2021 0710s

2021 SESSION

21-0860

06/10

SENATE BILL **52**

AN ACT relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

SPONSORS: Sen. Avard, Dist 12; Sen. Giuda, Dist 2; Rep. Pauer, Hills. 26; Rep. Homola, Hills. 27

COMMITTEE: Election Law and Municipal Affairs

---

ANALYSIS

This bill requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a supermajority vote.

-----

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

## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

*In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty One*

AN ACT relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

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

1 1 Municipal Charters; Separability, Preservation. Amend RSA 49-B:13, II-a to read as follows:

2 II-a. ***Notwithstanding RSA 49-B:1***, all town or city charters which have been adopted,  
3 revised, or amended ***before July 5, 2011*** to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and all charter  
4 commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and all  
5 actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed,  
6 ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable~~[without regard to whether such entities  
7 or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken]~~.

8 2 City Charters; Limitations. Amend RSA 49-C:33, I(d) to read as follows:

9 (d) A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes  
10 under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override  
11 threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as  
12 determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions  
13 for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or  
14 revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest and principal payments on municipal***  
15 ***bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be by a supermajority vote as determined***  
16 ***in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice that redistributes excludable budget***  
17 ***items from within the limits of the capped budget to outside the limits of the capped budget***  
18 ***shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter.***

19 3 Optional Forms of Legislative Body. Amend RSA 49-D:3, I(e) to read as follows:

20 (e) Other matters of local concern may be included in a charter including, but not limited  
21 to, conflict of interest provisions which shall be at least as strict as those established in the general  
22 laws, citizen powers of initiative, referendum and recall as described in RSA 49-C, the adoption and  
23 periodic review of an administrative code, a merit personnel system, a purchasing system, and a  
24 town investment policy, and the adoption of a tax cap limiting the annual increases in amounts  
25 raised by taxes under the town budget. Such tax cap shall include an override threshold on a vote to  
26 exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter.  
27 Such tax cap may specifically exclude certain dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or  
28 accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest***  
29 ***and principal payments on municipal bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be***  
30 ***by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice***  
31 ***that redistributes excludable budget items from within the limits of the capped budget to***

1 *outside the limits of the capped budget shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in*  
2 *the charter.*

3 4 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

SB 52 - VERSION ADOPTED BY BOTH BODIES

03/18/2021 0710s

2021 SESSION

21-0860

06/10

SENATE BILL

**52**

AN ACT

relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

SPONSORS:

Sen. Avard, Dist 12; Sen. Giuda, Dist 2; Rep. Pauer, Hills. 26; Rep. Homola, Hills.  
27

COMMITTEE:

Election Law and Municipal Affairs

---

ANALYSIS

This bill requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a supermajority vote.

-----  
Explanation:

Matter added to current law appears in *bold italics*.

Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struck through.~~]

Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.



## STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

*In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty One*

AN ACT relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

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

1 1 Municipal Charters; Separability, Preservation. Amend RSA 49-B:13, II-a to read as follows:

2 II-a. ***Notwithstanding RSA 49-B:1***, all town or city charters which have been adopted,  
3 revised, or amended ***before July 5, 2011*** to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and all charter  
4 commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and all  
5 actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed,  
6 ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable~~[, without regard to whether such entities  
7 or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken].~~

8 2 City Charters; Limitations. Amend RSA 49-C:33, I(d) to read as follows:

9 (d) A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes  
10 under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override  
11 threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as  
12 determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions  
13 for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or  
14 revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest and principal payments on municipal***  
15 ***bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be by a supermajority vote as determined***  
16 ***in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice that redistributes excludable budget***  
17 ***items from within the limits of the capped budget to outside the limits of the capped budget***  
18 ***shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter.***

19 3 Optional Forms of Legislative Body. Amend RSA 49-D:3, I(e) to read as follows:

20 (e) Other matters of local concern may be included in a charter including, but not limited  
21 to, conflict of interest provisions which shall be at least as strict as those established in the general  
22 laws, citizen powers of initiative, referendum and recall as described in RSA 49-C, the adoption and  
23 periodic review of an administrative code, a merit personnel system, a purchasing system, and a  
24 town investment policy, and the adoption of a tax cap limiting the annual increases in amounts  
25 raised by taxes under the town budget. Such tax cap shall include an override threshold on a vote to  
26 exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter.  
27 Such tax cap may specifically exclude certain dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or  
28 accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest***  
29 ***and principal payments on municipal bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be***  
30 ***by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice***  
31 ***that redistributes excludable budget items from within the limits of the capped budget to***

SB 52 - VERSION ADOPTED BY BOTH BODIES

- Page 2 -

1 *outside the limits of the capped budget shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in*  
2 *the charter.*

3 4 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

CHAPTER 88  
SB 52 - FINAL VERSION

03/18/2021 0710s

2021 SESSION

21-0860  
06/10

SENATE BILL

**52**

AN ACT

relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

SPONSORS:

Sen. Avard, Dist 12; Sen. Giuda, Dist 2; Rep. Pauer, Hills. 26; Rep. Homola, Hills.  
27

COMMITTEE:

Election Law and Municipal Affairs

---

ANALYSIS

This bill requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a supermajority vote.

-----  
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.

CHAPTER 88  
SB 52 - FINAL VERSION

03/18/2021 0710s

21-0860  
06/10

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

*In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty One*

AN ACT relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

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

1 88:1 Municipal Charters; Separability, Preservation. Amend RSA 49-B:13, II-a to read as  
2 follows:

3 II-a. ***Notwithstanding RSA 49-B:1***, all town or city charters which have been adopted,  
4 revised, or amended ***before July 5, 2011*** to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and all charter  
5 commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and all  
6 actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed,  
7 ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable~~[, without regard to whether such entities  
8 or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken].~~

9 88:2 City Charters; Limitations. Amend RSA 49-C:33, I(d) to read as follows:

10 (d) A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes  
11 under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override  
12 threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as  
13 determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions  
14 for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or  
15 revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest and principal payments on municipal***  
16 ***bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be by a supermajority vote as determined***  
17 ***in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice that redistributes excludable budget***  
18 ***items from within the limits of the capped budget to outside the limits of the capped budget***  
19 ***shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter.***

20 88:3 Optional Forms of Legislative Body. Amend RSA 49-D:3, I(e) to read as follows:

21 (e) Other matters of local concern may be included in a charter including, but not limited  
22 to, conflict of interest provisions which shall be at least as strict as those established in the general  
23 laws, citizen powers of initiative, referendum and recall as described in RSA 49-C, the adoption and  
24 periodic review of an administrative code, a merit personnel system, a purchasing system, and a  
25 town investment policy, and the adoption of a tax cap limiting the annual increases in amounts  
26 raised by taxes under the town budget. Such tax cap shall include an override threshold on a vote to  
27 exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter.  
28 Such tax cap may specifically exclude certain dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or  
29 accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest***  
30 ***and principal payments on municipal bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be***

CHAPTER 88  
SB 52 - FINAL VERSION

- Page 2 -

1 *by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice*  
2 *that redistributes excludable budget items from within the limits of the capped budget to*  
3 *outside the limits of the capped budget shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in*  
4 *the charter.*

88:4 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

Approved: June 21, 2021

Effective Date: August 20, 2021

# Amendments

Amendment to SB 52

1 Amend the title of the bill by replacing it with the following:

2

3 AN ACT relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

4

5 Amend the bill by replacing all after the enacting clause with the following:

6

7 1 Municipal Charters; Separability, Preservation. Amend RSA 49-B:13, II-a to read as follows:

8 II-a. ***Notwithstanding RSA 49-B:1***, all town or city charters which have been adopted,  
9 revised, or amended ***before July 5, 2011*** to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and all charter  
10 commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and all  
11 actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed,  
12 ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable ~~without regard to whether such entities  
13 or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken~~.

14 2 City Charters; Limitations. Amend RSA 49-C:33, I(d) to read as follows:

15 (d) A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes  
16 under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override  
17 threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as  
18 determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions  
19 for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or  
20 revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest and principal payments on municipal  
21 bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be by a supermajority vote as determined  
22 in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice that redistributes excludable budget  
23 items from within the limits of the capped budget to outside the limits of the capped budget  
24 shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter.***

25 3 Optional Forms of Legislative Body. Amend RSA 49-D:3, I(e) to read as follows:

26 (e) Other matters of local concern may be included in a charter including, but not limited  
27 to, conflict of interest provisions which shall be at least as strict as those established in the general  
28 laws, citizen powers of initiative, referendum and recall as described in RSA 49-C, the adoption and  
29 periodic review of an administrative code, a merit personnel system, a purchasing system, and a  
30 town investment policy, and the adoption of a tax cap limiting the annual increases in amounts  
31 raised by taxes under the town budget. Such tax cap shall include an override threshold on a vote to  
32 exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter.

Amendment to SB 52

- Page 2 -

1 Such tax cap may specifically exclude certain dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or  
2 accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes, *or interest*  
3 *and principal payments on municipal bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be*  
4 *by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice*  
5 *that redistributes excludable budget items from within the limits of the capped budget to*  
6 *outside the limits of the capped budget shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in*  
7 *the charter.*

8 4 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

UNAPPROVED



2021-0447s

AMENDED ANALYSIS

This bill legalizes tax caps in municipal charters adopted, revised, or amended before July 5, 2021.

This bill also provides the manner for excluding enumerated budget items from a capped budget.

UNAPPROVED

Amendment to SB 52

1 Amend the title of the bill by replacing it with the following:

2

3 AN ACT relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.

4

5 Amend the bill by replacing all after the enacting clause with the following:

6

7 1 Municipal Charters; Separability, Preservation. Amend RSA 49-B:13, II-a to read as follows:

8 II-a. ***Notwithstanding RSA 49-B:1***, all town or city charters which have been adopted,  
9 revised, or amended ***before July 5, 2011*** to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and all charter  
10 commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and all  
11 actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed,  
12 ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable~~[without regard to whether such entities~~  
13 ~~or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken].~~

14 2 City Charters; Limitations. Amend RSA 49-C:33, I(d) to read as follows:

15 (d) A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes  
16 under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override  
17 threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as  
18 determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions  
19 for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or  
20 revenue from sources other than local taxes, ***or interest and principal payments on municipal***  
21 ***bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be by a supermajority vote as determined***  
22 ***in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice that redistributes excludable budget***  
23 ***items from within the limits of the capped budget to outside the limits of the capped budget***  
24 ***shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter.***

25 3 Optional Forms of Legislative Body. Amend RSA 49-D:3, I(e) to read as follows:

26 (e) Other matters of local concern may be included in a charter including, but not limited  
27 to, conflict of interest provisions which shall be at least as strict as those established in the general  
28 laws, citizen powers of initiative, referendum and recall as described in RSA 49-C, the adoption and  
29 periodic review of an administrative code, a merit personnel system, a purchasing system, and a  
30 town investment policy, and the adoption of a tax cap limiting the annual increases in amounts  
31 raised by taxes under the town budget. Such tax cap shall include an override threshold on a vote to  
32 exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter.

Amendment to SB 52

- Page 2 -

1 Such tax cap may specifically exclude certain dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or  
2 accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes, *or interest*  
3 *and principal payments on municipal bonded debt, or capital expenditures which shall be*  
4 *by a supermajority vote as determined in the charter. An ordinance or accounting practice*  
5 *that redistributes excludable budget items from within the limits of the capped budget to*  
6 *outside the limits of the capped budget shall be by a supermajority vote as determined in*  
7 *the charter.*

8 4 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

# Committee Minutes

# SENATE CALENDAR NOTICE

## Election Law and Municipal Affairs

Sen James Gray, Chair  
Sen Regina Birdsell, Vice Chair  
Sen Ruth Ward, Member  
Sen Donna Soucy, Member  
Sen Rebecca Perkins Kwoka, Member

Date: January 20, 2021

### HEARINGS

Thursday	01/28/2021	
(Day)	(Date)	
Election Law and Municipal Affairs	REMOTE 000	9:00 a.m.
(Name of Committee)	(Place)	(Time)
9:00 a.m. SB 52	relative to city charter provisions for tax caps.	
9:15 a.m. SB 53	enabling municipalities to establish a community preservation and resilience program funded in part through a surcharge on real property.	
9:45 a.m. SB 80-FN-A	establishing an independent advisory commission on redistricting.	

Committee members will receive secure Zoom invitations via email.

Members of the public may attend using the following links:

1. Link to Zoom Webinar: <https://www.zoom.us/j/92138850239>
2. To listen via telephone: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): 1-301-715-8592, or 1-312-626-6799 or 1-929-205-6099, or 1-253-215-8782, or 1-346-248-7799, or 1-669-900-6833
3. Or iPhone one-tap: US: 13126266799, 92138850239# or 16465588656, 92138850239#
4. Webinar ID: [921 3885 0239](https://www.zoom.us/j/92138850239)
5. To view/listen to this hearing on YouTube, use this link: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjBZdtrjRnQdmg-2MPMiWrA>
6. To sign in to speak, register your position on a bill and/or submit testimony, use this link: <http://gencourt.state.nh.us/remotecommittee/senate.aspx>

The following email will be monitored throughout the meeting by someone who can assist with and alert the committee to any technical issues: [remotesenate@leg.state.nh.us](mailto:remotesenate@leg.state.nh.us) or call (603-271-6931).

**EXECUTIVE SESSION MAY FOLLOW**

**Sponsors:**

**SB 52**

Sen. Avard

Sen. Giuda

Rep. Pauer

Rep. Homola

**SB 53**

Sen. Watters

Sen. Perkins Kwoka

Sen. Prentiss

Sen. Sherman

Rep. Mangipudi

Rep. Southworth

**SB 80-FN-A**

Sen. Sherman

Sen. Kahn

Rep. M. Smith

Sen. D'Allesandro

Sen. Rosenwald

Sen. Perkins Kwoka

Sen. Soucy

Sen. Watters

Sen. Whitley

Rep. Wolf

Tricia Melillo 271-3077

James P. Gray  
Chairman

**Senate Election Law and Municipal Affairs Committee**  
*Tricia Melillo 271-3077*

**SB 52**, relative to city charter provisions for tax caps.

**Hearing Date:** January 28, 2021

**Members of the Committee Present:** Senators Gray, Birdsell, Ward, Soucy and Perkins Kwoka

**Members of the Committee Absent :** None

**Bill Analysis:** This bill requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a supermajority vote.

---

**Sponsors:**

Sen. Avard  
Rep. Homola

Sen. Giuda

Rep. Pauer

---

**Who supports the bill:** Senator Kevin Avard, Senator Bob Giuda, Rep. Susan Homola, Rep. Tom Lanzara, Rep. Diane Pauer, Bill Ohm, Dan Moriarty, Timothy Twombly, Beth Scaer, Patrick Parks, Michael Dyer, Allison Dyer, Alicia Houston, Doris Hohensee, Deborah Foley, John Foley, Jack Tulley, Paula Uzdanovich, Karen Thoman, Paul Thoman, Daniel Richardson

**Who opposes the bill:** Rep. Mangipudi, Rep. Jan Schmidt, Rep. Patricia Klee, Rep. Laura Telerski, Cordell Johnston, Brian Hawkins, Phil Hatcher

**Summary of testimony presented in support:**

**Senator Kevin Avard**

- This bill was brought to his attention by former alderman, Dan Moriarty.
- His concern, along with many others in Nashua, is out of control spending and up shifting of blame on the state for high property taxes.
- In 1993 there was a spending cap that was voted on by referendum in Nashua.
- Previous Nashua city administrations have abided by the law, only bypassing it with a supermajority vote, through a loophole in the law.
- In 2017, Dan Moriarty and Fred Teeboom, brought a lawsuit that went all the way to the Supreme Court.
- This case found that because of the loophole, the spending cap could not be enforced.
- This bill, using suggestions by the Supreme Court, allows the will of the people and the 1993 spending cap to be enforced.
- It is simple language to fix the loophole for the people of Nashua.
- Senator Perkins Kwoka asked how widely has he been able to inquire with other municipalities that have tax caps to make sure this language is not going to cause any procedural issues with enforcement.
  - Senator Avard replied that this is a spending cap and not a tax cap, which was already voted in by the people in 1993 and they want it enforced. It is brought forth to avoid over spending. When the people speak they want their voices heard.
- Senator Perkins Kwoka asked if there were any other fixes that he had explored so that it does not affect any other spending or tax caps in other communities.
  - Senator Avard replied that this will only enforce spending or tax caps that other communities already have.

## **Dan Moriarty**

- The purpose of SB 52 is to rectify the current inconsistencies within RSA 49-C:33, the statute that sets the framework for cities to establish tax or spending caps.
- These inconsistencies involve two words, override and exclusion.
- To summarize everything, when the Supreme Court reviewed this, they decided that the specific definition of the word override is not the same as exclusion.
- The Legislature, over several repairs, tried to make that the case, there are laws on the books that are inconsistent with each other.
- Ultimately, because RSA 49-C:33 talks about an override, and an exclusion, which the Supreme Court ruled is not the same, this bill aims to repair that inconsistency.
- Historically, the Mayor of the City of Nashua and the Board of Aldermen had met the intent of the spending cap as established in its City Charter for several Mayoral administrations.
- This has been on the books for a long time, people were used to doing things a certain way and it worked.
- Now, there are growing instances where the Mayor and Board of Aldermen have bypassed the intent of the spending cap via maneuvers that allowed spending in excess of the cap - only requiring a simple majority vote - while still claiming to meet the letter of the spending cap as written in the charter.
- In SB 52, two main problems are resolved. It responds to the recommendations made by the Supreme Court Justices in 2018, relative to RSA 49-C:33 and clears up the inconsistencies in paragraph D.
- The spending cap is a single sentence in the City Charter and its over-ride provision is a 2nd sentence located immediately following the cap sentence.
- The intent of the spending cap put in place by the people of Nashua still exists, but the Mayor and Board of Alderman have found a way around it.
- The ruling of the Supreme Court nullifies the actions of prior Mayoral administrations, along with the supermajority vote of those Boards of Aldermen, which overrode the spending cap via a clause well understood to be an override provision in compliance with RSA 49-C:33.I(d).
- Rather, the NH Supreme Court holds that the clause in question is actually an "exclusion" - not an override - and thus does not meet the letter of the law and is therefore unenforceable.
- The Supreme Court agreed that this needs to be fixed because even though a city might want an override by a supermajority, that is not what the language currently means.
- SB52 will resolve misinterpretations and prevent manipulations of established spending caps in future budgeting for any city across New Hampshire where the tax-paying residents have spoken in support of reasonable spending and expect their representatives to act within the law.

## **Timothy Twombly**

- In the six years he was a state representative he voted for legislation in favor of spending and tax caps.
- Testimony at that time stated that the new legislation would not affect existing caps and they would remain enforced.
- Recently, the Supreme Court has ruled differently on this matter for Nashua.
- This legislation will resolve the issue of bad or inconsistent wording and closes loopholes in the current law.

## **Beth Scaer**

- She would like them to vote OTP on this bill to protect the spending caps on NH cities and towns.
- Nashua has been struggling with a very spend happy Board of Alderman and Mayor who have very little fiscal restraint.
- Having the spending caps back in place would put a check on them.
- She has neighbors that are struggling to pay their property tax. They are elderly and living on social security.



- People cannot afford to keep paying increases in property tax due to the heavy spending of elected officials.
- With property taxes shooting up, rents are going to be raised even higher and there will be even less affordable housing.
- They are projected to have a 5.5% increase in property taxes.
- The spending cap is critical to the people of Nashua.

### **Paula Johnson**

- She was on the Board of Alderman in 2002 – 2005.
- She helped get the spending caps passed because of outrageous spending in the city of Nashua.
- The people of Nashua overwhelmingly voted for it each time it was on the ballot.
- It is the will of the people that we have the spending caps back.
- She helped to get exclusions clarified.
- New Hampshire and other states will be looking for revenue because of the shut downs due to the pandemic and the people have no more tax revenue to give.
- This is a spending cap not a tax cap and it worked very well before.
- They are trying to avoid runaway spending.
- She is only asking that they fix the language so We the People, can have their rights back and have a spending cap to protect them from higher taxes.

### **Bill Ohm**

- He has lived in Nashua for sixteen years and has benefitted greatly from the spending cap that was in place and honored by the Mayor and Alderman at the time.
- Currently, desperate for more funds, the current elected officials have chosen to use accounting gimmicks to get additional spending passed rather than going to a supermajority.

### **Amanda Reichert**

- She sells real estate across New Hampshire.
- The property taxes that people are having to pay are crippling their budgets.
- As a private citizen she has to budget her finances, and the city should have to do that as well.
- Rising property taxes means that the city has more money to work with and to add increases on top of that is unfair.
- It is making it increasingly impossible for people to continue to afford to live in Nashua.
- In addition, she sees people who are middle class, who are considered low income because they cannot even afford to rent.
- People are having to pay \$2300 just to have a decent place to live.
- Taxes going up is a major contributor to that.

### **Dan Moriarty - 2nd Testimony**

- It is important that they make this readable, but the intent still holds.
- Specifically, with Manchester, the fact that this allows the bonding as an override is fine because there is still an override.
- This does not cause any problems for overrides in other city charters.
- RSA 49:3 is specific to cities so this would not affect town votes at all.

**Summary of testimony presented in opposition:**

## **Cordell Johnston – NH Municipal Association**

- He spent a lot of time reading the bill and trying to understand the language.
- His main concern is that it is confusing and very hard to understand but also will create some problems.
- The current statute on tax caps in a city charter says that “ a charter may contain a limit on spending increases that increase tax revenue.” “The tax cap must provide for an override by a supermajority of the legislative body.” “It may exclude revenue from dedicated or enterprise funds or other revenues from non-tax sources.”
- In this statute, clearly an override and an exclusion are two separate things.
- You can exclude certain things from the revenue of the tax cap at the same time you have to have a provision that allows an override of the tax cap.
- He understands from prior testimony, that the goal of the bill is to make an override and an exclusion the same thing, but they are not.
- SB 52 states, “ if the charter has an exclusion provision, that requires a supermajority vote, that satisfies that statutory requirement for an override.”
- He does not agree with that and looked at several charters with tax cap provisions.
- Manchester’s tax cap basically states that budgeted tax revenues may not exceed last year’s tax revenues, plus an inflation factor. This may be overridden by a 2/3rds vote of the alderman.
- It also contains an exclusion for enterprise funds and bond payments and states that capital improvements may be excluded by a 2/3rds vote.
- Under SB 52, Manchester would not need an override provision and he does not think that was the intent.
- In paragraph two of the bill the language contradicts itself regarding when an exclusion is enacted and the votes that are needed.
- He would suggest that Committee members talk to their local officials and see how it would affect tax caps.
- Senator Soucy commented that sometimes the IRS may do an audit which then requires the city to change some line items and asked if on line 20, where it talks about accounting practices changing the organization of the budget, would require a supermajority to comply with law.
  - Mr. Johnston replied that is what it seems to say, and he does not see how that can work.

TJM

Date Hearing Report completed: February 5, 2021

# Speakers

**Election Law and Municipal Affairs Committee****SB52****1/28/2021****Support: 21 Oppose: 7 Neutral: 0 Total to Testify: 6**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Testifying</b>
Ohm, Hon. Bill	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	Yes
Moriarty, Dan	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	Yes
Avard, Senator Kevin	An Elected Official	SD 12	Support	Yes
Twombly, Timothy	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	Yes
Johnston, Cordell	A Lobbyist	NHMA	Oppose	Yes
Scaer, Beth	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	Yes
Homola, Susan	An Elected Official	Myself	Support	No
Mangipudi, Latha	An Elected Official	Hills 35	Oppose	No
Parks, Patrick	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Dyer, Michael	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Lanzara, Tom	An Elected Official	Myself	Support	No
Dyer, Allison	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Houston, Alicia	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Hawkins, Brian	A Lobbyist	NEA-NH	Oppose	No
Hohensee, Doris	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Foley, Deborah	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Foley, John	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Tulley, Jack	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Pauer, Diane	An Elected Official	Myself	Support	No
Uzdanovich, Paula	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Giuda, Bob	An Elected Official	SD 2	Support	No
Hatcher, Phil	A Member of the Public	Myself	Oppose	No
Schmidt, Jan	An Elected Official	Myself	Oppose	No
Klee, Patricia	An Elected Official	Myself	Oppose	No
Telerski, Laura	An Elected Official	Hillsborough 35	Oppose	No
Thoman, Karen	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Thoman, Paul	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No
Richardson, Daniel	A Member of the Public	Myself	Support	No

# Testimony

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to motions for rehearing under Rule 22 as well as formal revision before publication in the New Hampshire Reports. Readers are requested to notify the Reporter, Supreme Court of New Hampshire, One Charles Doe Drive, Concord, New Hampshire 03301, of any editorial errors in order that corrections may be made before the opinion goes to press. Errors may be reported by e-mail at the following address: [reporter@courts.state.nh.us](mailto:reporter@courts.state.nh.us). Opinions are available on the Internet by 9:00 a.m. on the morning of their release. The direct address of the court's home page is: <http://www.courts.state.nh.us/supreme>.

THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

---

Hillsborough-southern judicial district  
No. 2018-0171

FRED S. TEEBOOM

v.

CITY OF NASHUA

DANIEL MORIARTY

v.

MAYOR, CITY OF NASHUA & a.

Argued: May 8, 2019  
Opinion Issued: July 2, 2019

Douglas, Leonard & Garvey, P.C., of Concord (Charles G. Douglas, III on the brief and orally), for plaintiff Fred S. Teeboom.

Office of Corporation Counsel, of Nashua (Steven A. Bolton and Dorothy S. Clarke on the memorandum of law, and Mr. Bolton orally), for the defendants.

LYNN, C.J. Plaintiff Fred S. Teeboom appeals an order of the Superior Court (Temple, J.) dismissing his claims for declaratory, injunctive, and

mandamus relief based upon the court's determination that the budget spending cap<sup>1</sup> in the Nashua city charter is unenforceable because it violates state law. We affirm.

I. Pertinent Facts

The trial court found the following facts. The spending cap was added to the Nashua city charter in November 1993. As quoted by the trial court, the spending cap provides:

Recognizing that final tax rates for the City are set by the New Hampshire Department of Revenue Administration . . . the Mayor, the [Board of Aldermen], and all departments in the City . . . shall prepare their annual budget proposals and the [Board of Aldermen] shall act upon such proposals in accordance with the mandates in this paragraph.

In establishing a combined annual municipal budget . . . for the next fiscal year, the Mayor and the [Board of Aldermen] shall consider total expenditures not to exceed an amount equal to the [combined annual municipal budget] of the current fiscal year, increased by a [specified] factor . . . .

This provision shall not prevent the Mayor and [Board of Aldermen] from establishing a [combined annual municipal budget] below this limit.

This provision shall not prevent the Mayor and the [Board of Aldermen] from appropriately funding any programs or accounts mandated to be paid from municipal funds by state and federal law.

(Brackets and ellipsis omitted.)

The Nashua city charter also outlines exemptions to the spending cap:

The total or any part of principal and interest payments of any municipal bond, whether established for school or municipal purposes, may be exempted from the limitation defined in [the spending cap provision] upon an affirmative vote of at least ten (10) aldermen. This decision shall be made annually.

In addition, capital expenditures deemed necessary by the mayor and the board of aldermen, . . . may similarly be exempted

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this opinion we refer to spending caps and tax caps interchangeably.

from this limitation upon an affirmative vote of at least ten (10) aldermen.

In April 2017, by a vote of nine to six, the Nashua Board of Aldermen (board) passed an ordinance exempting the entire wastewater treatment fund from the combined annual municipal budget. Later that month, Nashua's mayor proposed a budget for fiscal year 2018 that, consistent with the ordinance, removed the wastewater treatment fund from the spending cap calculation. In so doing, the mayor did not adjust for the fact that the 2017 combined annual municipal budget included \$8.1 million of wastewater treatment funds that were not included in the proposed 2018 combined annual municipal budget. This process had the effect of allowing the mayor to allocate a significant amount of additional funds to other areas without running afoul of the spending cap.

On the surface, the proposed 2018 combined annual municipal budget appeared to comply with the spending cap. The maximum allowable budget pursuant to the cap was \$267,517,084, and the 2018 combined annual municipal budget was \$265,598,979. Faced with a proposed 2018 combined annual municipal budget purporting to be \$1,918,105 below the spending cap, the board voted, ten to five, to adopt that budget.

Thereafter, Teeboom brought the instant lawsuit against the City of Nashua (City), asking the trial court to enforce the spending cap provision on the ground that the ordinance exempting the wastewater treatment fund from the combined annual municipal budget violated that provision. Teeboom contended that the wastewater treatment fund does not qualify for exemption from the spending cap and that, even if it did, such an exemption may be made only by an annual vote of a supermajority of ten aldermen. Because the ordinance was adopted by only nine aldermen, Teeboom contended that, even if the wastewater treatment fund could be excluded from the spending cap, the ordinance was ineffective to accomplish this objective. Teeboom also asserted that the board's vote on the proposed 2018 budget did not amount to a vote to exempt the wastewater treatment fund from the spending cap because the vote was not labeled as such.

The City countered that the ordinance was validly enacted. Alternatively, the City argued that, even if the ordinance violates the spending cap, the 2018 budget is valid because a supermajority of the board impliedly voted to override the spending cap by adopting the mayor's proposed budget. The City also argued that Teeboom lacked standing to bring his action.

Following a bench trial, the trial court ruled that Nashua's spending cap is unenforceable because it does not contain an override provision as required by state law. *See* RSA 49-C:12, III, :33, I(d) (2012). The court found that the charter provision allowing a supermajority of the board to exempt from the



spending cap municipal bond and capital expenditures did not constitute the requisite override provision. The court decided that because the spending cap was unenforceable, it could not provide redress for Teeboom's alleged injury and, therefore, that he lacks standing to bring his claims. Having so ruled, the trial court dismissed Teeboom's action. This appeal followed. Plaintiff Daniel Moriarty, whose separate action challenging the ordinance and the 2018 budget was consolidated in the trial court with Teeboom's action, has not appeared in this appeal.

## II. Analysis

### A. Teeboom's Standing

Before addressing the merits of Teeboom's appellate arguments, we consider the City's assertion that he lacks standing. For the purposes of our analysis, we assume without deciding that, as the City argues, the 2018 amendments to Part I, Article 8 of the State Constitution, related to taxpayer standing, do not apply to this case.

When the relevant facts are not in dispute, we review de novo the trial court's determination on standing. State v. Actavis Pharma, 170 N.H. 211, 214 (2017). "[S]tanding under the New Hampshire Constitution requires parties to have personal legal or equitable rights that are adverse to one another, with regard to an actual, not hypothetical, dispute, which is capable of judicial redress." Duncan v. State, 166 N.H. 630, 642-43 (2014) (citations omitted). "In evaluating whether a party has standing to sue, we focus on whether the party suffered a legal injury against which the law was designed to protect." Actavis Pharma, 170 N.H. at 215 (quotation omitted). "Neither an abstract interest in ensuring that the State Constitution is observed nor an injury indistinguishable from a generalized wrong allegedly suffered by the public at large is sufficient to constitute a personal, concrete interest." Id. (quotations omitted). "Rather, the party must show that its own rights have been or will be directly affected." Id. (quotation omitted).

In the trial court, Teeboom asserted that his personal rights were directly affected by passage of the 2018 budget because, by his calculations, his 2018 property taxes will be \$290 more than they would have been had the wastewater treatment fund been included in the spending cap calculation. The City contends that Teeboom's assertion is insufficient to confer standing because his alleged injury "is shared generally by all other taxpayers in the city, meaning it is not a distinguishable, particularized injury." However, there is no requirement that a party suffer a "unique" injury to establish standing. Although, under our standing doctrine as articulated in Duncan and its progeny, a person's status as a taxpayer is not, by itself, sufficient to establish standing, taxpayer status in conjunction with an injury or impairment of rights can confer standing. See Duncan, 166 N.H. at 645 (to bring a declaratory

judgment action, a party must establish that some right of the party has been impaired or prejudiced by application of a rule or statute). As the United States Supreme Court has explained:

As a general matter, the interest of a federal taxpayer in seeing that Treasury funds are spent in accordance with the Constitution does not give rise to the kind of redressable “personal injury” required for Article III standing. Of course, a taxpayer has standing to challenge the collection of a specific tax assessment as unconstitutional; being forced to pay such a tax causes a real and immediate economic injury to the individual taxpayer.

Hein v. Freedom From Religion Foundation, Inc., 551 U.S. 587, 599 (2007).

Here, Teeboom contended that the adoption of the 2018 budget, based upon the elimination of the wastewater treatment fund from the spending cap calculation, would impair his personal rights by illegally increasing his property taxes. He asserted that his individual, annual tax bill would increase “proportional to the amount the spending cap had [impermissibly] exceeded the statutory limit.” Thus, he did not merely assert standing as a taxpayer. See Duncan, 166 N.H. at 646 (holding that the petitioner’s claim that a program would result in “net fiscal losses” to local governments does not articulate a personal injury sufficient to confer standing (quotation omitted)). Instead, Teeboom contested the collection of a specific tax, arguing that it results from a budget that is based upon an unlawful spending cap calculation. Although, arguably, other taxpayers in Nashua will suffer the same injury — increased property taxes — that does not mean that Teeboom’s personal rights are not sufficiently impaired to confer standing.

The City also argues that Teeboom’s assertion that his taxes will increase is too speculative, “conjectural and hypothetical” to confer standing. The City observes that, if the ordinance exempting the wastewater treatment fund from the spending cap had not passed, the board “could have adopted the exact same budget” by exempting “some or all of debt service or capital improvement expenditures from the spending cap calculations.” The City further notes that the mayor and board “have other ways to respond to anticipated tax increases,” such as by raising “the amount of unassigned general fund balance they annually choose to apply to the tax rate.” “In short,” the City argues, “one cannot say that this one specific action by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen directly resulted in an increase in any particular taxpayer’s property tax, as there are other actions that were taken and could be taken by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen that affect the amount of property tax paid.”

Contrary to the City’s assertions, Teeboom’s allegedly increased property taxes are not an abstract possibility. The 2018 budget was adopted, and, as

the City concedes, it was based upon calculations that excluded the wastewater treatment fund from the spending cap.

Nor is Teeboom's articulated injury insufficiently concrete because he cannot demonstrate that the elimination of the wastewater treatment fund from the combined annual municipal budget "directly resulted" in his having to pay increased property taxes. All that is required for standing purposes is that the alleged injury be "fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant and not the result of the independent action of some third party not before the court." Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992) (quotation, ellipses, and brackets omitted); see Actavis, 170 N.H. at 216. We conclude that Teeboom has demonstrated the requisite causal connection between his injury — increased property taxes — and the claimed violation — the adoption of a budget based upon an impermissible spending cap calculation — sufficient to confer standing. See Conduent State & Local Solutions v. N.H. Dep't of Transp., 171 N.H. 414, 419 (2018).

To the extent that the City contends that Teeboom lacks standing because, as the trial court determined, the spending cap provision is unenforceable and, therefore, his claims are not "capable of judicial redress," we disagree. Duncan, 166 N.H. at 642-43. The City's argument and the trial court's standing decision misconstrue the redressability inquiry under Duncan. The redressability inquiry under our decision in Duncan and federal cases such as Lujan upon which Duncan relied, requires a court to presume that a favorable decision will issue. To establish standing, the plaintiff must show that it is "likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that [his] injury will be redressed by a favorable decision." Lujan, 504 U.S. at 561 (quotations omitted; emphasis added). Here, the City's standing argument and the trial court's standing decision presume that an unfavorable decision will issue. That is not a "standing" inquiry, but rather is an inquiry into the merits of Teeboom's claims.

#### B. Enforceability of the City's Spending Cap

Having concluded that Teeboom has standing, we now consider his appellate arguments on their merits. On appeal, Teeboom argues that the spending cap is enforceable either because it contains an override provision as required by RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d), or because the City's spending cap is exempt from complying with RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d) pursuant to RSA 49-B:13, II (2012).

Resolving these issues requires that we interpret the relevant statutes. We review the trial court's statutory interpretation de novo. See State v. Exxon Mobil Corp., 168 N.H. 211, 223 (2015). In matters of statutory interpretation, we are the final arbiter of the intent of the legislature as expressed in the words of the statute considered as a whole. Conduent State & Local Solutions, 171

N.H. at 419. We first look to the language of the statute itself, and, if possible, construe that language according to its plain and ordinary meaning. *Id.* at 419-20. Moreover, we do not consider words and phrases in isolation, but rather within the context of the statute as a whole. *Id.* at 420. This enables us to better discern the legislature’s intent and to interpret statutory language in light of the policy or purpose sought to be advanced by the statutory scheme. *Id.*

Absent an ambiguity, we will not look beyond the language of the statute to discern legislative intent. *Id.* However, “[i]n the construction of a statute, it is proper to consider the previous state of the law, the circumstances which led to its enactment, and especially the evil or mischief which it was designed to correct or remedy.” *Appeal of Coastal Materials Corp.*, 130 N.H. 98, 103 (1987). In addition, “[w]hen interpreting two statutes that deal with a similar subject matter, we construe them so that they do not contradict each other, and so that they will lead to reasonable results and effectuate the legislative purpose of the statutes.” *Grand China v. United Nat’l Ins. Co.*, 156 N.H. 429, 431 (2007).

### 1. Overview of the Statutory Scheme

The statutory scheme at issue implements the so-called “home rule amendment,” Part I, Article 39 of the State Constitution. *City of Manchester v. Sec’y of State*, 161 N.H. 127, 131 (2010). That amendment provides in part:

The legislature may by general law authorize cities and towns to adopt or amend their charters or forms of government in any way which is not in conflict with general law, provided that such charters or amendments shall become effective only upon the approval of the voters of each such city or town on a referendum.

N.H. CONST. pt. I, art. 39.

The legislation implementing the home rule amendment is set forth in RSA chapters 49-B, 49-C, and 49-D. *City of Manchester*, 161 N.H. at 131. RSA chapter 49-B “provides the statutory framework through which cities and towns may amend their actual forms of government, and grants them the power necessary to carry out such changes.” *Id.* (quotation omitted). The stated intent of RSA chapter 49-B is to allow municipalities to “adopt a form of government that best addresses local needs,” while also recognizing the “need to require uniform procedures and practices when there is a corresponding state interest.” RSA 49-B:1 (2012). Thus, RSA chapter 49-B “is intended only to provide a procedural framework by which a city or town may amend its actual form of government,” and is not intended to “create any power in, or confer any power upon, any city or town beyond that necessary to carry out the amendment of a charter or form of government” as set forth in RSA chapter

49-B. Id. The legislature has instructed that RSA chapter 49-B is to be “strictly interpreted to allow towns and cities to adopt, amend, or revise a municipal charter relative to their form of government so long as the resulting charter is neither in conflict with nor inconsistent with the general laws or the constitution of this state.” Id.

In turn, “RSA chapters 49-C and 49-D work in conjunction with RSA chapter 49-B by providing a limited list of forms of government that are available to municipalities.” City of Manchester, 161 N.H. at 131 (quotation omitted). A municipality “may establish either a town or city government,” RSA 49-B:2, I (2012), and must prepare its charter according to the framework statutorily mandated for that municipal form. City of Manchester, 161 N.H. at 132; see RSA ch. 49-C (2012) (city); RSA ch. 49-D (2012) (town). We infer from the trial court’s order that the City has a mayor-board of aldermen form of government as permitted by RSA chapter 49-C. See City of Manchester, 161 N.H. at 132 (taking judicial notice that Manchester’s charter denominates it as a city and that Manchester has chosen the mayor-board of alderman form of government).

RSA chapter 49-C “sets forth an exhaustive blueprint for the mayor-board of aldermen form of government.” Id. (quotation and brackets omitted). Certain city charter provisions are statutorily-mandated. See, e.g., RSA 49-C:23 (mandating that a city charter contain certain provisions related to the budget process and fiscal control). Other city charter provisions are not mandated, but are statutorily-authorized. See RSA 49-C:33, I (setting forth optional charter provisions).

Both RSA chapter 49-B and RSA chapter 49-C contain savings clauses. Before 2011, the savings clause in RSA chapter 49-B provided, in pertinent part:

I. The provisions of this chapter and of charters created under this chapter are separable. If any portion of this chapter, or of any charter adopted under the provisions of this chapter, or if the application of the chapter or such charter to any person or circumstance shall be invalid, the remainder of the chapter or such charter or the application of such invalid portions to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected by such invalidation.

II. All town and city charters which have been adopted, revised or amended; all charter commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and actions properly taken pursuant to such charters are hereby legalized, provided that such charters at the time of their adoption were not contrary to the general laws and constitution of the state.

RSA 49-B:13 (Supp. 2010) (amended 2011). The savings clause in RSA chapter 49-C provides:

So much of the previous charter of the city and of laws passed in amendment or supplementary to the charter, as now may be in force, relative to the constitution and bounds of its several wards, its school districts and sewer, lighting, and other special precincts and their government and affairs, to its water works, and to the borrowing of money in aid of its school districts, is hereby continued in force, with the exception of such provisions as are inconsistent with this chapter. All special legislation relative to the government of the city, not expressly saved, is hereby repealed. All general laws relative to the government of cities shall remain in force in the city so far as consistent with this chapter. Existing ordinances and other municipal regulations shall remain in force so far as the same can be applied consistently with the intents and purposes of this chapter, but are hereby annulled so far as inconsistent with this chapter. In all existing laws, ordinances and regulations hereby saved, references to the city councils, board of mayor and aldermen, board of public works, or other bodies or officers hereby abolished and superseded, or to bodies or officers hereby abolished and superseded, or to bodies or officers whose constitution or functions are hereby altered, shall be taken to mean the body or officer upon whom jurisdiction of the matter in question is conferred by the charter or by the administrative code.

RSA 49-C:34.

Before 2011, there was no explicit statutory authorization for a municipality to include a spending cap in its charter. See City of Manchester, 161 N.H. at 132-34. Nor did the statutory scheme allow a city charter to contain a provision by which such a spending cap could be overridden by a two-thirds or supermajority vote. See id. at 133-34. Thus, in City of Manchester, we concluded that a proposed amendment to Manchester's charter that would have imposed a spending cap and would have allowed the cap to be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the board of aldermen violated RSA chapter 49-C. Id. at 128, 134. Specifically, we held that the proposed amendment violated RSA 49-C:12, I, because it constrained the board of aldermen "to either abide by the spending cap or act by a two-thirds majority to override it," thereby conflicting with the board's authority under RSA 49-C:12, I, "to adopt a budget by the vote of a simple majority." Id. at 134 (citation omitted).

In response, the legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 2 in 2011. The stated purpose of SB 2 was to enable "the citizens of New Hampshire to adopt a tax

cap either in their charters or at their town meetings.” Laws 2011, 234:1. Among other provisions, SB 2 amended RSA 49-C:12 to add a new paragraph, which provides: “Notwithstanding any contrary provision in paragraph I, the adoption of an override threshold provision to a tax cap included in a charter . . . shall provide for a supermajority vote of the elected body to adopt the annual budget.” RSA 49-C:12, III; see Laws 2011, 234:2. SB 2 also added the following to RSA 49-C:33, I, which provides that “City charters may include provisions relating to any or all of the following matters”:

A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes.

RSA 49-C:33, I(d); see Laws 2011, 234:3. In addition, SB 2 amended RSA 49-B:13 to add:

All town or city charters which have been adopted, revised, or amended to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and all charter commissions which have been properly established and elected; all elections properly held; and all actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable, without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken.

RSA 49-B:13, II-a; see Laws 2011, 234:7.

The instant appeal asks that we decide whether: (1) the City’s spending cap contains an override provision as required by RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d); and (2) if not, whether the spending cap, nevertheless, is enforceable under RSA 49-C:13, II-a.

## 2. Whether the City’s Spending Cap Contains an Override Provision

We agree with the trial court that the City’s spending cap does not contain an override provision within the meaning of RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d). RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d) require a city charter to contain a provision by which a supermajority of the pertinent body may “exceed” the spending cap

(“the limit on annual increases”). RSA 49-C:33, I(d); see RSA 49-C:12, III. The City’s spending cap does not include such a provision.

Rather, the spending cap allows the board to exempt from the spending cap municipal bond and capital expenditures. Under the plain meaning of RSA 49-C:33, I(d), a provision related to exempting expenditures from a spending cap does not constitute an override provision. The sentence regarding the required override provision is followed immediately by a sentence allowing a spending cap to “provide for specific exclusions for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes.” RSA 49-C:33, I(d). This language indicates that the legislature distinguishes between override provisions and provisions allowing certain expenditures to be excluded from the spending cap. Consistent with the interpretative canon that the “legislature is not presumed to waste words or enact redundant provisions and whenever possible, every word of a statute should be given effect,” we conclude that a vote to exempt expenditures from a spending cap does not constitute a vote to exceed the spending cap for the purposes of RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d). In re Search Warrant (Med. Records of C.T.), 160 N.H. 214, 221 (2010) (quotation omitted). Accordingly, we hold that the provision of the City’s charter that allows the board to exempt municipal bond and capital expenditures from the spending cap does not constitute an override provision within the meaning of RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d).

In arguing for a contrary result, Teeboom observes that, at trial, the City’s current mayor, who was also mayor in the 1980s, referred to the provision allowing the board to exempt certain expenditures from the spending cap as an “override” provision. The mayor’s subjective belief that the City’s spending cap contains an override provision is irrelevant to our statutory interpretation.

### 3. Whether the City’s Spending Cap is Enforceable

Having concluded that the City’s spending cap does not contain an override provision within the meaning of RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d), we next consider whether the spending cap is, nonetheless, enforceable pursuant to RSA 49-B:13, II-a. Teeboom argues that the override requirement pertains only to spending caps adopted after SB 2 was enacted. He contends that, pursuant to RSA 49-B:13, II-a, any spending cap that was adopted before SB 2 is “endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and [is] fully enforceable” in both the past and future, without condition, regardless of whether it contains an override provision. RSA 49-B:13, II-a.

The City counters that, although RSA 49-B:13, II-a “begins expansively[,] . . . all that comes before is modified by the last clause,” which provides: “without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at



the time they were established or taken,” RSA 49-B:13, II-a. The City contends that any spending cap adopted before SB 2 was enacted is “saved from a challenge asserting that [it was] not authorized by law at the time [it was] enacted,” but is not “saved from challenges asserting that [it is] not authorized by current law.” The City contends that, to rule that the City’s spending cap need not comply with RSA 49-C:12, III and :33, I(d), requires adding words to RSA 49-B:13, II-a that the legislature did not include and violates the principle that the expression of one thing in a statute implies the exclusion of another (expressio unius est exclusio alterius). The City also argues that such an interpretation is contrary to the purpose of RSA chapter 49-B, and, by extension, RSA chapters 49-C and 49-D, which is to “require uniform procedures and practices when there is a corresponding state interest.” RSA 49-B:1.

“[W]henver possible, a statute will not be construed so as to lead to absurd consequences.” Petition of Poulicakos, 160 N.H. 438, 444 (2010) (quotation and ellipsis omitted). “Thus, as between a reasonable and unreasonable meaning of the language used, the reasonable meaning is to be adopted.” Id. (quotation omitted). Here, we conclude that the City’s interpretation of the statute is the only reasonable interpretation because, unlike Teeboom’s interpretation, the City’s interpretation gives meaning to all parts of the statute, is consistent with our canons of statutory construction, and gives effect to the legislature’s expressed intent.

The City’s interpretation of RSA 49-B:13, II is consistent with the plain meaning of the statutory language. Pursuant to its plain language, the statute endorses, ratifies, validates, legalizes and renders “fully enforceable” any spending cap adopted before 2011, without regard to whether it was lawful to adopt a spending cap at that time. The phrase “are hereby endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable” must be read together with the next clause, “without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken.” Accordingly, as the City argues, the final clause of RSA 49-B:13, II-a — “without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken” — modifies what comes before it — “All town or city charters which have been adopted, revised, or amended to include a tax or spending cap of any kind . . . are hereby endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable.” Pursuant to the plain meaning of RSA 49-B:13, II-a, previously-enacted spending caps are “endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable” only with respect to whether they were lawful when adopted. Thus, as the City contends, such caps are safe only from challenges based upon the grounds set forth in City of Manchester, 161 N.H. at 132-34; RSA 49-B:13, II-a does not render them safe from challenges based upon other grounds.

In context, therefore, under RSA 49-B:13, II-a, a “tax or spending cap of any kind” that was adopted before 2011 and “all actions properly taken” related to that tax or spending cap are capable of being enforced notwithstanding the fact that, before 2011, there was no statutory authorization for a municipality to adopt such a cap. In other words, the fact that there was no statutory authorization for a municipality to adopt a tax or spending cap before 2011 is not a barrier to enforcing a previously-adopted cap.

Such an interpretation is consistent with “ordinary rules of grammar” pursuant to which a modifying phrase should be placed next to the clause it modifies. Anderson v. Robitaille, 172 N.H. \_\_\_, \_\_\_ (decided March 8, 2019) (slip op. at 5); see In re Richard M., 127 N.H. 12, 17 (1985) (explaining that “[a]lthough the legislature is not compelled to follow technical rules of grammar and composition, a widely accepted method of statutory construction is to read and examine the text of the statute and draw inferences concerning its meaning from its composition and structure” (quotation omitted)); see also Mt. Valley Mall Assocs. v. Municipality of Conway, 144 N.H. 642, 652 (2000) (explaining the “last antecedent rule” of statutory construction).

Likewise, the City’s interpretation is consistent with the legislature’s expressed intent, which is “to require uniform procedures and practices when there is a corresponding state interest.” RSA 49-B:1. Here, the legislature demonstrated a state interest in ensuring that municipal spending caps contain override provisions by referring to that requirement in two statutes, RSA 49-C:12, III and RSA 49-C:33, I(d). See RSA 49-C:12, III (“the adoption of an override threshold provision to a tax cap included in a charter pursuant to RSA 49-C:33, I(d) shall provide for a supermajority vote of the elected body to adopt the annual budget”), :33, I(d) (“Such a tax cap shall provide for an override threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter.”). The word “shall” denotes that the override provision and the supermajority vote are mandatory requirements. See Appeal of Rowan, 142 N.H. 67, 71 (1997). The legislature’s decision to allow municipalities to adopt tax or spending caps only if they contain override provisions is a policy decision that we cannot second guess.

By contrast, Teeboom’s construction is inconsistent with the statute’s plain meaning and our established canons of statutory interpretation. His interpretation requires that we read the first clause in isolation, and it renders the final clause superfluous. Under his interpretation, the language “without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken” could be deleted from the statute, and the meaning of the statute would remain unchanged. However, we do not consider words and phrases in isolation, Conduent State & Local Solutions, 171 N.H. at 420, and “every word of a statute should be given effect,” In re Search Warrant (Med. Records of C.T.), 160 N.H. at 221 (quotation omitted).

Teeboom’s construction also contravenes the legislature’s expressed intent of requiring uniform practices when there is a corresponding state interest. See RSA 49-B:1. As well, it conflicts with RSA 49-C:33, I(d), which authorizes a municipality to adopt a spending cap, but provides that such caps “shall” include “an override threshold.” RSA 49-C:33, I(d). The override provision is a mandatory requirement, and the statute contains no exceptions for spending caps adopted before its effective date. Teeboom’s construction of RSA 49-B:13, II-a directly conflicts with this mandatory requirement. Indeed, his construction requires adding language to RSA 49-B:13, II-a that the legislature did not see fit to include. He construes it to mean:

All town or city charters which have been . . . amended to include a tax or spending cap of any kind and . . . all actions properly taken related to the tax or spending cap in such charters are hereby endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable, without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken or whether they comply with the requirements of RSA 49-C:12, III and RSA 49-C:33, I(d).

Furthermore, the City’s construction directly and narrowly addresses the “evil or mischief” that SB 2 “was designed to correct or remedy.” Appeal of Coastal Materials Corp., 130 N.H. at 103. The problem faced by the legislature in 2011 was how to respond to City of Manchester. After we decided City of Manchester, caps adopted before 2011 were potentially vulnerable to legal challenge on the same grounds as was the spending cap in City of Manchester. In addition, past actions taken pursuant to those caps were potentially vulnerable to legal challenge as a result of the City of Manchester decision. Thus, the “evil or mischief” the legislature was attempting to correct was the lack of authority we recognized in City of Manchester, and the effects that might flow from that lack of authority in municipalities that had adopted spending or tax caps similar to Manchester’s.

It is that exact “mischief” that is remedied by the City’s construction of the statute — by ratifying past actions properly taken related to spending caps and making them fully effective “without regard to whether [they] were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken,” the legislature “undid” the effects of City of Manchester and protected municipalities from challenges to their past actions based on the grounds set forth in City of Manchester. The evident intent of the legislature was to immunize existing spending caps from challenges based upon the lack of authority we identified in City of Manchester, not, as Teeboom posits, to immunize those caps from all challenges for all time. See RSA 49-B:13, II-a (ratifying all actions “properly taken” related to a previously-enacted spending cap).

Although we need not examine legislative history, Teeboom invites us to do so. Our review of that history confirms that the legislature intended SB 2 to provide the statutory authorization that we held was lacking in City of Manchester. See Laws 2011, 234:1 (explaining that purpose of SB 2 is to enable “the citizens of New Hampshire to adopt a tax cap either in their charters or at their town meetings”).

Senator Boutin, one of SB 2’s sponsors, explained that SB 2 was “derived from the Supreme Court’s ruling in the case of Manchester.” Relative to Adoption of Spending Caps by Municipalities, SB 2, 2011 Session (N.H. 2011) (Apr. 19, 2011 hearing, remarks of Senator Boutin); see also N.H.S. Jour. 43 (2011) (identifying Senator Boutin as one of the sponsors of SB 2); N.H.S. Jour. 435 (2011) (Senator Boutin explaining that “Senate Bill 2 is enabling legislation that permits localities to adopt a spending cap”). Similarly, the majority committee report of the House Municipal and County Government Committee explained:

The purpose and intent of SB 2 is to provide a process by which any municipality may adopt a tax/spending cap. The bill amends RSA [chapter] 49-C and RSA [chapter] 49-D so that cities or towns that are governed by a town or city council can amend their charters to include spending caps. The legislation also provides a clear process by which a charter can be amended and it provides the language necessary to comply with [a] recent supreme court ruling.

N.H.H.R. Jour. 1087 (2011) (emphasis added).

Nothing in the legislative history of SB 2 suggests that the legislature specifically intended to exempt spending caps adopted before 2011 from the override provision requirement. Indeed, it appears that the legislature viewed override provisions as mechanisms that allow municipalities the flexibility necessary to address local needs. See N.H.S. Jour. 435, 436 (2011) (Senator Boutin explaining that SB 2 is intended as a “measure to get local budgetary expenditures under control” and that “in order to override the spending cap, it requires a two-thirds or a three-fifths supermajority vote” (quotation omitted)).

According to Senator Boutin’s public hearing testimony, “[t]he purpose of the override is to address special circumstances” and to ensure that municipal officials “are not handicapped by the existence of caps” in meeting local needs. Relative to Adoption of Spending Caps by Municipalities, SB 2, 2011 Session (N.H. 2011) (Apr. 19, 2011 hearing, remarks of Senator Boutin). The override provision was intended to grant municipalities “flexibility.” Id. As another legislator testified, “[T]he over-ride is important to take care of genuine emergencies.” Relative to Adoption of Spending Caps by Municipalities, SB 2,

2011 Session (N.H. 2011) (Apr. 19, 2011 hearing, remarks of Representative Leonard).

Teeboom's interpretation of RSA 49-B:13, II-a suggests that the legislature intended not to provide the citizens of certain municipalities with the protection it afforded all others. When the legislature took its first look at tax and spending caps, it made the policy decision that any such cap must provide for an override process. See RSA 49-C:12, III, :33, I(d). Teeboom's interpretation of the statute implies that the legislature concluded that this protection should be afforded only to citizens of municipalities that had not already adopted a cap. We can discern no possible reason why the legislature would have intended not to provide the citizens of Nashua, for example, with the same protections it gave everyone else. Indeed, such a result would be contrary to the legislature's stated intent of requiring uniform practices when there is a corresponding state interest. See RSA 49-B:1.

For all of the above reasons, therefore, we affirm the trial court's determination that the City's spending cap is unenforceable because it does not contain an override provision.

Affirmed.

BASSETT and DONOVAN, JJ., concurred; HICKS and HANTZ MARCONI, JJ., concurred in part and dissented in part.

HICKS and HANTZ MARCONI, JJ., concurring in part and dissenting in part. We concur in parts II.A., II.B.1. and II.B.2. of the majority's decision. We write separately because we disagree with part II.B.3. of that decision. We agree with plaintiff Teeboom that, pursuant to the plain language of RSA 49-B:13, II-a (2012), the spending cap of defendant City of Nashua (City) is enforceable regardless of whether it contains an override provision. On its face, RSA 49-B:13, II-a pertains to "[a]ll town or city charters which have been adopted, revised or amended to include a tax or spending cap of any kind." RSA 49-B:13, II-a. Under RSA 49-B:13, II-a, all such charters that include a spending cap "of any kind" are "hereby endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable." *Id.* (emphases added). Pursuant to its plain meaning, therefore, RSA 49-B:13, II-a renders the City's spending cap "fully enforceable" regardless of whether it contains an override provision.

We disagree with the City and the majority that the last clause of RSA 49-B:13, II-a narrows the phrase "hereby endorsed, ratified, validated, and legalized and are fully enforceable." The plain meaning of the last clause, "without regard to whether such entities or actions were authorized by law at the time they were established or taken," is that a charter, which was amended or adopted before Senate Bill 2 was enacted to include a spending cap "of any kind," is "fully enforceable," even though, when the charter was amended or

adopted, state law did not expressly allow a city or town to adopt a spending cap. See City of Manchester v. Sec’y of State, 161 N.H. 127, 132-34 (2010).

To our view, the majority and the City misconstrue the plain meaning of the phrase “are fully enforceable.” Under the majority’s and the City’s interpretation, previously-adopted spending caps are only “fully enforceable” if they contain an override provision. Such an interpretation requires that we add language to RSA 49-B:13, II-a, which the legislature did not see fit to include. RSA 49-B:13, II-a renders “fully enforceable” previously-adopted spending caps “of any kind,” not just those containing override provisions.

Moreover, to the majority and the City, previously-adopted spending caps are not, in fact, “fully” or entirely enforceable. Rather, in the City’s words, “[t]hey are saved from a challenge asserting that they were not authorized by law at the time they were enacted,” but are not “saved from challenges asserting that they are not authorized by current law.” However, the use of the present tense indicates that previously-adopted spending caps are capable of being enforced under the current statutory scheme.

We acknowledge that, at first blush, it appears that enforcing the City’s spending cap, which does not contain an override provision, contravenes the legislature’s intent “to require uniform procedures and practices when there is a corresponding state interest,” assuming, of course, that the State has an interest in ensuring that a spending cap contains an override provision. RSA 49-B:1 (2012). However, the purpose of RSA chapter 49-B, and correspondingly, RSA chapters 49-C and 49-D, is to balance the need for uniform procedures and practices with a municipality’s interest in “adopt[ing] a form of government that best addresses local needs.” Id. Whether allowing previously-adopted spending caps not to contain override provisions while requiring newly-adopted spending caps to contain such provisions strikes the right balance is a policy decision for the legislature, not for this court. See Petition of Kilton, 156 N.H. 632, 645 (2007).

For all of the above reasons, therefore, we would reverse the trial court’s determination that the City’s spending cap is unenforceable because it does not contain an override provision and remand for further proceedings.

Testimony for SB52, relative to city charter provisions for tax caps  
Election Law and Municipal Affairs Senate Committee  
January 28, 2021

Dear Senators,

My name is Beth Scaer and I live in Nashua. I am asking you to vote OTP on HB52 to protect the spending caps for NH cities and towns, most especially my city of Nashua.

Nashua has been struggling under a very spend-happy Board of Alderman and Mayor. They have very little fiscal restraint, and having our spending cap back in force would place a check on them.

I have neighbors that are struggling to pay their property taxes. Our neighbors across the street are elderly and living on social security and having a tough time paying their bills.

My neighbor a couple of houses down the street died a few days ago from lung cancer. He was the breadwinner for the family and left only a modest life insurance policy, which won't last long with the sharply rising property tax increases predicted with the heavy spending by our city elected officials.

There are many struggling families with children in my ward in Nashua. They are already paying very high rents, which will shoot up alongside the property tax increases.

We are predicted to have a 5.5% increase in property taxes to cover the state aid lost because the Nashua School District had several hundreds of students leave because they didn't open for in-person learning. No one knows how many of these students will return next year and how that will affect the city budget.

Please vote OTP on SB52. Nashuans deserve better.

Beth Scaer  
111 East Hobart Street, Nashua  
bscaer@gmail.com

**Comparing Budget Caps between NH Communities**

	NH Community	Type of Gov't	Effective		Exemption/Exclusion from the Budget Cap*	annual Override**	inflation	Comments	Meets 2011 NH state law?	
1	Nashua	city	adopted Nov 1993	Spending Cap	municipal bonds and capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	NO	GDP/IPD	2011 NH state law requires an unrestricted override vote.	NO	
2	Franklin	city	amended Nov 1998	Tax cap	municipal bonds and capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	2/3 vote limited to lost revenues	CPI			
3	Laconia	city	adopted Nov 2005	Tax cap	municipal bonds and capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	2/3 vote	CPI-U	2011 NH state law does not require a supermajority vote for exclusions/exemptions.  2011 NH state law does not allow exempting municipal bonds and capital expenditures, sourced from local taxes, from the capped budget.	Deviation from NH 2011 tax cap law has not been challenged in a court of law	
4	Rochester	city	adopted July 2009	Tax cap	municipal bonds and capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	2/3 vote	CPI-U			
Budget Caps Adopted or Amended after July 5, 2011										
5	Manchester	city	amended Nov 2011	Tax cap	enumerated funds plus capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	2/3 vote	CPI-U			
6	Somersworth	city	Adopted Nov 2012	Tax cap	municipal bonds and capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	2/3 vote	CPI-U			
7	Derry	town	amended March 2020	Tax cap	municipal bonds and capital expenditures with a 2/3 annual vote.	2/3 vote	CPI-U			
8	Dover	city	amended Nov 2011	Tax cap	enumerated funds	2/3 vote	CPI-Boston	Fully Compliant	yes	

\* Exemption/exclusions = Budget items from sources other than local taxes not subject to the cap.

\*\* Override = Supermajority vote to exceed the budget cap

Cities

**RSA 49-C:33, I(d)** "A limit on the annual spending increases that increase the amount raised by taxes under the city budget adopted pursuant to RSA 49-C:23. Such a tax cap shall provide for an override threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter. A tax cap provision in the city charter may provide for specific exclusions for dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes."

Towns

**RSA 49-D:3, I(e)** ".....and the adoption of a tax cap limiting the annual increases in amounts raised by taxes under the town budget. Such tax cap shall include an override threshold on a vote to exceed the limit on annual increases which shall be by a supermajority as determined in the charter. Such tax cap may specifically exclude certain dedicated, enterprise, or self-supporting funds or accounts, capital reserve funds, grants, or revenue from sources other than local taxes."



## Tricia Melillo

---

**From:** CHARLES HALL <graywolf7401@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 10:34 AM  
**To:** James Gray; Rebecca Perkins Kwoka; Regina Birdsell; Ruth Ward; Donna Soucy; Tricia Melillo  
**Subject:** Support SB 52

Dear Committee Members, I have lived in Nashua for 60 years and voted to support the spending cap when first introduced. I also support SB 52 and its intent. The intent of the original spending cap should be adhered to since it is the will of the people. The intent was followed by most but not all administrations. The wording must be corrected to ensure that all administrations current and future adhere to the will of the people.

Please vote yes in support of SB52 tax cap.

Thank you.  
Charles Hall  
9 Allds St.  
Nashua, NH  
03060  
603-930-5005

**Tricia Melillo**

---

**From:** Schmidt, Jan <SchmidtJ@nashuanh.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 26, 2021 2:32 PM  
**To:** Tricia Melillo  
**Subject:** SB52 - local control  
**Attachments:** NashuaCitysealcolorjpeg\_000.jpg

Most Honorable Senators,

There is no reason for the state to interject itself into the budgeting of cities and towns. Allow the members of each community make this decision themselves.

Respectfully,  
Jan

Jan Schmidt  
schmidtj@nashuanh.gov<mailto:schmidtj@nashuanh.gov>

Nashua's Ward 1 Alderman

[cid:B355A4DA-B6DD-4016-8963-28F38ED8634B@hsd1.nh.comcast.net.]

**Tricia Melillo**

---

**From:** Kevin Avard <avardsenate@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 26, 2021 11:01 AM  
**To:** Kevin Avard  
**Subject:** Fwd: Senate Bill 52

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** LEILA ROSENBERG <lala70leila@comcast.net>  
**Date:** Tue, Jan 26, 2021, 10:58 AM  
**Subject:** Senate Bill 52  
**To:** avardsenate@gmail.com <avardsenate@gmail.com>  
**Cc:** Dan Moriarty <aldermanmoriarty@gmail.com>

**In reviewing Dan Moriarty's e-mail (1/26/2021) I am in support of SB 52 as described in first and last paragraphs of Mr. Moriarty's email which I repeat below:**

**"I am in support of Senate Bill 52."**

"I am in support of SB52 an Act relative to city charter provisions for tax caps. There are two main considerations to address: responding to the recommendations of the opinions of NH Supreme Court Justices who wrote, in 2018, relative to RSA 49-C:33; and to address "loopholes" in the text of RSA 49-C:33 paragraph d which sets the framework for cities to establish tax or spending caps. To review the most recent history of RSA 49-C:33.d and its usage let's address the spending cap of the City of Nashua. The spending cap is a single sentence in the City Charter and its over-ride provision is a second sentence located immediately following the cap sentence. Leading up to 2017 the City of Nashua had met the intent of the spending cap for several Mayoral administrations. There were instances where the Mayor and Board of Aldermen decided it was necessary to over-ride the spending cap via a supermajority vote. There were also instances where the Mayor and Board of Aldermen were able to bypass the intent of the spending cap by maneuvers that allowed spending in excess of the cap but only requiring a simple majority vote.

"The purpose of SB52 is to resolve the inconsistency of the wording. By clarifying that when a mechanism or action of an "exclusion" has the same effect on spending as an "override" then it shall be considered the same as far as the requirements of RSA 49-C:33.d. This In addition the purpose of SB52"

**Sincerely,**  
**Leila A. Rosenberg**  
**Resident: 5 Stratham Green, Nashua, NH 03063**

# Jim Donchess

Mayor • City of Nashua

February 23, 2021

Senate Committee on Election Law and Municipal Affairs  
State House Room 100  
107 N. Main Street  
Concord, NH 03301

RE: Senate Bill 52

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

I am writing in opposition to SB 52, which would take away local control from the City of Nashua and impose a budget cap by legislative action.

Right now — at the worst time, in the middle of the pandemic — the State of New Hampshire is forcing Nashua to increase its budget and is raising Nashua's tax rate by 5.5%.

The State has informed the City that it is hiking the City's pension costs by \$4.4 million over and above what would be caused by any increase in wages. This action alone amounts to a 2% property tax increase. This increase will make Nashua's total pension bill \$29 million. According to the State Retirement System, 80% of this bill — or about \$24 million — is caused by the State's desire to increase the assets of the State Retirement System and not needed to pay benefits for current City employees.

The State originally enticed the cities and towns into the State pension system by promising that it would pay 35% of municipal pension costs. The State has broken that promise in recent years, costing Nashua taxpayers a cumulative total of \$74 million.

In addition to the hike in the City's pension bill, the State has informed the City of Nashua that State school aid will be cut by \$7.4 million next year — from about \$39 million down to about \$32 million.

The tax effect of these two State actions is an \$11.8 tax hit upon the hardworking taxpayers of the City of Nashua, or a 5.5% tax increase.

At the same time the State is raising Nashua's taxes and increasing Nashua's budget, SB 52 would prevent the City from increasing its budget to offset the State's downshifting.

Before considering SB 52, the State should appropriate \$11.8 million to Nashua so that SB 52 affects only the decisions made by the City of Nashua, independent of the State's decision to downshift more costs.

# Jim Donchess

Mayor • City of Nashua

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jim Donchess". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the left of the typed name.

Jim Donchess, Mayor  
City of Nashua

**From:** Mike Chrissis <[mike.chrissis@gmail.com](mailto:mike.chrissis@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 26, 2021 8:44 PM

**To:** ~Senate Democrats <[Senate.Democrats@leg.state.nh.us](mailto:Senate.Democrats@leg.state.nh.us)>; ~Senate Republicans <[SenateRepublicans@leg.state.nh.us](mailto:SenateRepublicans@leg.state.nh.us)>

**Subject:** Support of SB 52

I am unable to call in to voice my support for this legislation but I urge you to support it to remove the clerical errors that permit city legislative bodies to go on spending sprees.

I am in support of SB52 an Act relative to city charter provisions for tax caps. There are two main considerations to address: responding to the recommendations of the opinions of NH Supreme Court Justices who wrote, in 2018, relative to RSA 49-C:33; and to address "loopholes" in the text of RSA 49-C:33 paragraph d which sets the framework for cities to establish tax or spending caps.

Michael P. W. Chrissis

Nashua

To the New Hampshire Senate in support of SB52 an Act relative to city charter provisions for tax caps.

I am in support of SB52 an Act relative to city charter provisions for tax caps. The purpose of SB52 is to rectify the current inconsistencies within RSA 49-C:33, the statute that sets the framework for cities to establish tax or spending caps.

Historically, the Mayor of the City of Nashua and the Board of Aldermen had met the intent of the spending cap as established in its City Charter for several Mayoral administrations. There were occasional instances where it was necessary to override the spending cap, which was done via a supermajority vote.

However, there are growing instances where the Mayor and Board of Aldermen have bypassed the intent of the spending cap via maneuvers that allowed spending in excess of the cap - only requiring a simple majority vote - while still claiming to meet the letter of the spending cap as written in the charter.

The two main problems successfully resolved in SB52 are:

- (1) the bill responds to the recommendations of the NH Supreme Court Justices who wrote, in 2018, relative to RSA 49-C:33, l(d); and
- (2) the current inconsistencies in the text of RSA 49-C:33, specifically paragraph d, which sets the framework for cities to establish tax or spending caps.

The spending cap is a single sentence in the City Charter and its over-ride provision is a 2nd sentence located immediately following the cap sentence. Leading up to 2017 the City of Nashua had met the intent of the spending cap for several Mayoral administrations. There were instances where the Mayor and Board of Aldermen decided it was necessary to override the spending cap via a supermajority vote.

In 2017, as a result of the Mayor and a simple majority of the Board of Aldermen once again managed to devise an accounting maneuver to spend in excess of the spending cap while still claiming to meet the letter of the Cap as written in the Charter, I filed a lawsuit against the Mayor and the City. At roughly the same time a second person, Fred Teeboom, filed a lawsuit against the Mayor and the City. Our cases were merged by the judge. The case resulted in a trial court ruling against us on 2 counts, however the appellate court ruled more favorably in part. Most relevant, however, is the precedent setting NH Supreme Court holding that establishes that no override clause currently exists which meet the requirements of RSA 49-C:33.l(d).

The ruling nullifies the actions of prior Mayoral administrations, along with the supermajority vote of those Boards of Aldermen, which overrode the spending cap via a clause well understood to be an override provision in compliance with RSA 49-C:33.l(d). Rather, the NH Supreme Court holds that the clause in question is actually an "exclusion" - not an override - and thus does not meet the letter of the law and is therefore unenforceable.

In its 3-2 ruling in support of this holding, several opinions were written to explain the judgement. The

problem lies within the current wording of RSA-C:33 that refers to both an “exclusion” and an “override.”

Even though a city’s tax cap or spending cap may intend to provide an override mechanism via the use of an exclusion and even though the voters’ may have already supported this intention via passing a referendum and putting into law such a process, the judges decided this was not allowable because of vague or inconsistent wording.

In addition, SB52 paragraphs d.3. and d.4 rectify the conflicting language in the current version of RSA 49-C:33.I(d). These inconsistencies (specifically the one addressed by SB52 paragraph d.3) were used by the Nashua Mayor and Board of Aldermen in 2017 to bypass the spending cap and were the incentive for filing the original court case to protect the spending cap.

I offer my support of SB52 based on my 6 years’ first-hand experience in the municipal legislation process. I have discussed, considered, and voted for or against 6 city budgets. I have led a court case on this topic. I have been influenced by the rule of law established: I recommend supporting SB52.

SB52 will resolve misinterpretations and prevent manipulations of established spending caps in future budgeting for any city across New Hampshire where the tax-paying residents have spoken in support of reasonable spending and expect their representatives to act within the law.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Daniel T Moriarty, Nashua, NH



## Tricia Melillo

---

**From:** Ray Chadwick <rfchadwick@juno.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 28, 2021 10:03 AM  
**To:** Tricia Melillo  
**Cc:** dmc2015@comcast.net; danmcguire@gmail.com; avardsenate@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Senate Bill 52

Dear Senate Election Law and Municipal Affairs Committee Members

I testify on behalf of Granite State Taxpayers, New Hampshire's oldest state-wide Taxpayer advocacy group, founded in 1990 by the late Governor Mel Thomson and the late NH Senator George Lovejoy.

Granite State Taxpayers supports SB 52 that requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a super-majority vote.

As our founder, Mel Thomson, famously said: "Low taxes are the result of low spending."

Tax and Budget Spending Caps are a legal, voter approved common-sense budgeting requirement for City governments to respect and follow. They typically limit budget and spending increases to the rate of inflation, and provide a legal check on the growth of spending.

They also typically provide an override clause to allow for dealing with extraordinary, and one would say emergency, spending situations.

Our main goal is to support and defend the taxpayers from interests that are too eager to increase spending and raise taxes.

Too often and too easily budgets seem to reflect the fact that elected officials fail to seek out efficiencies or other strategies that constrain spending.

In short, they need to act more frugally, like they would if they were spending their own money, not other people's money.

Of course, they aren't spending their own money; they are spending the money earned by the taxpayers.

Without spending cap laws, which require respect for other people's money, budgets and taxes can run up in an uncontrolled fashion.

Advocates for spending increases are focused and insistent, while taxpayers in general are not.

The consequence is that City governments occasionally seek to implement higher spending in contravention of established tax and spending caps, or resort to strategies to "reclassify" certain spending as being exempt from the spending cap.

We support SB 52 that requires city charter exclusions and ordinances that have the effect of an override of a tax cap, to require a super-majority vote.

Thank you for your attention and your work on behalf of the citizens of New Hampshire.

Ray

Ray Chadwick, Chairman  
Granite State Taxpayers  
101 Powder Hill Road  
Bedford, NH 03110  
1-603-566-9129  
[www.GraniteStateTaxpayers.org](http://www.GraniteStateTaxpayers.org)

**From:** Fred Teeboom <fredtee@comcast.net>

**Date:** March 1, 2021 at 12:46:58 PM EST

**To:** Richard Lehmann <rick@nhlawyer.com>, Kevin Avard <avardsenate@gmail.com>, James Gray <James.Gray@leg.state.nh.us>

**Cc:** Dan Moriarty <aldermanmoriarty@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Amended SB52: Hows it affects NH communities who have a local tax or spending cap

Hi Sen. Gray:

I watched your committee meeting this morning (1 March) on Zoom. The request came up to have Manchester and Derry review the amendment (2021-0447s) to SB52.

1. Paragraph 1 of the amendment **fixes Nashua's problem** and several other communities (inc. **Rochester**) with a tax/spending caps predating year 2011 that could be legally challenged, same as Nashua. The amendment deletes the phrase in RSA 49-B:13, II-a the NH Supreme Court decided (Case #2018-0171) terminated the grandfather status of Nashua's charter beyond July 5, 2011 when the legislature enacted a tax/spending cap law.
2. Paragraph 2 of the amended SB52 **for cities** in RSA 49-C:33, I(d) and paragraph 3 of the amended SB52 **for towns** in RSA 49-D:3, I(e) removes the risk for several communities (**incl.. Manchester and Derry**). These communities amended their charter after July 5, 2011 with changes that do not fully conform with the NH July 5 2011 tax/spending cap law and could therefore be legally challenged.
  - The amendment allows bonded debt and capital. expenditures in addition to other enumerated budget items to be excluded from the capped budget with a 2/3 vote.

I have attached my spreadsheet for the eight (8) communities that have enacted local tax/spending caps in New Hampshire. I recently sent Atty. Lehman the tax/spending cap language extracted from the charters of these eight communities, from which I built this spread sheet, for his review.

Perhaps you may find it useful to forward this message (or a brief version thereof) to the members on your committee.

Fred Teeboom  
Nashua

---

# Voting Sheets

1:32 p.m  
3/8/21-  
Requested  
OLS.

**Senate Election Law  
& Municipal Affairs Committee**  
EXECUTIVE SESSION RECORD  
2021 Session

Bill # SB 52

Hearing date: 1-28-2021

Executive Session date: 3/1/21

Motion of: OTP Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Member	Present	Made by	Second	Yes	No
Sen. Gray, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Birdsell, Vice Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Ward	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Soucy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Perkins-Kwoka	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Motion of: 0447s Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

Committee Member	Present	Made by	Second	Yes	No
Sen. Gray, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Birdsell, Vice Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Ward	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Soucy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Perkins-Kwoka	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Motion of: OTP/A Vote: 3-2

Committee Member	Present	Made by	Second	Yes	No
Sen. Gray, Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Birdsell, Vice Chair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Ward	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Soucy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sen. Perkins-Kwoka	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Reported out by: Sen. Gray

Notes: Senator Birdsell Asking Perry

# Committee Report



## General Court of New Hampshire - Bill Status System

**Docket of SB52**

Docket Abbreviations

**Bill Title:** (New Title) relative to municipal charter provisions for tax caps.*Official Docket of SB52.:*

<b>Date</b>	<b>Body</b>	<b>Description</b>
1/19/2021	S	<b>Introduced</b> 01/06/2021 and Referred to Election Law and Municipal Affairs; <b>SJ 3</b>
1/21/2021	S	Remote <b>Hearing:</b> 01/28/2021, 09:00 am; Links to join the hearing can be found in the Senate Calendar; <b>SC 8</b>
3/9/2021	S	Committee Report: Ought to Pass with Amendment <b>#2021-0710s</b> , 03/18/2021; <b>SC 15</b>
3/18/2021	S	Committee Amendment <b>#2021-0710s</b> , RC 14Y-10N, AA; 03/18/2021; <b>SJ 8</b>
3/18/2021	S	<b>Ought to Pass with Amendment</b> 2021-0710s, RC 14Y-10N, MA; OT3rdg; 03/18/2021; <b>SJ 8</b>
3/31/2021	H	Introduced (in recess of) 02/25/2021 and referred to Municipal and County Government <b>HJ 4</b> P. 50
5/17/2021	H	Public Hearing: 05/17/2021 09:00 am Members of the public may attend using the following link: To join the webinar: <a href="https://www.zoom.us/j/91407870095">https://www.zoom.us/j/91407870095</a> / Executive session on pending legislation may be held throughout the day (time permitting) from the time the committee is initially convened.
5/25/2021	H	Majority Committee Report: Ought to Pass (Vote 10-9; RC) <b>HC 26</b> P. 27
5/25/2021	H	Minority Committee Report: Inexpedient to Legislate
6/4/2021	H	Lay on Table (Rep. Maggiore): MF DV 186-186 06/04/2021 <b>HJ 9</b> P. 5
6/4/2021	H	Indefinitely Postpone (Rep. Maggiore): MF <b>RC 174-197</b> 06/04/2021 <b>HJ 9</b> P. 6
6/4/2021	H	<b>Ought to Pass:</b> MA <b>RC 195-177</b> 06/04/2021 <b>HJ 9</b> P. 8
6/4/2021	H	Reconsider (Rep. True): MF <b>RC 171-201</b> 06/04/2021 <b>HJ 9</b> P. 21
6/17/2021	H	Enrolled (in recess of) 06/10/2021
6/17/2021	S	Enrolled Adopted, VV, (In recess 06/10/2021); <b>SJ 20</b>
6/22/2021	S	Signed by the Governor on 06/21/2021; Chapter 0088; Effective 08/20/2021

NH House

NH Senate

# Other Referrals



**Senate Inventory Checklist for Archives**

Bill Number: SB 52

Senate Committee: ELMA

Please include all documents in the order listed below and indicate the documents which have been included with an "X" beside

Final docket found on Bill Status

**Bill Hearing Documents: {Legislative Aides}**

Bill version as it came to the committee

All Calendar Notices

Hearing Sign-up sheet(s)

Prepared testimony, presentations, & other submissions handed in at the public hearing

Hearing Report

NA Revised/Amended Fiscal Notes provided by the Senate Clerk's Office

**Committee Action Documents: {Legislative Aides}**

All amendments considered in committee (including those not adopted):

- amendment # 0447s     - amendment # 0710s

\_\_\_ - amendment # \_\_\_    \_\_\_ - amendment # \_\_\_

Executive Session Sheet

Committee Report

**Floor Action Documents: {Clerk's Office}**

All floor amendments considered by the body during session (only if they are offered to the senate):

\_\_\_ - amendment # \_\_\_    \_\_\_ - amendment # \_\_\_

\_\_\_ - amendment # \_\_\_    \_\_\_ - amendment # \_\_\_

**Post Floor Action: (if applicable) {Clerk's Office}**

\_\_\_ Committee of Conference Report (if signed off by all members. Include any new language proposed by the committee of conference):

\_\_\_ Enrolled Bill Amendment(s)

\_\_\_ Governor's Veto Message

**All available versions of the bill: {Clerk's Office}**

as amended by the senate     as amended by the house

final version

Completed Committee Report File Delivered to the Senate Clerk's Office By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Aide

8/4/21  
Date

Senate Clerk's Office