

1 CONWAY CHARTER COMMISSION AGENDA  
2 CONWAY TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM  
3 23 MAIN STREET, CONWAY NH  
4

5  
6 November 8, 2023, 5:30 PM  
7

8  
9 The following members were present: Ray Leavitt and Victoria Noel Blake, Mark Guerrigue,  
10 Eliza Grant, Harrison Kanzler, Karen Umberger, S. Sand, David Weathers, and Thomas Holmes.

11 **Pledge of Allegiance**

12 Those able stood for the pledge of allegiance.

13 **Approval of Agenda**

14 ***K. Umberger moved to approve the agenda as presented seconded by H. Kanzler.***  
15 ***Vote in favor 9-0.***

16 ***K. Umberger moved to strike item #4; seconded by D. Weathers.***  
17 ***Vote in favor 9-0***

18 **Preamble**

19 T. Holmes- any comments on the preamble?

20 K. Umberger- I thought it was excellent.

21 ***S. Sand motioned to accept the preamble and purpose as presented; seconded by H. Kanzler.***  
22 ***Vote in favor 9-0***

23 **Budget Committee Transition**

24 K. Umberger- I was concerned that Stacy did not include the fact that the Red Stone Fire District  
25 is dissolved 1-1-24. Under the current rules nothing would happen, but under the charter, that  
26 would open up a budget committee seat when we had the election and that would provide 1  
27 seat without stretching it out.

28 S. Sand- it does address that by saying if the districts dissolves that would take effect, so I didn't  
29 take that into account because it hasn't happened yet, and I don't know for a fact that it's going  
30 to happen.

31 K. Umberger- the only concern I have is that this is going out to 2030. I don't think we need to  
32 go beyond 8.

33 S. Sand- but it shows how the people who've been elected, how it would fall versus cause if it  
34 was the same amount every year like it is now I would not have done that.

35 D. Weathers- if you stay with what you have now and you don't go along with having councilors  
36 then were going to have to rewrite or I would suggest that we rewrite. Theres a lot of good  
37 ideas that should be incorporated into our existing charter.

38 E. Grant- so the options are status quo or exactly this proposal, and if we choose this proposal,  
39 this is where we go. If it goes back to the status quo, then there's the opportunity to revisit the  
40 existing.

41 T. Holmes- the attorney had a side note that were going to have a special election and we  
42 should talk to the Moderator and the Supervisor of the Checklist. He's proposing a June 11<sup>th</sup>,  
43 2024, special election.

44 S. Sand- if that position is dissolved at the first of the year, that means the Board will be an even  
45 number. Both of these transitions are wrong because what exists now will not exist the  
46 following election. I think I can rework the numbers to make it odd.

47 K. Umberger- it is not going to take longer. When you run into an issue is when the Charter  
48 doesn't pass.

49 V. Blake- so if nothing passes then it will be an issue.

50 H. Kanzler- we can also go back to the option of here are the number of seats and so it all in one  
51 year. Have the special election for all members of the budget committee the first year and lay  
52 out the terms one to three staggered, and there you go. It may hurt some feelings, but it is  
53 getting it done.

54 D. Weathers- and if you go under that assumption when that election occurs, they'll literally will  
55 sign up for either 1-, 2-, or 3-year terms when they run.

56 V. Blake- I feel like it's our job to force that situation if there's going to be change.

57 S. Sands and R. Leavitt will bring back a recommendation. H. Kanzler also indicated he would  
58 provide something on the Budget Committee transition.

59 T. Holmes- we will put the Budget Committee item on hold. Next to discuss is the draft hold  
60 items.

61 3.5- we held this because we had vacancies in different places.

62 3.2. takeout the last sentence address the election of vice and chair.

63 3.1 T. Holmes- I wanted to revisit the idea of 7 councilors. I believe it is endangering this  
64 passing. In the future if there is a need for 7 councilors then it is a simple warrant article. Once  
65 we get this structure of government in. so I would like to reconsider the 7 and bring it back to 5.

66 S. Sand- I strongly feel one of my purviews when I was elected was to have better  
67 representation in Town and my feeling is that the status quo, same with the budget committee,  
68 as with the Select Board they don't want to change, there happy with how things are.

69 H. Kanzler- I agree with Stacy, a lot of what we have done so far is updates with minor changes.  
70 I cannot imagine looking at this and voting it down due to the number of Selectmen. With all  
71 that we have put in here, having more representation should be better and we should not turn  
72 it back.

73 M. Guerrigue- I think if you had 7 there might be a sense that you might get some new people  
74 and get the younger generation out there.

75 David Weathers left the meeting at 6:10 pm.

76 T. Holmes- adding 2 more can be a warrant article in 2025.

77 H. Kanzler- what is the rational of adding 2 more people a real reason to not have this move  
78 forward.

79 T. Holmes- as was stated, the Selectmen like their jobs and like their committees and don't  
80 want to give them up.

81 H. Kanzler- they won't lose them; they are adding help.

82 R. Leavitt- this charter we are making to look to years down the road. We cannot put this  
83 together for the convenience of the boards that sit now. We have to look at where the town  
84 needs to go. I can't vote against something just because I want to vote against it. I think we put  
85 the best foot forward and let the voters decide.

86 E. Grant- my perception if this fails, it is because people don't want to go to a council, and a 5-  
87 to-7-member board is not going to save that. I hear that the hesitation is the council as it takes  
88 more control away from the voters. I am curious of the proposal of the 5 members. I feel 5 is a  
89 weird middle ground.

90 ***S. Sand motioned that we remove "in subsequent years...."at the end of 3.2; and accept the***  
91 ***changes from 3.1-3.5; seconded by E. Grant***  
92 ***Vote in favor 8-0***

93 **H. Kanzler motioned to accept 3.16 as amended; seconded by K. Umberger**  
94 **Vote in favor 8-0**

95 **S. Sand motioned to accept items 3.6-3.16; seconded by K. Umberger.**  
96 **Vote in favor 8-0**

97 K. Umberger- under 5.8, I think I still need to revisit it. I don't think that we would have adopted  
98 it in our current charter if it wasn't legal. I think the date on this is 2009, so I will type it up as it  
99 is. I suggest we hold until the next meeting.

100 **E. Grant motioned to accept 9.3 as written; seconded by H. Kanzler**  
101 **Vote in favor 7-1**

102 H. Kanzler- is there any interest from anyone else present to add an educational requirement  
103 for the Planning Board?

104 T. Holmes- I'm not in favor of taking people's rights to run for office away due besides  
105 residency.

106 H. Kanzler- it's not, it would be required to do it within the first year.

107 R. Leavitt- I don't necessarily go along with that, not that I don't think they should be educated,  
108 but I think that can be done through the natural process of bringing them on. I think this  
109 requirement is counterproductive.

110 H. Kanzler- Bringing people on board is great if they know what they are doing and how they  
111 are operating is legal. I think it would also reduce the running of candidates based on 1 issue.

112 E. Grant- OPD does have some free training. There is a lot of educational stuff that we would  
113 like to do, but due to budget concerns we have not been able to do that. I think multiple  
114 members have expressed wanting to go to classes, but the budget has not allowed it.

115 R. Leavitt- I would go for the recommendation vs mandatory. Our requirements continually  
116 expand and grow, and I would hate to have someone who was pretty talented and not run for  
117 office because of the requirement.

118 K. Umberger- can we put it in 10? As a recommendation? Make it 10.6.

119 R. Leavitt- it could read, any officer holder may avail themselves of any pertinent training.

120 **E. Grant motioned to add the language to 10.6 any officer holder may avail themselves of any**  
121 **pertinent training; seconded by R. Leavitt.**  
122 **Vote fails 4-4**

123 M. Guerrigue- I don't see the value in it if it is recommended.

124 ***S. Sand motioned to approve article 11 excluding 11c; seconded by E. Grant.***

125 ***Vote in favor 8-0***

126 H. Kanzler- I think looking back I think Karens transition plan I believe that Karens is an  
127 actionable and reasonable plan that we could adopt now. It accounts for the dissolution it  
128 already has. We would just need to lower the number of elected members to 9, and then it  
129 gives the reason why and the plan to make that happen.

130 ***R. Leavitt motioned to accept article 12 with the revisions and 12.8 to be revisited; seconded***  
131 ***by H. Kanzler.***

132 ***Vote in favor 8-0***

133 K. Umberger- I will make the edits and send it off.

134 T. Holmes- we still have to write a preliminary report and send it to the lawyer.

135 **Public Comments**

136 **Adjournment**

137

138 ***T. Holmes adjourned the meeting.***

139

140 Respectfully Submitted,

141

142 Alicia Jipson

143 Recording Secretary