

GRAFTON COUNTY DELEGATION VOTE ON FY26 BUDGET

Administration Building

North Haverhill, NH 03774

June 23, 2025

PRESENT: See attached spreadsheet

Rep. Sykes called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM and began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Rep. Barton stated that they need to adopt the agenda for their meeting. Rep. Sykes stated that he does not believe they have ever adopted an agenda for their meetings. Rep. Barton stated that under the rules of order for this Delegation, they adopt agendas.

MOTION: Rep. Barton moved to adopt the proposed agenda. Rep. Sellers seconded the motion.

MOTION: Rep. Barton moved to amend the agenda as follows: moving Item #1 – FY26 Budget to line item #3, after old and new business. Rep. Sellers seconded the amendment.

Rep. Barton stated that he would propose addressing old business and new business before discussing the budget. Rep. McFarlane asked Rep. Sykes, regarding the proposed agenda, why the approval of the previous Delegation meeting minutes was not included. CA Libby stated that the Executive Committee approved the Delegation meeting minutes at their January meeting. Rep. McFarlane asked why the Delegation does not approve their minutes. Rep. Ladd stated that it is in their bylaws that if appropriate or necessary due to situations of calendar timing or general election outcomes, the Executive Committee may approve Delegation meeting minutes. CA Libby explained that when they meet in June, these minutes have to be sent to the Department of Revenue Administration to set the tax rate, and the Delegation is not scheduled to meet again until next June. She stated that they would not want to call the whole Delegation back for another meeting, only to approve a set of minutes. Rep. McFarlane stated that if that is the case, he would ask where they would find the minutes. He also noted that, given what they were just told, the bylaws have a conditional “if” clause, and they were just informed why that “if” clause would apply to the June set of minutes, but they do not know why it would apply to the December meeting minutes. Rep. Sykes stated that the minutes are available online. Rep. Oppel stated that the Delegation met in December and has not met since then; it is now June. He stated that there is a right-to-know law and a requirement regarding when minutes are to be made available to the public. Rep. Barton stated that draft minutes can be sent out until they accept the final minutes. The right-to-know regards approved minutes. Rep. Sykes requested a vote on this motion.

Rep. Barton stated that this motion is debatable and he would like to speak in favor of his motion. The reason he would like to move the budget behind old and new business is that, traditionally, agendas address old business before they entertain new business. Rep. Barton stated that there is no old or new business listed and asked why it is on the agenda. Rep. Sykes stated that this is the agenda form that is in their bylaws.

MOTION: Rep. Barton moved to amend his amended motion further and strike old and new business from the agenda.

Rep. Sykes suggested that their primary purpose for being there today is to ensure they have a budget set within the time frame they have to complete it. Rep. Barton stated that this is standard order of business. Rep. Sykes noted that at all meetings, he asks for new or old business as part of the agenda, in case any items need to be addressed. Rep. Barton stated that he would rescind his last motion and he would entertain his motion to move the budget behind those two (2) line items. Rep. McFarlane stated that he would speak in support of the motion, as they need to consider old business before the move to the budget because it is important for this body to come to a shared understanding and agreement of the actions of the Chairman of the last Delegation meeting, which have been inaccurately reflected in the minutes. He will be petitioning to change the minutes.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the amendment. Rep. Almy “no”, Rep. Baldwin “no”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “no”, Rep. Cormen “no”, Rep. Fracht “no”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “no”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “no”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “no”, Rep. Lucas “no”, Rep. Oppel “no”, Rep. Rockmore “no”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “no”, Rep. Stavis “no”, Rep. Stringham “no”, Rep. Sullivan “no”, Rep. Sykes “no”. With the vote being nine (9) in favor and sixteen (16) in opposition, the amendment fails.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the motion to adopt the proposed agenda. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “no”, Rep. Beaulier “no”, Rep. Berezhny “no”, Rep. Bjelobrk “no”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “no”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “no”, Rep. Louis “no”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “no”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes”. With the vote being seventeen (17) in favor and eight (8) in opposition, the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Muirhead moved to appropriate \$57,657,170 for fiscal year 2026, of which \$30,487,410 is to be raised by taxes. Rep. Cormen seconded the motion.

MOTION: Rep. McFarlane moved to amend the budget by inserting the following condition. Whereas the public has the right to accessible and transparent county government, and whereas residents across Grafton County including those in the underserved and outlying areas should be able to observe and participate in the public business of their elected Commissioners without unreasonable barriers, therefore no funds shall be expended from the following three (3) accounts unless and until the Grafton County Commissioners reinstate the practice of permitting remote attendance at and remote public comment during all public sessions of the Commissioner meetings via a publicly accessible virtual platform such as Zoom that allows real time remote participation by members of the public. The accounts in question are the 01-4100-700

Travel & Expense - Commissioner, 01-4100-711 Travel Expense, and 01-4100-670 Advertising and PR, under the Commissioner's Office. Rep. Barton seconded the amendment.

Rep. Beaulier asked to make a point of order. He stated that on the Grafton County website, under the "Meeting Links, Agendas, and Handouts" tab, it states that the Delegation Vote is scheduled for June 26th at 9:00 a.m. His concern is about the public having an adequate opportunity to participate in this meeting. He asked if it would be appropriate for a motion to definitely postpone the meeting so the public can have an adequate opportunity to participate. CA Libby stated that the actual meeting posting is correct; the incorrect date was listed as part of the team's link. Rep. Sykes asked if the actual meeting requirement for the posting is accurate. CA Libby stated that it was. Rep. Beaulier stated that, regardless of the legal requirement, if a member of the public goes to the website, it gives the impression that this will be on the 26th. Rep. Sykes stated that in order to pass a budget in a timely manner that will keep the County running, with the required public notices, today is about the last day they can do so. With that understanding, their only requirement is to have a quorum of members present to conduct county business, which they do have. Online is not a requirement under law, it is good to do, and he makes sure their Executive Committee and Delegation meetings are available online, but they have met the requirements necessary for them to conduct their business today. Rep. Barton stated that there could be legal concerns about their business, and it would revoke anything they do today, if the meeting was improperly noticed in any form, especially with the general public, as they have a right to view anything they do here. He stated that it seems as though it might have been intentional to mislead them. Rep. Sykes stated that Rep. Barton is ascribing motivation that he has no basis for doing so, and he will not accept that he can stand there and tell them that someone did something on purpose when he does not know that. Rep. Sykes stated that it is against the decorum typically observed in these meetings, where they attribute motivation to other individuals. It is not appropriate. Rep. Sykes added that he is reaching a point where he will start recognizing some of this for what it is; he wants them to move the business forward.

MOTION: Rep. Barton moved to postpone the meeting definitely. Rep. Beaulier seconded the motion.

Discussion: Rep. Spahr stated that he visited the Grafton County website, looked up the schedule, and found that the Delegation meeting is clearly posted for June 23rd at 9:00 a.m. and is very transparent. Rep. Sykes stated that Rep. Barton is trying to make a motion within a motion, and Rep. Barton stated that this motion proceeds Rep. McFarlane's motion because the meeting is incorrectly posted in one (1) location, especially a team's link. Some people may try to log in on the 26th. Rep. Sullivan stated that he is sympathetic in theory to what Rep. Barton is saying, but he cannot find the discrepancy, so he is not concerned, unless he can see it. Rep. Sykes asked that they vote on this motion.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy "no", Rep. Baldwin "no", Rep. Barton "yes", Rep. Beaulier "yes", Rep. Berezny "no", Rep. Bjelobrk "no", Rep. Bolton "no", Rep.

Cormen “no”, Rep. Fracht “no”, Rep. Franz “no”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “no”, Rep. Ladd “no”, Rep. Louis “no”, Rep. Lovett “no”, Rep. McFarlane “no”, Rep. Muirhead “no”, Rep. Lucas “no”, Rep. Oppel “no”, Rep. Rockmore “no”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “no”, Rep. Stavis “no”, Rep. Stringham “no”, Rep. Sullivan “no”, Rep. Sykes “no” With the vote being three (3) in favor and twenty-two (22) in opposition the motion fails.

Rep. McFarlane spoke to his amendment. He stated that many of the Delegates are well aware of the actions over the last several months by Commissioner McLeod and the Commissioners as a group. Some may be aware that it has become apparent that the action to stop the remote attendance is an action that is not supported by constituents. He stated that Commissioner McLeod has given the impression to many people that she is acting in a way that is deceptive and intended to reduce the transparency of Commissioner meetings. He would urge that they vote in favor of transparency and vote with one (1) of the Democrat Commissioners by voting for the restoration of Zoom meetings. Rep. Barton spoke in support of the motion. He stated that the Zoom link for the Commissioners' meeting was not made public. Grafton County is the second-largest county in the State of New Hampshire. For the general public to participate and hear what the Commissioners are discussing, they have had the technology to enable participation and listening, ensuring complete transparency. It is essential to have that, and since we are in a large county, offering something they have already provided before, allowing the public to participate, should move forward. He stated that he understands that they are not in COVID times anymore, but they have the technology and can save people gas and time. Rep. Beaulier noted that the meetings are available by audio recordings, but often not for several days. He feels it is worthwhile to have the meetings live virtually, and he hopes that everyone will support this motion.

Rep. Oppel stated that he is sympathetic to the intent of this motion, but the Executive Committee has expressed its strong support to return to the remote capabilities. He stated that it sounds like this motion would permit anyone to make a comment at any time, which would be disruptive to the meeting. Most public meetings allow for public comment at a designated time. Rep. Oppel added that he also finds it ironic that members of the whole house are dismissive of people testifying online regarding bills in Concord. He recognizes that Grafton County is a large county, and he believes remote opportunities should be available. However, traveling to Concord is also just as far, so he hopes people will support this being done in Concord as well. He will vote against this motion because he feels it is too restrictive.

Rep. Sullivan stated that they all support transparency in government, and to phrase it as if they vote yes or no means they are either for or against transparency is disingenuous. He stated that his understanding is that there is an issue of people being disruptive. They need a system where people can raise their concerns, online or in person, in an orderly manner, so the meeting can be conducted. To have a system where people can chime in at will is not the way. He will vote against this amendment because he does not believe they should hold the budget hostage, as he considers this a procedural process. Rep. Sellers stated that they are not holding the budget hostage. They want to withhold funding on these three (3) lines. He added that they are already paying for Zoom and Teams, and he does not understand why it stopped. Rep. Bjelobrk stated that the public is not interrupting the meetings, and comments are held till the end of the meeting. Rep. Ladd stated that he has not attended any Executive Committee meetings. When

they conduct a meeting in Concord, they stream the meetings, and there are options for the public to submit their testimony. Rep. Ladd asked what the Executive Committee has done in terms of trying to make this transparent. Rep. Sykes stated that the Executive Committee continues to make a Teams link available for their meetings. This change only affects the Commissioners' meeting. There is a willingness and intent on the Commissioners to return to virtual meetings once some technical issues are taken care of. Commissioner McLeod stated that this is on their agenda tomorrow, and the new IT Director is going to help them. They are not statutorily obligated to allow public comments, but they do. She stated that they will continue to accept public comments at the end of their meetings. She stated that the comments are pejorative, inaccurate, and suggest motivation. Rep. McFarlane stated that he was under the impression that this was a meeting of the delegates and was not aware that they recognized people who are not delegates. The assertion that this motion would require the public to be able to comment at all times is incorrect; this motion simply demands that there be an opportunity for public comment during the session.

MOTION: Rep. Hakken Phillips made a motion to move the question. Rep. Bolton seconded the motion.

Discussion: Rep. Barton requested an amendment to the motion. Rep. Sykes stated that the question has been moved. Rep. Barton noted that he had risen but was not recognized. Rep. Sykes stated that he does not believe moving the question is a debatable motion. Rep. Barton stated that as a point of order, amendments to a main motion under Roberts Rules of Order, which govern this body, take precedence over the main motion. Rep. Sykes stated that if Rep. Barton wants to add to Rep. Hakken-Phillips' motion, she has to accept it.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on moving the question. Rep. Almy "yes", Rep. Baldwin "yes", Rep. Barton "no", Rep. Beaulier "yes", Rep. Berezhny "yes", Rep. Bjelobrk "yes", Rep. Bolton "yes", Rep. Cormen "yes", Rep. Fracht "yes", Rep. Franz "yes", Rep. Hakken-Phillips "yes", Rep. Ladd "yes", Rep. Louis "yes", Rep. Lovett "yes", Rep. McFarlane "yes", Rep. Muirhead "yes", Rep. Lucas "yes", Rep. Oppel "yes", Rep. Rockmore "yes", Rep. Sellers "yes", Rep. Spahr "yes", Rep. Stavis "yes", Rep. Stringham "yes", Rep. Sullivan "yes", Rep. Sykes "yes". With the vote being twenty-four (24) in favor and one (1) in opposition, the motion passes.

Rep. Barton stated that he would like to offer an amendment to the main motion. Rep. Sykes stated that it is too late.

MOTION: Rep. Barton moved to appeal the chair's decision.

Rep. Sykes asked if there was such a thing in Robert's Rules. Rep. Barton stated that Roberts' Rules states that an appeal takes precedence over any question and requires a second.

There was no second to the motion.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the amendment to the budget motion. Rep. Almy “no”, Rep. Baldwin “no”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezchny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “no”, Rep. Cormen “no”, Rep. Fracht “no”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “no”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “no”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “no”, Rep. Lucas “no”, Rep. Oppel “no”, Rep. Rockmore “no”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavlis “no”, Rep. Stringham “no”, Rep. Sullivan “no”, Rep. Sykes “no”. With the vote being ten (10) in favor and fifteen (15) in opposition, the motion fails.

MOTION: Rep. Sellers moved to reduce the budget to \$56,935,055. Rep. Franz seconded the motion.

Discussion: Rep. Sellers stated that he was out sick last week when the Executive Committee met for deliberations, and he had issues with his microphone signing on to Teams. He explained that he reviewed the entire budget and identified 130 line items that comprise this reduction, representing a savings of \$647,667.00 over the Commissioners' values. Notably, not a single line item pertained to salary and benefits. There is room to reduce the budget without compromising the ability to operate. The tax increase would have been 11.32% and this reduction brings it down to 8.91%. Rep. Sellers added that if they did not use any surplus to reduce taxes, the Executive Committee budget would have had a 17.54% increase. He noted that it is good to use some surplus to reduce the amount to be raised by taxes.

Rep. Cormen stated that he appreciates what Rep. Sellers is trying to do and his effort to go through the budget line by line. He stated that without having seen the 130 lines that were proposed to be reduced, he does not have enough information to vote for it. Rep. Stringham also noted that he appreciates Rep. Sellers' participation on the Executive Committee, but he would not support this. The budget calls for about a 2.54% increase in expenses over last year and does so with a higher level of service. There is an increase in the census, which has an associated increased cost for caring for those residents. He shares the concern, but the increase is not due to spending. The state is not increasing Medicaid rates for nursing homes. He stated that the costs go up, but the revenue does not go up. Rep. Stringham also noted that the Proshare payment is variable, and this year was substantially less than expected, so they needed to adjust the figures they asked from property taxpayers. While they are above 10% in this request, when they average the last several years, they are under 3%. The state limits the county cap to 2% per year, but this year, the budget coming out of Concord calls for a 3% increase. There are downshifting impacts on this budget. Rep. Stringham stated that he appreciates Rep. Sellers' efforts to sharpen his pencil, but he does not have personal confidence in each line-item reduction. He relies on the highly qualified people they have working here to limit spending.

Rep. Barton stated that statutorily, they cannot go line by line to veto; they can only offer a final amount to reduce the budget line. He noted that the courthouse expense is unnecessary and that there is a lot of pork in the budget. The Commissioners can go back and look at it. They do not want higher taxes, and he trusts Rep. Sellers' assessment of the budget. Cuts could be made without detrimental impacts to salary and benefits. Rep.

Barton stated that he will support the motion. Rep. Almy stated that she appreciates Rep. Sellers finding 130 items that do not have anything to do with salary, but this county provides many essential services. She is worried about what the federal government may do to all of their budgets when they pass their final budget.

Rep. Sellers stated that he had spoken with the County Administrator about the ProShare payment, and it appears that they will have a better handle on calculating estimated payments going forward. His proposal still results in a 1.7% increase. Rep. Sellers discussed the tax impact and noted that Ashland is increasing by 23%, Dorchester is increasing by 21.93%, Franconia is increasing by 21.8%, and Holderness is increasing by 35.2%. He stated that some tax impacts are hurting the towns they represent. He noted that four (4) towns decreased.

Rep. McFarlane spoke to the amendment. He stated that he has looked through all the line items that are affected by this amendment. There are one (1) or two (2) items that he disagrees with, but he would ask that when they vote on this motion, they not vote on whether they disagree with a handful of items; instead, they vote on whether they want to reduce the budget to achieve a lower tax rate.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the motion. Rep. Almy “no”, Rep. Baldwin “no”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezchny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “no”, Rep. Cormen “no”, Rep. Fracht “no”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “no”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “no”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “no”, Rep. Lucas “no”, Rep. Oppel “no”, Rep. Rockmore “no”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “no”, Rep. Stavis “no”, Rep. Stringham “no”, Rep. Sullivan “no”, Rep. Sykes “no” With the vote being nine (9) in favor and sixteen (16) in opposition the motion fails.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the motion to appropriate \$57,657,170 for fiscal year 2026, of which \$30,487,410 is to be raised by taxes. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “no”, Rep. Beaulier “no”, Rep. Berezchny “no”, Rep. Bjelobrk “no”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “no”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “no”, Rep. Louis “no”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “no”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “no”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes”. With the vote being sixteen (16) in favor and nine (9) in opposition, the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Oppel moved to authorize the Treasurer to borrow Tax Anticipation Loans in an amount up to \$12,000,000. Rep. Hakken-Phillips seconded the motion.

Discussion – Rep. Sellers asked why they are requesting \$12 million this year. Treasurer Cryans stated that it looks like the County will run out of money around the end of July or the beginning of August. He explained that they need sufficient funds to cover the rest of the calendar year until they receive tax payments in December. He stated that they will

only take what they need, but if they do not vote for \$12 million and they need that much, they will need to have the Delegation meet again.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “no”, Rep. Beaulier “no”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “no”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-two (22) in favor and three (3) in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Lucas moved to contribute \$36,000 from Dispatch Fees for fiscal year 2026 to the Dispatch Capital Reserve Account. Rep. Almy seconded the motion.

Discussion: Rep. Barton inquired about the reason for voting on this. Rep. Sykes explained that they typically take a percentage of their Dispatch fee revenue and put it in the capital reserve account for equipment purchases.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Almy moved to expend \$32,000 from the Dispatch Capital Reserve account for equipment for the Dispatch Center. Rep. Spahr seconded the motion. Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Stringham moved to expend \$271,174 from the Nursing Home Capital Reserve account for equipment at the nursing home. Rep. Hakken Phillips seconded the motion.

Discussion – Rep. Stringham reported that the Executive Committee was given reasons for the expenditures out of the nursing home capital reserve, and they all seemed reasonable. Rep. Sellers asked if the ice maker has gone out to bid. CA Libby stated that

it will go out to bid once it has been approved in the budget. Rep. Sellers asked how they came up with this number in the budget. Supt. Oakes explained that they reach out to the vendor to get a budgetary number.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Rockmore moved to expend \$10,918 from the Register of Deeds Surcharge account for equipment. Rep. Almy seconded the motion. Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Oppel moved, Pursuant to NH RSA 104:31, to increase the Sheriff’s Fees by 3.4% for FY 26. Rep. Lucas seconded the motion.

Discussion: Rep. Barton inquired about the necessity of this measure. Rep. Oppel explained that the legislature authorized this with the passing of HB36. It is reimbursement for writ services provided by the Sheriff.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Cormen moved, Pursuant to [NH RSA 24:14](#), to authorize the Grafton County Board of Commissioners to apply for, receive and expend federal and/or state grants and/or other unanticipated funds that become available during the course of FY26, and also to accept and expend funds from any other governmental unit or private source to be used for purposes for which Grafton County may legally appropriate money, and the expenditure of such funds shall be exempt from restrictions on over-expenditures of appropriations. Rep. Oppel seconded the motion.

Discussion Rep. Berezhny asked if this is for one-time expenses. Rep. Sykes explained that when they apply for grants, there are reporting requirements as to where the money will be spent. This authorizes the County to spend only what is awarded through the grant. Rep. Sellers asked why these funds would be exempt from restrictions on over expenditures. Rep. Sykes explained that, according to the bylaws, if a department overspends an account by \$5,000, it must obtain approval from the Executive Committee. Rep. Sykes stated that they changed this motion, with regard to ARPA funds, so that the Executive Committee would have final approval for ARPA expenses. Rep. Sellers asked if this motion pertained to grants, and Rep. Sykes stated that was correct. Rep. Bjelobrk asked if this will never include taxpayer money, just grants. Rep. Sykes stated that there are no intentions from this motion to spend anything outside of grant funds. CA Libby stated that theoretically they would not accept a grant that would require them to pay more than the grant awarded, but noted that there are times when some grants have a match component, but that would be something that would be discussed. CA Libby gave an example of a current pending grant that the Sheriff's Department has applied for. If awarded, a grant fund is set up that those funds would run through. Rep. Berezhny asked what the downside would be if this motion did not pass. He wondered if the Delegation would have to meet each time a grant was applied for. CA Libby stated that, timing-wise, sometimes grant applications have timelines that they might not be able to meet if they needed to reconvene the Delegation. Rep. Beaulier asked if it were possible to split the difference and authorize this motion, subject to the Executive Committee reviewing and approving the grant applications. This would provide more flexibility for the Executive Committee and add another layer of oversight. Rep. Sykes stated that this is a possible amendment to the motion.

MOTION: Rep. Beaulier moved to amend the motion to authorize the motion, subject to Executive Committee reviewing the grant applications. Rep. Barton seconded.

Discussion: Rep. Almy stated that this paragraph was put into the bylaws when they were created, and it was Rep. Ladd who wrote it. Rep. Ladd stated that the Delegation votes on this in every Delegation meeting, and they have gone ahead with this wording due to timing. He would recommend that they support the motion that was presented, not the amendment. Rep. Sykes stated that in his experience, the original motion worked. They did make a change when ARPA funds were introduced, but he does not feel this change needs to be made. CA Libby explained that in circumstances where something abnormal arises, for example, the broadband grant, the Delegation was brought in to approve that grant before it was accepted. If it is something outside of the normal grants they receive, they ensure the Delegation is brought in to vote on it. Rep. Beaulier explained that this was to add additional oversight and transparency, and provide a relatively quick way to accept grants. Rep. Barton spoke in favor of the motion. He read RSA 24:14, which states the county convention may require that the County Commissioners obtain written authority from the Executive Committee before transferring any appropriations. He stated that it is sound to have some level of checks on the Commissioners. The Executive Committee meets more frequently than the full Delegation, and he does not feel it would be any time hindrance for the Executive Committee to be brought in on these

appropriations. Rep. McFarlane stated that he supports this amendment in light of the reference to the broadband grant. He stated that this grant has been available for a long time, and the transparency regarding what has been happening with that grant on the website is minimal. The last substantive documents date back to prior years. When they contemplate whether it is a large grant or a small grant, they do not have adequate transparency with the Commissioners at the moment. It is prudent that this be given to the Executive Committee.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the amendment. Rep. Almy “no”, Rep. Baldwin “no”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “no”, Rep. Cormen “no”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “no”, Rep. Ladd “no”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “no”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “no”, Rep. Lucas “no”, Rep. Oppel “no”, Rep. Rockmore “no”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “no”, Rep. Stavis “no”, Rep. Stringham “no”, Rep. Sullivan “no”, Rep. Sykes “no” With the vote being eight (8) in favor and sixteen (16) in opposition the amendment fails.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on Rep. Cormen’s motion. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “no”, Rep. Berezny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “no”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “no”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes” With the vote being twenty-two (22) in favor and three (3) in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. Fracht moved to appropriate \$5,000 for the Grafton County Unincorporated Place of Livermore for FY 2026. The Unincorporated place of Livermore’s Budget for 2026 is adopted separately from the Grafton County Budget. This motion is to comply with the NH Department of Revenue Administration’s instructions. Rep. Cormen seconded the motion.

Discussion – Rep. Beaulier asked why the County is spending money in Livermore. Rep. Sykes stated that if there is a motor vehicle accident in Livermore, there has to be a way to pay for it, and this is where the money would come from. CA Libby explained that Livermore pays county taxes, and part of this is to pay the property taxes to the County. She noted that Livermore expenses are offset by the payment in lieu of taxes the County receives from the Federal Government. There is no impact to the budget.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes”. With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition, the motion passes.

Old Business

Rep. McFarlane stated that he would like to read the bylaws related to minutes. The bylaws read as follows:

Written minutes shall reflect what business is conducted at meetings. The Approved minutes are the official written record that is kept and available to the public at the Grafton County Complex and on the County website. Minutes of the full Delegation shall be approved at a subsequent Delegation meeting. If appropriate and necessary due to situations of calendar timing or general election outcomes, the Executive Committee is authorized to approve or 'accept' minutes of previously held Delegation or Executive Committee meetings.

Rep. McFarlane stated that the fact that the Executive Committee approved those minutes according to the bylaws does not alleviate the need for the whole Delegation to approve them at the next Delegation meeting. It was not appropriate or necessary to approve those following the December 9th meeting. There was an argument made for the Executive Committee approving this set of minutes, and that argument was in accordance with 91:a. He stated that bylaws also state that unapproved draft meeting minutes shall be available and open to public inspection not more than 5 business days after the meeting (RSA 91-A:2.II). Rep. McFarlane stated that there is a practice of publishing draft minutes and making them available with right-to-know requests. He stated that it is not appropriate or necessary for the Executive Committee to approve the Delegation minutes from December 9th. He would request that they revisit those minutes and revisit this practice.

Rep. McFarlane is seeking to achieve transparency by allowing delegates to approve their own minutes and ensuring that they have accurate and complete minutes from their meetings. Rep. Oppel stated that RSA 91:A, in spirit, is about transparency, which is why there is a requirement that minutes be made available within five (5) days, approved or not. For the public to wait six (6) months in this case, to find out whether minutes are approved or in draft, seems to be antithetical to what Rep. McFarlane is saying. He would think the public would want to know as soon as possible whether the minutes are approved. The bylaws clearly enable the Executive Committee to approve minutes in circumstances where the Delegation will not meet for a period of time, and delaying that until the Delegation meeting again does not serve transparency. Rep. McFarlane asked Rep. Oppel if he believes that would be consistent with the current writing in the bylaws, and if so, how he believes it is not transparent or necessary to do this. How does he believe that it is appropriate that a body that is not the Delegation votes on what the Delegation did? Rep. Oppel stated that the answer to that is in the bylaws. The Delegation granted authority to the Executive Committee to approve Delegation minutes as necessary. Rep. Sykes stated that Grafton County was the first county to establish bylaws. If they were to change the way minutes are approved, he would recommend that it be at the first meeting of a new Delegation when they address the bylaws.

MOTION: Rep. McFarlane moved that the Delegation express its clear intent as already expressed in the bylaws, that the Delegation shall be responsible for approving Delegation minutes with the sole exception of when it is necessary due to calendar timing or general elections, not when it is solely for purposes of "transparency" or convenience.

Rep. Oppel asked if a motion to change the bylaws was appropriate at this time. Rep. McFarlane stated that he is not moving to change the bylaws but to respect them and follow them. Rep. Sykes stated that the motion that was read is, in fact trying to change how minutes are accepted, and he does not believe the motion is in order.

Rep. McFarlane withdrew his motion.

MOTION: Rep. McFarlane moved to amend the minutes from December 9th, 2024. Rep. Barton seconded the motion.

Rep. Sykes stated that these minutes have been approved and published, and he does not see how they can now change them after approval. Rep. McFarlane stated that they can change the minutes by making a motion to amend them. Rep. Sykes stated that the time to have done that would have been at the Executive Committee meeting, in which they were approved. Rep. McFarlane stated that he is not part of the Executive Committee, and it is not in accordance with the bylaws for the Executive Committee to approve those minutes. It is still a proper motion and requires 2/3 majority. Rep. Barton had a point of order. He stated that this body has purview over the minutes, whether another body has adopted them or not, and they can be corrected. He stated that he believes that Rep. McFarlane intends to have these corrections made that the Executive Committee overlooked, and have this body ratify the minutes. Rep. Hakken-Phillips stated that once minutes are approved, that motion is then closed. She believes Rep. McFarlane is asking for reconsideration of that approval. She thinks that would be the opportunity to try to open the amendment, but she does not believe they can do that once the approval has been passed. Rep. McFarlane noted that he is not requesting a reconsideration; he is seeking an amendment.

Rep. Ladd stated that he is concerned. At the first meeting of the Delegation, they have always looked at the bylaws. They consider revising or changing them in some way, but they have always done it this way. When these bylaws were developed, a subcommittee was appointed by the Executive Committee to oversee the process. The subcommittee met numerous times, with meetings publicly noticed. When they examined the issue of the Executive Committee approving Delegation minutes, there are times when it is necessary for this to happen. If they take that ability away, there will be times when the Delegation will not meet in a timely manner. There needs to be room for adjustment, and that is why there is an Executive Committee. Rep. Ladd stated that the way they wrote the bylaws is accurate, and they have never had a problem.

Rep. Sykes stated that they need to move on. This is not a motion that would be appropriate at this time. The bylaws were previously on the agenda. Rep. McFarlane stated that the current motion has nothing to do with bylaws and is not intended to question them. Rep. Sykes stated that the motion, in his opinion, was not in order. Rep. Barton stated that in the very beginning of this meeting, they adopted an agenda. The opportunity to discuss business regarding minutes should have been added to the agenda. It is neither old nor new business. Ratifying the minutes should have been part of the

agenda, and he agrees with the chair that the motion is not in order. Rep. Barton stated that he would recommend a bylaws committee be formed to review this issue with the approval of the minutes. He stated that he would recommend that Rep. McFarlane be on that committee. Rep. Barton withdrew his second. Rep. Sykes noted that he was not accepting that motion at this time.

New Business

1. Rep. Beaulier stated that he would like to bring forth a resolution for this body that shows their support and cooperation with U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement, in line with HB511 and SB 62, which Governor Ayotte signed. He stated that it would be worthwhile for this body to make its position known and send a signal to the other members of the county government about where this body stands. Rep. Stavis stated that she does not believe it is the business of this Delegation to send a message to other county Delegations. She thinks it is the business of this Delegation to vote on motions listed in the agenda. Rep. Beaulier stated that this is new business, and he is under the understanding that a member of the Delegation can make a motion to adopt a resolution, as other county Delegations do similar things. Rep. Stavis noted that the business of this Delegation is Grafton County, not other counties. Rep. Beaulier stated that this is in regard to Grafton County. It is about support for ICE within Grafton County and local law enforcement cooperating with the federal government, which is a concern to Grafton County, given its proximity to the national border. Rep. Oppel stated that he sees no point in this Delegation taking a position that is a repetition of what is now state law. Rep. Sykes stated that he would agree that the state law passed would achieve what was discussed. He does not want to set a precedent that the Delegation makes resolutions on every state law that is passed. Rep. Sellers stated that part of their concern, given that the Commissioners issued a statement and their Sheriff signed on to 287 (g), is that they think, as a Delegation, they need to show support for the Sheriff and the laws. Rep. Beaulier stated that if a member doesn't like the resolution, then vote against it; he is asking that they be allowed to speak about it.

MOTION: Rep. Hakken Phillips moved to table the resolution so the Executive Committee can review it with more time. Rep. Rockmore seconded the motion. Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy "yes", Rep. Baldwin "yes", Rep. Barton "no", Rep. Beaulier "no", Rep. Berezhny "no", Rep. Bjelobrk "no", Rep. Bolton "yes", Rep. Cormen "yes", Rep. Fracht "yes", Rep. Franz "no", Rep. Hakken-Phillips "yes", Rep. Ladd "yes", Rep. Louis "no", Rep. Lovett "yes", Rep. McFarlane "no", Rep. Muirhead "yes", Rep. Lucas "yes", Rep. Oppel "yes", Rep. Rockmore "yes", Rep. Sellers "no", Rep. Spahr "yes", Rep. Stavis "yes", Rep. Stringham "yes", Rep. Sullivan "yes", Rep. Sykes "yes". With the vote being seventeen (17) in favor and eight (8) in opposition the motion passes.

MOTION: Rep. McFarlane moved that the leadership of the Grafton County Delegation receive continuing education in parliamentary procedure to help ensure adherence to the Delegation's bylaws and establish parliamentary practices. Rep. Barton seconded the motion.

MOTION: Rep. Oppel made a motion to move the question. Rep. Hakken-Phillips seconded the motion. Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy "yes", Rep. Baldwin

“yes”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes”. With the vote being twenty-five (25) in favor and none in opposition, the motion passes.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll on the motion for the leadership of the Grafton County Delegation to receive continuing education in parliamentary procedure to help ensure adherence to the Delegation’s bylaws and establish parliamentary practices. Rep. Almy “no”, Rep. Baldwin “no”, Rep. Barton “yes”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “no”, Rep. Cormen “no”, Rep. Fracht “no”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “no”, Rep. Ladd “no”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “no”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “no”, Rep. Lucas “no”, Rep. Oppel “no”, Rep. Rockmore “no”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “no”, Rep. Stavis “no”, Rep. Stringham “no”, Rep. Sullivan “no”, Rep. Sykes “no”. With the vote being eight (8) in favor and seventeen (17) in opposition, the motion fails.

Comments of the Delegates

1. Rep. Sellers asked if Rep. Beaulier would like to read the statement that was tabled, so they know what will be discussed at the Executive Committee meeting. Rep. Beaulier read the following resolution:

GRAFTON COUNTY RESOLUTION

In the Year of Our Lord two thousand and twenty-five

A RESOLUTION STRONGLY SUPPORTING COOPERATING WITH U.S IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Resolved by the Representative Delegation of Grafton County as follows:

WHEREAS, the Representative Delegation of Grafton County (henceforth referred to as “the Delegation”) recognizes the importance of following all Federal and State laws; and

WHEREAS, the Delegation is aware of the importance of the county Sheriff to work with all Federal and State law enforcement; and

WHEREAS, the Governor on May 22, 2025, signed House Bill HB511 and Senate Bill SB62 into law that requires New Hampshire law enforcement agencies to cooperate with U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Delegation supports cooperating with U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement under the 287(g) program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Delegation supports recommending to the County Sheriff Office to support the U.S Immigration and Customs Enforcement in supporting any local actions.

The Delegation will forward a copy of this Resolution to our United States Congressional Delegation, namely Representatives Maggie Goodlander and Chris Pappas, Senators Jeanne Shaheen and Maggie Hassan, and to our New Hampshire Senators Daniel Innis, David Rochefort, Mark McConkey, Timothy Lang and Suzanne Prentiss and to our County Commissioners Martha McLeod, Wendy Piper and Katie Hedberg and to our Governor Kelly Ayotte and Attorney General John Formella.

BE IT FURTHER Resolved that the Delegation calls on Governor Kelly Ayotte and Attorney General John Formella to do everything in their power to protect the interest of the residents of Grafton County by urging the President and his Administration to enforce the laws of our great nation.

This Resolution shall take effect upon passage.

Rep. Barton spoke in support of the resolution. The County Commissioners issued a resolution to the contrary, and he understands that the members of this body wish to remain silent on this issue by tabling the vote, which is unfortunate.

2. Rep. Rockmore stated that her understanding is that if a delegate is not a member of the Executive Committee but wants to be heard on the issue of the minutes, that delegate can attend the Executive Committee meeting in which these minutes are approved. Rep. Sykes stated that it was correct. Comments from people are allowed at Executive Committee meetings. Rep. McFarlane stated that he would point out that he has attended some Executive Committee meetings and unlike the Commissioner meetings, where the Commissioners have been very willing to receive comments from the public who are not legislators or delegates, the Executive Committee is refusing delegates the opportunity to comment on items of business until after all business was conducted. He stated that he could have made a comment on the minutes but it would have been after they were approved.

3. Next Meeting Date: 9/22 at 9:00 a.m.

Public Comment

1. Register Monahan stated that she was notified on Friday that the Grafton County Register of Deeds had received the National Achievement Award from NACO, which will be presented in July, for their historic records ARPA project.


Rep. Almy moved to adjourn the meeting. Rep. Fracht seconded the motion.

Rep. Barton stated, as a point of order, that once they have gone through the agenda and completed their business, the chair can adjourn the meeting without a vote. Rep. Sykes stated that they always take a vote on adjournment.

Rep. Baldwin called the roll. Rep. Almy “yes”, Rep. Baldwin “yes”, Rep. Barton “no”, Rep. Beaulier “yes”, Rep. Berezhny “yes”, Rep. Bjelobrk “yes”, Rep. Bolton “yes”, Rep. Cormen “yes”, Rep. Fracht “yes”, Rep. Franz “yes”, Rep. Hakken-Phillips “yes”, Rep. Ladd “yes”, Rep. Louis “yes”, Rep. Lovett “yes”, Rep. McFarlane “yes”, Rep. Muirhead “yes”, Rep. Lucas “yes”, Rep. Oppel “yes”, Rep. Rockmore “yes”, Rep. Sellers “yes”, Rep. Spahr “yes”, Rep. Stavis “yes”, Rep. Stringham “yes”, Rep. Sullivan “yes”, Rep. Sykes “yes”. With the vote being twenty-four (24) in favor and one (1) in opposition, the motion passes.

11:30 AM With no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,


Heather Baldwin, Clerk



Delegation Vote FY26 Budget

June 23, 2025

Sign In Sheet ~ **PLEASE PRINT**

1 George Sykes
2 Jerry Stringham
3 William Bolton
4 Thomas O'Brien
5 HEATHER P. BALDWIN
6 Peter Lovett
7 Terry Spahr
8 Janet Lucas
9 Thomas Cormen
10 David Fracht
11 MARY HICKEN-PHILLIPS
12 Ellen Rockmore
13 Susan W. Almy
14 Jared Sullivan
15 Russell Muirhead
16 CALVIN BEAULIER
17 Lex Berezchny
18 Pam Gilbert
19 JOSEPH BARTON Grafton 1
20 Darrell A. Louis
21 Marie Bjelobok
22 Linda Franz
23 Rick Ladd
24 Ben Sellers
25 Julie Libby
26 Holly Elsholtz
27 Sam Narcuss
28 Martha McLeod
29 Wendy Piper
30 Katie Wood Hedberg

31 Thayer Paronto
32 Jill Myers
33 Kelley Monahan
34 Nicole Mitchell
35 Craig Labue
36 Glenn Libby
37 Marae Homich
38 Pete Braun- via Teams
39 Alex Anti-Biasi - via Teams
40 Omer C. Aherm Jr- via Teams
41 Sally Braun- via Teams
42 Nick De Mayo- via Teams
43 Dan Hamilton
44 Alison Evans
45 Heather Bryant
46 Mike Cryans
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60