

**Village District of Eidelweiss ~ 2026 Elections & Annual Meeting
Madison Elementary School, March 7, 2026**

First Session – Official Ballot Voting

Article 01 - Voting for Officers

Moderator Bob Ingram declares the Polls Open for Voting for Officers at 8:05am.

Present for the opening of the polls are: Moderator Bob Ingram; Supervisors of the Checklist Cheryl Brooks and Karen Shackford; and Clerk Doug Prescott.

Voting is for the following offices for 2026:

Commissioner - 3-year term

Treasurer – 3-year term

Moderator - 2-year term

Clerk Doug Prescott delivers three Absentee Ballots to the Moderator. Moderator relays the voter names to the Supervisors of the Checklist, opens the envelopes, and delivers the ballots into the voting box.

Moderator Ingram declares the Polls closed at 10:00am

Second Session – Transaction of All Other Business

Moderator Ingram calls the Meeting to order at 10:00am.

Meeting is live streamed by MadisonTV with Asia and her team providing the service.

There are 29 attendees, including the Moderator, the Deputy Moderator, three Commissioners, the Deputy Treasurer, the Clerk and the three District DPW employees. The TV crew and Supervisors of the Checklist are not included in this count.

Moderator Ingram requests all people stand and he leads the Pledge of Allegiance.

Moderator Ingram calls for moment of silence to remember relatives, friends and residents who have passed. Moderator Ingram asked for special recognition for Paul Mattatall and Cathy Sholtanis for their service to the District over the years.

Moderator Ingram introduces himself, Deputy Moderator Larry Sodano; Commissioners Mark Graffam, Nancy Cole, and Wooda McNiven; Deputy Treasurer Jane Gunn; Clerk Doug Prescott; and District Administrator Jennifer Scully who is not in attendance today.

Moderator Ingram outlines and reviews the Rules and Procedures for the meeting. There are two Articles that include a Bond of over \$100,000 each. This requires a paper ballot vote with the voting open for 60 minutes.

Article 01 – Election of Officers- Results:

Moderator Ingram announced the results of the election:

Commissioner - 3-year term	Mark Graffam	25 votes
	Write-in	0 votes
Treasurer - 3-year term	Jane Gunn	26 votes
	Write-in	0 votes
Moderator - 2-year term	Write-in	Larry Sodano
	Write-in	Bob Ingram
		11 votes
		3 votes

Larry Sodano accepted the position of Moderator per the Write-in votes.

Total votes cast Absentee:	3
Total votes cast on Election Day:	<u>23</u>
Total votes cast:	26
Total Registered Voters at end of Election Day:	320
Turnout percentage of Total Registered Voters:	8.1%

Article 02 – Purchase of a new Truck

To see if the village district will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$310,000 (gross budget) for a new DPW truck, to also authorize a withdrawal from the Highway Capital Reserve in the amount of \$70,000, to authorize the issuance of not more than \$240,000 of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33), and to authorize the municipal officials to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and to determine the rate of interest thereon; and to further appropriate \$22,300 for the first year payment. Funds for this appropriation will be raised by taxation. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0 (3/5 ballot vote required).

Article is read by Moderator Ingram. Moved by Commissioner Graffam;
Seconded by Commissioner Cole.

Commissioner McNiven introduces the DPW staff: Jeff DiMartino, Tony Eldridge, and Andy Manning. He expresses appreciation for their excellent work. He explains that this proposal is for a Western Star heavy truck to replace the 2008 International truck. An application has been submitted to the Granite State Clean Streets Program. The goal of this program is to replace older dirty emission diesel trucks with new cleaner emission diesel trucks. Approval would result in an 80% reimbursement of the cost. The first step has been completed – the District has been approved as a “Selectee”. The second step is approval by the NH Governor’s Executive Council by late March or early April. The District has to fully-fund this purchase up front. The reimbursement would be used to pay off the Bond.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for the Ballot Vote. Moderator Ingram opens Ballot Voting at 10:15am and closes the Polls at 11:15am.

At 11:15am, upon the report from the Supervisors of the Checklist, Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously, 22-0.

Meeting continues during the hour of Ballot Voting for Article 02.

Nick Borelli requests a **Motion** to allow non-resident property owners to speak.

Moved by Nick Borelli;

Seconded by (unidentified female).

There being no questions or comments, Moderator Ingram restates the Motion and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Nick Borelli requests a **Motion** to allow DPW staff to speak.

Moved by Nick Borelli;

Seconded by Paul McKenna.

There being no questions or comments, Moderator Ingram restates the Motion and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Article 03 – Purchase of a new Truck

To see if the village district will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$180,000 (gross budget) for the purchase of a new truck, and to authorize the issuance of not more than \$180,000 of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33) and to authorize the municipal officials to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and to determine the rate of interest thereon; further to appropriate \$16,700 for the first years payment. Funding for this appropriation will be raised by taxation. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0. (3/5 ballot vote required).

Article is read by Moderator Ingram.

Moved by Commissioner Graffam;

Seconded by Commissioner Cole.

Commissioner McNiven explains that this new Dodge 5500 is to replace the 2019 Dodge RAM 5500, which is in dire condition. Repairs and maintenance on this truck have been \$10-12,000 per year. The new truck includes new safety features such as a backup camera.

Paul McKenna asks what the truck's mileage is and whether oil samples have been analyzed.

Jeff DiMartino indicates the truck has 31,000 miles. Eidelweiss is a small area (17 miles of roads), so vehicles have low mileage, but the miles are hard due to steep roads which results in wear & tear. Oil samples have not been analyzed in the past.

Paul McKenna suggests that this truck should be equipped for heavy duty use.

Commissioner McNiven indicates that due to past management, maintenance was not done well. This new vehicle will have a 7-year extended warranty and will be better maintained.

Terri Cancelarich asked what is the rate, terms, and source for the Bond.

Commissioner McNiven replies that the source has yet to be determined. The District will be shopping it for best terms.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for the Ballot Vote. Moderator Ingram opens Ballot Voting at 10:28am and closes the Polls at 11:28am.

At 11:30am, upon the report from the Supervisors of the Checklist, Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** by the necessary 3/5ths, 19-3.

Meeting continues during the hour of Ballot Voting for Article 03.

FEMA Reimbursement Update – July 2023 Storm

Commissioner Graffam presented a slide that summarized the status of reimbursements from FEMA for damage done / expenses incurred during the July 2023 flood, which was declared a disaster.

VDOE received \$7,200.00 for the repair of the Grison water main. These funds went back into the Water Assessment Fund.

The original estimated cost for the reconstruction of the Grison culvert (using a large concrete box culvert design) following the flood was over \$500,000. FEMA has advanced \$42,258.79 to VDOE (as 75% of the total estimated cost for a redesign) for development of a new lower cost Gison culvert design (such as a metal arched).

VDOE has received \$219,557.95 from FEMA for 75% of the cost of road repairs following the flood. This is being reinvested into more road work that is not 2023-flood-related reimbursable, such as improved ditching to improve drainage to protect the roads, paved shoulder improvements, etc.

An additional \$25,297.37 was requested from FEMA on 02-11-2026 for 75% of costs expended for eligible road repairs during December 2025.

FEMA has obligated a total of \$362,865.12 for VDOE flood-related road damage reimbursement. Subtracting the amounts already reimbursed or requested (\$219,557.95 and \$25,297.37), the remainder of the reimbursement is \$118,009.80. VDOE has until 08-01-2026 to expend this remainder amount for designated purposes to be eligible for an additional 75% reimbursement in the amount of \$88,507.35.

Article 04 - Operations Budget

Moderator Ingram requests a Motion to delay consideration of Article 04 until the results of the votes for Articles 02 and 03 are complete.

Moved by Commissioner Graffam;

Seconded by Kerry McNiven.

Nick Borelli asks why we don't use the Town stickers? He indicates that Madison found that hanging signs do not work. The Town went to stickers.

Bob Ingram indicates that he has one Madison sticker. His family cannot fit into one car. We need to have more than permit per household. Using the sticker would not preclude Madison residents from outside of Eidelweiss from using the beaches. He has spoken with multiple folks on Geneva Beach who indicated they are staying at North Conway Hotels. He suggests two placards per household, including houses on the water. He feels that the issue is parking at the beaches, and that the Police Chief feels that permitting is enforceable. He feels that permitting will discourage out-of-towners once the message gets out. He asks if having a placard could allow street parking near the beaches. Bob indicates that at Thusis Beach, the VLAP water testing team nearly always has to park on the street – would they be at risk of being towed while doing the VLAP work for the District? We need to allow, with the placard, parking on the roads near the beach.

Kerry McNiven says she is planning to vote Yes on this. She says that some real estate listings for out-of-District properties state that the property owner has the use of all VDOE beaches. She would like to have two placards and not use the Madison sticker.

Terri Cancelarich indicates that since VDOE already owns the beach parking lots and the land to the water's edge, it is all already private. She estimates that since VDOE property tax bills include an additional \$59,000 charge for waterfront access, something in the range of \$500,000 in tax revenue is going to Madison. She wants to see street parking allowed near the beaches during the summer months. Someone witnessed a bus pulling up to a beach to drop folks off to use the beach.

Bob Ingram says he is not necessarily opposed to the proposal but just wants to be sure his family can use the beach and park near the beach.

Commissioner Graffam indicates that \$1,200 of the \$1,600 requested in this Article is for 500 placards, and \$400 is for beach signs. Two placards per household would increase this to \$2,400 plus \$400 = \$2,800 total. A previous speaker indicated that the Commissioners have allowed non-residents to use the beaches by not doing anything, but it is the Voters who have allowed non-residents to use the beaches by consistently voting down Warrant Articles presented by the Commissioners.

Paul McKenna says the placards should be redone annually, maybe with a new color.

Commissioner Graffin confirms that to issue two placards per household, the cost would increase to \$2,800.

Bob Ingram requests an **Amendment** to change the proposal to two placards per household which increases the dollar amount for the Article to \$2,800.

Moved by Bob Ingram;
Seconded by unidentified female.

Nick Borelli says that this makes no sense since there is not enough parking. Allowing parking on the roads would block emergency vehicles.

Bob Ingram asks if this will be an annual cost? Will there be ongoing costs for future years?

Commissioner Cole indicates this would move into the Parks & Rec line in the Budget for future years.

There being no other questions or comments, Deputy Moderator Sodano restates the Amendment and calls for a hand vote. Deputy Moderator Sodano declared the **Amendment passed**.

Roger Keene asks if waterfront properties will not get placards. (This is clarified as incorrect.) Wording of Article does not seem to reflect the discussion here.

Commissioner Cole indicates that the Beach Ordinance would need to be changed to reflect all this. This would require a Public Hearing.

Janet Keene indicates concern that this would need a lot of detailed record-keeping, which could be a massive administrative job. How do we know they are not being mis-used? What happens to new owners who arrive mid-year?

Commissioner McNiven says this project needs civic involvement. An Ad Hoc committee was formed a few years ago to work on this. They had good ideas, but it did not get too far. Eliminating non-residents from parking would free up spaces. Using the Madison sticker does not limit the beach parking to Eidelweiss property owners – this is why we are looking at our own placards.

Mike Dolan suggests that the permits be good for two years to cut costs.

Commissioner Graffam indicates that the plan does not have a lot of details yet. The Commissioners need to know if this permitting idea is a “Go” in general before getting into details or revision of the Beach Ordinance. We are not currently planning to reissue placards each year. It may take the rest of this year to work out the plan – perhaps with a community committee for input – and implement it next year.

Mike Dolan suggests that Real Estate Agents be notified that the beaches are NOT available for non-residents.

Commissioner Graffam indicates that we will need to talk with the current Madison Police Chief about this.

Nick Borelli requests an **Amendment** to change the proposal back to one placard per household with the budget of \$1,600.00.

Moved by Nick Borelli;

Seconded by no one - Motion does not proceed.

Roger Keene requests an **Amendment** to change the wording of the entire Article to:

“To see if the Village will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$2,800 for the purpose of providing two hang tags for each property in Eidelweiss and to update the Beach Ordinance to allow parking on the roads within 100 yards of the beach between July 1 and September 30.”

Moved by Roger Keene;

Seconded by Bob Ingram.

Sharon Monroe pointed out that the Amendment does not include mention of the beach signs.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** with one “No” vote.

Article 08 - Pond Level Ordinance

To see if the Village District will vote to allow the Board of Commissioners to update the Pond Level Ordinance. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0 (Majority vote required)

Article is read by Moderator Ingram.

Moved by Commissioner McNiven;

Seconded by Commissioner Cole.

Commissioner McNiven indicates that two years ago the Legislative Body approved a version of this ordinance written by John Cancelarich. He generally likes the Ordinance as previously adopted and the provisions are generally very sensible but there is one bone of contention. As written, the Ordinance can only be changed by the Legislative Body, and not by the Commissioners. According to RSA 47:17, the City Council has the power to make and amend Ordinances for a number of purposes including public ways, docks, etc. following a public hearing. Part of the system at Boulder Beach is the road: the road is actually the dam. We don't want to change the Ordinance other than to return the right to amend the Ordinance back to the Commissioners. The Board needs to have the flexibility to adjust the Ordinance to deal with situations. For example, section 3.4 indicates that in the event of failure of the dam, we must follow the Emergency Action Plan. There is a need to have inspections of the dam, which will likely require lowering the water level, and that is not provided for in the current Ordinance.

John Cancelarich indicates that RSA 47:17 does not apply to Villages, only to City Councils. Did you check with a lawyer on this? There are different rules in New Hampshire for Towns vs. Cities.

Commissioner McNiven asked if John checked with a lawyer on this.

John indicates “Yes” – he checked online with the State. Look at what you did last year when you changed the Road Ordinance: the weight limit was changed from 10 tons to 13; the No Parking on Roads was implemented; the parking at the Huttwil lot was reduced from 30 days to 4. All this should have been presented to the Legislative Body and voted on.

Commissioner Cole indicated that a proper Public Hearing was done before any of these changes were made.

John Cancelarich points out that only one person came to the 1st Public Hearing and none came to the 2nd and that does not work. This year there were some provisions of the Ordinance that were not followed – he reminded the Board of the requirements.

Terri Cancelarich indicates that the ponds are the greatest asset here in the District, so the ponds need to be safeguarded. The quality of the water and the abundance & health of the wildlife are very important. The ponds are deteriorating. Frogs are an example of the overall water quality. There are far fewer frogs now than there were 10 years ago, and bullfrogs have completely disappeared. In the winter of 2016-17, the Commissioners lowered the water late in the year such that the frogs who typically hibernate for the winter in the mud were exposed to freezing and did not survive. By Spring

2017 there were no bullfrog pollywogs. Perhaps unintentionally the Commissioners have done damage to the wildlife and the ponds. Now they want you to give them the authority to change the Pond Ordinance. She implores the voters to not give that authority to them.

Jane Gunn agrees with the quality issues, but the middle pond is different than the large pond. The water level should be kept high. At times the Commissioners have lowered the water level too much. There is a bacteria or viral infection that has decimated the frog population worldwide. There have been times when heavy rains have caused high water levels in the ponds. She would like to see the Board have some authority to deal with water level issues.

Commissioner McNiven says that the Board has followed the Ordinance as closely as possible for the last two years. If we failed somewhere it wasn't because we were thumbing our noses at the voters. That was never the intention. As Jane indicated, sometimes the water level gets too high. There is a marker at the spillway – if the water level is above the marker, we are allowed to pull a board according to the Ordinance. Regarding the gaps in the boards that allow water through, my understanding is that it is intentional to prevent Banfield Brook from drying up downstream. The Board wants to stick with the guidelines in the Ordinance but does need the authority to lower the water level for monitoring and maintenance of the spillway. We want to be able to repair the dam now so we don't have to replace it.

Paul McKenna proposed an **Amendment** to add some language to the end of Article 8: “by submitting a Warrant Article for approval at the Annual Town Meeting as described in Chapter 635:3.”

Moved by Paul McKenna;

Seconded by Nick Borelli.

John Cancelarich says that changing the Ordinance would be just like a Warrant Article process – write the Ordinance and present it to the Annual Meeting.

Commissioner Cole indicates that the NH RSA's clearly state the requirements for changing an Ordinance: hold a Public Hearing, and the Commissioners can change the Ordinance. Nowhere does it indicate a requirement to bring it to the Annual Meeting. The Commissioners need to have the flexibility to revise the Ordinance to deal with a situation if that were to happen.

John Cancellarich states that the RSA's do NOT give that authority to the Commissioners. He indicates that he inquired of the Commissioners during 2024 about the health of the dam and was told that a DES inspection indicated the dam was “good for 100 years.” Why does the Board need the flexibility to deal with a situation if the dam is in good shape?

Commissioner Cole indicated that it would have been a DES inspection and not a full structural inspection.

Commissioner McNiven indicated that the DES did come in 2024 to inspect. It was a cloudy day so the visibility down into the spillway was impaired. The DES did make a comment such as that. However, the DPW staff feel that the divot (not really a “hole”) is getting bigger & bigger. It is very difficult to get a good look at this – someone may need to go down into the spillway to get this good look, and that may require lowering the water level.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Amendment and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares the Amendment failed.

John Cancellarich read the email from Commissioner McNiven dated 10-29-2025 describing the condition of the dam. "The divot does not appear to be too deep." Approving this Article would allow the Commissioners to lower the water level whenever they want. The Dam Emergency Action Plan (EAP) covers all situations for the Dam, including maintenance. Have you been doing monthly inspections and filling out the report? The Plan includes instructions for how to handle various situations. He recommends voting this Article down.

Commissioner Graffam indicates he has been around the dam for 48 years. There are videos by the National Association of Dam Keepers about the way different concrete fails. He would not describe the leak as a divot. The DPW tells us they can see down in when they are taking a board out. The road is actually the dam. The concrete structure is a sluiceway that lets the water out and allows us to control the level. The dam has been documented as having a problem. The DPW tells us the water is flowing through this failure. The leak is about the size of a softball. We can't see the leak from the outside of the dam due to the accumulation of mud. We would need to lower the water level by a few feet and excavate the mud to see the other side of the failure. The Ordinance states the water needs to flow over the top of the concrete. Due to that water flow we can't see anything inside the sluiceway. You can't do an inspection of any type with the water flowing over the concrete. My main concern is the metal grate. The metal bars that protect the DPW have not been touched since the dam was built. The DPW has reported that the metal grate across the top is rotting. How do we fix the metal bars and grate if we cannot lower the water level? That would require lowering the water by a few inches. To work on the leak, we would need to lower the water level by several feet. We can't do any of that.

Diane Rozek feels that we are all suffering from a lack of trust due to the prior Board. We need to start trusting that our vote means something. She feels that the current Board has done an excellent job and we need to start trusting the Board again.

John Cancelarich says that the EAP allows lowering the water level for inspections, maintenance, etc. He feels that everything being discussed is already covered in the EAP and that we don't need to change the Ordinance.

Commissioner Graffam asks if the interpretation of the EAP is that the Board has the authority to lower the water level once per month for inspections.

Moderator Ingram feels that what has been presented seems to support that.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares motion passed.

Moderator Ingram indicates that since the results of ballot voting for Articles 02 and 03 are complete, Article 04 can now be considered.

Zone is very low due to the small 2" water line. The engineer has designed a modern PRV underground vault (formerly called a pit). This is a small room 4' x 8' x 4'. The equipment to be installed includes the PRV to reduce the water pressure and an instrument to measure the flow (gallons per minute). This will provide the engineer with the information needed to determine when it is time to change the water main from 2" to 4" coming down from Oak Ridge. This is the first of these new, modern PRV vaults to be installed in the District over the next decade.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Article 10 - Close the Medical Insurance CRF

To see if the village district will vote to discontinue the Medical Insurance CRF created in 2016. Said funds, with accumulated interest to date of withdrawal, are to be transferred to the municipality's general fund. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0 (Majority vote required)

Article is read by Moderator Ingram.

Moved by Commissioner Cole;
Seconded by Commissioner Graffam.

Commissioner Cole explains that this Capital Reserve was set up in 2016, but this has never been used. We want to close this CRF and in the next Article we will be redistributing the funds to a proper use. The Budget for Administration and Employee Benefits had covered these expenses, which are the District portion of employee deductibles, since this CRF was set up. By Law, these funds must go to the Unassigned Fund.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Article 11 - Deposit to Highway Equipment CRF

To see if the village district will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$5,385 to be added to the Highway Equipment CRF previously established. This sum to come from unassigned fund balance. No amount to be raised from taxation. Recommendations Required. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0 (Majority vote required)

Article is read by Moderator Ingram.

Moved by Commissioner Cole;
Seconded by Commissioner McNiven.

Commissioner Cole indicates that the previous Article closed the Medical Insurance CRF, with a balance of \$5,385. This Article is to move those funds from the Unassigned Fund to the Highway Equipment CRF.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Article 12 - Fund Waste Tank CRF

To see if the Village District will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$6,000.00 to be added to the Waste Tank CRF previously established. Recommendations Required. Funds for this appropriation will be raised by taxation. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0 (Majority vote required.)

Article is read by Moderator Ingram.

Moved by Commissioner Cole;

Seconded by Commissioner McNiven.

Commissioner Cole indicates there is a tight tank located behind the DPW garage that periodically needs to be pumped. This contains liquid runoff from the garage floor, which can include water, salt, sand, snow, etc. This was used a while ago for the first pumping. We feel that pumping may be required again – if not this year, soon. This is to make sure the funds are available when the need arises.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Article 13 - Update Water Hook-up fee to \$18,000.00

To see if the Village District will vote to change the Water Hook-up Fee to \$18,000. Recommended by the Board of Commissioners 3-0 (Majority vote required)

Article is read by Moderator Ingram.

Moved by Commissioner Graffam;

Seconded by Commissioner Cole.

Commissioner Graffam indicates that the water hook-up fee currently is \$10,000 and that has been in effect for several years. The District has some significant investments in the water system coming up. We need to put in a uranium system. We also need to put in a 2nd well in the same well field as our main source of water, which is the DPW well off Rt. 113. The existing well moves 170 gallons/min and pushes it all the way up to the Reinach tank. The numbers we are hearing for putting in a 2nd well into the same source as a backup for the 1st well should there be a problem is going to be in the range of \$500,000. The price tag for the uranium system is about \$35,000. Out of the existing hook-up fee, the cost for the contractor is at least \$3,000. This cost can be higher if the contractor runs into boulders, etc. The rest of the fee goes into the Water Assessment Fund which is also where the annual water fees go. The cost of water system construction projects has gone up faster than other costs such as food. By comparison, the state research indicates that the cost to put in a home well is about \$21,000, and that could go up to \$40,000. The homeowner also has to maintain the well and the treatment of the water. A new home needs to contribute to the water system capital investment.

Roger Keene asks if we still have a lottery for hook-ups.

Commissioner Graffam indicates no – that was only done for a short time. When we receive an application, our engineer assesses the site to determine whether we can provide the required minimum water pressure to the property. If not, the application is denied.

to multiple individuals) as Auditor. We have found one person who is qualified. The two steps to accomplish this are (1) Approval from the Legislative Body to go forward with this, and (2) Election on the Ballot at next year's Annual Meeting. But that would be for next year – what do we do for this year? NHMA gave us a list of qualified CPA firms that we were not familiar with. We had the Administrator contact these firms and one responded but said they would charge \$30-40,000 each year. Currently we pay about \$12,000. NHMA says we should contact the NH Attorney General: State Law requires the annual audit, but there are not enough firms to actually get that done. We're guessing that the AG would say, that's the marketplace – if that's what you have to pay, then that's what you have to pay. We are being warned by NHMA that we need to look at the fine print in all of our loans – the probability is that some of the loans may require auditing by a CPA. Similarly, future loans may also require auditing by a CPA. So we are not sure what we have to do. We need to talk with the AG. Could we use a CPA firm from Maine? This Article is to give permission to go to an elected Auditor, but we are not sure we can go that route.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram rereads Article and calls for a hand vote. Moderator Ingram declares **motion passed** unanimously.

Article 18 – Any Other Business

Moderator Ingram asks if there is any other business that may legally come before the meeting.

Nick Borelli asks about the water access assessment included in all VDOE property tax bills. How can they charge us for something that is not included in the Deed?

Commissioner Graffam says that VDOE homes have a higher market value than similar homes elsewhere in Madison. Why? This might be partly due to the possibility that these could be turned into STR's which equals value. The assessors could not use the STR reasoning, so they came up with using water access as a way to account for the higher value.

Nick Borelli asked about the new cell tower project. The Driveway Ordinance that says any property outside of VDOE cannot use District roads to access the property.

Commissioner Graffam indicated that the issue is whether the landowner has the right to use a “paper road” – it exists on paper, but not the ground. The Commissioners spoke with an attorney and got the opinion that the VDOE has to allow that use. He, Larry Sodano and Nick Borelli all question this opinion.

Nick Borelli said that if building off the “paper road” at the summit is allowed, it could lead to the building of many houses outside the District who would use the District roads.

John Cancelarich said we have the Driveway Ordinance. That should govern this situation.

Commissioner Graffam indicated there is a meeting scheduled with the power company regarding the cell tower project.. He posed the questions: Do we have to let them use our roads? Should we run this by another attorney to get a second opinion?

Moderator Ingram asked for a sense of the meeting. The sense is yes – we should run this by another attorney to get a second opinion.

Adjournment

Moderator Ingram requests a Motion to adjourn the 2026 Annual Meeting at 12:55pm.

Moved by Commissioner Graffam;

Seconded by Kerry McNiven.

There being no other questions or comments, Moderator Ingram calls for a hand vote.

Moderator Ingram declares the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Douglas T. Prescott', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Douglas T. Prescott
District Clerk