

## **SB-2 Study Committee Meeting Minutes For: June 11, 2025**

Attendees:

Colin Beasely	Kim Halquist
Laura Davis	Ashley Seybold
Debbie Stanley	

The meeting started at 10 AM

Nomenclature was reviewed. The group will be called the SB2 Study Committee and the reference to the forms of government being studied will be: Traditional Town Meeting (New London's current form of government) and SB2 form of government. Kim provided context around the alternative forms of government, highlighting that there is no such thing as SB1.

Colin walked through the document mailed out in advance of the meeting, highlighting its contents for future reading. It is attached.

Most of the meeting was focused on reviewing the proposed SB2 analysis shared with the SelectBoard (also attached), identifying who would take responsibility for the action item and report back to the committee. The Committee focused on the first several bullets, deferring the remainder to a future meeting after some research and interviews of other towns.

Colin agreed to update the % voter profile to address 10 years of data. Each committee member agreed to reach out to 3 or 4 towns to document their experience in adopting an SB2 form of government. In order to provide side by side comparisons of these discussions, it was agreed that a common set of questions should be asked of each town / interview so comparisons can be made.

Those questions / data points include:

1. Identify the size of the town.
2. Identify the size of the administrative staff.
3. Identify why the town decided to make the change to SB2
4. Identify any lessons learned by the town.
5. Provide insight into the voter experience before and after adopting the SB2 form of government.
6. Identify whether the town has an elected Budget Committee? Advisory Budget Committee? No Budget Committee?

7. Secure an example of the SB2 Ballot; How does the ballot represent the budget (one line item of the operating budget or multiple line items, how are proposals for reserves presented)?
8. How did the transition to SB2 go; how long did it take, any specific lessons learned?
9. What costs, if any, were incurred in the transition?
10. Identify what was the impact on staff, with some focus on the finance organization and the town clerk.
11. How did the town educate the community on the proposed change to SB2?

It was agreed that a sample of towns that adopted SB2 and then rescinded that decision (research currently shows 4) also should be interviewed. For those discussions, in addition to understanding the above questions for those towns, the following should also be explored:

1. What issue(s) caused the town to rescind its decision?
2. How long did it take to get the decision reversed?
3. What costs, if any, were incurred to reverse the decision?

Kim took the action item to identify whether there is any source of information that would identify those towns that proposed a change to SB2 but were not able to secure sufficient voter backing.

Once the interviews are complete, the committee would focus on: identifying how to package the information including what is common and different between traditional town meeting and SB2 forms of government; documenting the implementation steps and costs, if any; discussing other governance changes that might be suggested; and, documenting the pros and cons of the change. Finally, each committee member will have the opportunity to offer subjective commentary.

The committee then discussed the requirements of RSA 91-A:2; Kim summarized what the obligations of the committee are in its conduct as a public body.

The committee scheduled its next meeting for July 2, 2025 at 10 AM in the Syd Crook Room of the Academy Building.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 AM



SB2 Study Group  
Various References.doc



SB2  
Analysis\_06042025.doc