



TOWN OF RYE • OFFICE OF SELECTMEN
10 Central Road
Rye, NH 03870-2522
(603) 964-5523 • Fax (603) 964-1516

February 12, 2019

The Honorable Jaci Grote
NH State Representative
124 Washington Road
Rye, NH 03870

Dear Ms. Grote,

You asked that we write you with our concerns about a number of legislative bills that could cause the return of donor and receiver towns. If that were to happen it would significantly increase Rye's tax rate and result in reductions in services and possibly require the elimination of full and part-time staff. Five bills have been referred to the Education Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee is charged with taking the following education funding bills and converting them to one bill to bring back to the Education Committee:

HB 678
HB 713
HB 711
HB 709 (the bill that includes return of excess SWEPT to State)
HB 686

The Subcommittee is using HB 709 as the main bill and will amend it using other parts of the bills listed above to come up with one bill on education funding. I have attached the amendment to HB 709 and a spread sheet on the amendment to HB 709. Look at column X for the excess SWEPT figure. For example, a \$2,465,943 of SWEPT would not be retained by Rye and under the amended bill, would be sent to the State. This would convert to approximately a \$1.17 cent increase on Rye's tax rate.

I have also attached a list of pending education funding bills that was distributed at the Subcommittee work session. That list does not include several Senate bills or HB 676 before the Ways and Means Committee. Both HB 676 and HB 709 are both of concern to us. These are the ones that would eliminate the retention of SWEPT. HB 676 would do it by repealing all of SWEPT and HB 709 would do it by requiring excess SWEPT to be paid to the state.

We understand the need to properly fund education in NH and are not opposed to that. We are opposed to the return of donor and receiver towns that pit neighbor against neighbor. That was a difficult and divisive time in New Hampshire's history. We ask that you oppose any bill that would restore that scenario as well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Priscilla V. Jenness". The signature is fluid and elegant, with the first name being the most prominent.

Priscilla V. Jenness, Chairman
Board of Selectmen

Enclosure



TOWN OF RYE • OFFICE OF SELECTMEN
10 Central Road
Rye, NH 03870-2522
(603) 964-5523 • Fax (603) 964-1516

February 12, 2019

The Honorable Kate Murray
NH State Representative
PO Box 2193
New Castle, NH 03854

Dear Ms. Murray,

You asked that we write you with our concerns about a number of legislative bills that could cause the return of donor and receiver towns. If that were to happen it would significantly increase Rye's tax rate and result in reductions in services and possibly require the elimination of full and part-time staff. Five bills have been referred to the Education Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee is charged with taking the following education funding bills and converting them to one bill to bring back to the Education Committee:

HB 678
HB 713
HB 711
HB 709 (the bill that includes return of excess SWEPT to State)
HB 686

The Subcommittee is using HB 709 as the main bill and will amend it using other parts of the bills listed above to come up with one bill on education funding. I have attached the amendment to HB 709 and a spread sheet on the amendment to HB 709. Look at column X for the excess SWEPT figure. For example, a \$2,465,943 of SWEPT would not be retained by Rye and under the amended bill, would be sent to the State. This would convert to approximately a \$1.17 cent increase on Rye's tax rate.

I have also attached a list of pending education funding bills that was distributed at the Subcommittee work session. That list does not include several Senate bills or HB 676 before the Ways and Means Committee. Both HB 676 and HB 709 are both of concern to us. These are the ones that would eliminate the retention of SWEPT. HB 676 would do it by repealing all of SWEPT and HB 709 would do it by requiring excess SWEPT to be paid to the state.

We understand the need to properly fund education in NH and are not opposed to that. We are opposed to the return of donor and receiver towns that pit neighbor against neighbor. That was a difficult and divisive time in New Hampshire's history. We ask that you oppose any bill that would restore that scenario as well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Priscilla V. Jenness". The signature is fluid and elegant, with a large initial "P" and a long, sweeping underline.

Priscilla V. Jenness, Chairman
Board of Selectmen

Enclosure



TOWN OF RYE • OFFICE OF SELECTMEN
10 Central Road
Rye, NH 03870-2522
(603) 964-5523 • Fax (603) 964-1516

February 12, 2019

The Honorable Tom Sherman
NH State Senator
State House
Room 107
107 North Main Street
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Dr. Sherman,

You asked that we write you with our concerns about a number of legislative bills that could cause the return of donor and receiver towns. If that were to happen it would significantly increase Rye's tax rate and result in reductions in services and possibly require the elimination of full and part-time staff. Five bills have been referred to the Education Subcommittee.

The Subcommittee is charged with taking the following education funding bills and converting them to one bill to bring back to the Education Committee:

HB 678
HB 713
HB 711
HB 709 (the bill that includes return of excess SWEPT to State)
HB 686

The Subcommittee is using HB 709 as the main bill and will amend it using other parts of the bills listed above to come up with one bill on education funding. I have attached the amendment to HB 709 and a spread sheet on the amendment to HB 709. Look at column X for the excess SWEPT figure. For example, a \$2,465,943 of SWEPT would not be retained by Rye and under the amended bill, would be sent to the State. This would convert to approximately a \$1.17 cent increase on Rye's tax rate.

I have also attached a list of pending education funding bills that was distributed at the Subcommittee work session. That list does not include several Senate bills or HB 676 before the Ways and Means Committee. Both HB 676 and HB 709 are both of concern to us. These are the ones that would eliminate the retention of SWEPT. HB 676 would do it by repealing all of SWEPT and HB 709 would do it by requiring excess SWEPT to be paid to the state.

We understand the need to properly fund education in NH and are not opposed to that. We are opposed to the return of donor and receiver towns that pit neighbor against neighbor. That was a difficult and divisive time in New Hampshire's history. We ask that you oppose any bill that would restore that scenario as well.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Priscilla V. Jenness". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Priscilla V. Jenness, Chairman
Board of Selectmen

Enclosure