

**GILFORD POLICE STATION EXPANSION SURVEY**

**FINAL REPORT**

Prepared by:

Christopher G. Leggett, Ph.D.  
Statistics and Economics Consulting  
25 Bridget Circle  
Gilford, NH 03249  
(603) 524-4498

Prepared for:

Scott Dunn  
Administrator  
Town of Gilford  
47 Cherry Valley Road  
Gilford, NH 03249  
(603) 527-4700

July 21, 2009

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are grateful to several Gilford residents for providing comments on an initial draft of the survey, to Denise Morrissette for coordinating the mailing, and to Sandy Bailey for entering the survey data into a spreadsheet. We would also like to thank the survey respondents for completing the survey and providing extremely thoughtful comments. The survey design, data analysis, and report development were completed by Statistics and Economics Consulting at no cost to the Town of Gilford.

## **INTRODUCTION**

On March 10, 2009, Gilford voters defeated a warrant article requesting \$1.58 million for the construction and renovation of an expanded police station. The final vote was 661 YES and 647 NO (3/5 vote required for approval). The warrant article and final design represented the culmination of two years of work by the Facilities Planning Committee. Although opinions regarding potential reasons for the rejection were offered in the local press, these opinions were anecdotal in nature and did not necessarily provide an unbiased assessment of voter sentiment.

In April 2009, the Board of Selectmen authorized conducting a survey of registered voters who participated in the March 2009 election to determine why the warrant article was rejected and to solicit opinions regarding alternative approaches to addressing the space needs of the police department. This report provides a brief summary of the survey results. The report focuses entirely on voter opinions; it does not assess the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed project, nor does it recommend next steps for the Town of Gilford.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The survey questionnaire was mailed to voters on May 25, 2009. The mailing included a letter from the Town Administrator explaining the purpose of the survey, a two-page questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to return the survey. The survey was designed to be brief to minimize the burden on residents and to reduce the potential for non-response. In addition, in order to avoid biasing voters' opinions, the survey purposefully did not provide any details on the expansion project beyond the information that was included in the March 2009 warrant article.

The survey consisted of six questions (Appendix A). The first survey question asked for the respondent's opinion of the current funding level for various town departments. This question was included to help the respondent view the police station expansion project within the context of other town needs. The second question presented the exact warrant article that was on the ballot in March and asked if the voter would vote for or against the article. The third question asked respondents opposing the warrant article about potential reasons for voting against it. The fourth question asked whether or not the town should modify the project and present it to the voters again. The fifth question asked for the respondent's opinion regarding several potential modifications to the project. Finally, the sixth question was an open-ended question that provided the respondent with an opportunity to provide additional comments.

In order to conserve resources, the survey was not mailed to every one of the 1,342 individuals who voted in the March election. Instead, a random sample of 500 voters was selected using a statistical software program (Stata), and the survey was mailed to each selected voter. Random sampling methodologies are commonly used by survey researchers to reduce overall costs while providing an unbiased assessment of the characteristics of a population.

## RESULTS

Of the 500 voters sampled, 272 completed the survey, 11 never received the mailing (the mailing was returned as undeliverable by the USPS), and 217 did not respond. The overall survey response rate was 56% ( $0.56 = 272/489$ ), a very good response rate for a mail survey effort. With 272 responses from a population of 1,342 voters, the margin of error for the survey is plus or minus 5%.

Survey responses are summarized in Appendix B. Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they would reject the police station expansion as presented on the March 10<sup>th</sup> warrant article. Among respondents who indicated they would vote against the expansion, 27% oppose all spending increases, 18% do not think that the police department needs more space, 16% think that the overall cost of the project is too high, 13% don't support the current plan or design, 7% oppose all spending increases for the police, and 19% wrote in other reasons (Table 1). Among other reasons cited, the most common were reasons related to the current economy (cited by 9 respondents) and the respondent's perception that the town does not use existing space efficiently (cited by 6 respondents).

**Table 1: Reasons for Opposing Project**

<b>Reason for Opposing Project</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents</b>
Oppose all spending increases	27%
Don't think the police department needs more space	18
Think the overall cost of the project is too high	16
Don't support this particular plan or design	13
Oppose all spending increases for the police department	7
Other	19
	<hr/> 100%

Forty-seven percent of respondents indicated that the town should modify the police station expansion project and present it to voters again, 39% indicated that the town should not present it to voters again, and 13% were unsure. Among potential modifications to the project, respondents indicated the most support for postponing the project until the economy improves (58% in agreement), reducing the overall cost of the project (55% in agreement), and relying less on borrowing to fund the project (44% in agreement) (Table 2). Respondents showed less support for replacing the geothermal heating system with a conventional design (32% in agreement) or developing a plan for a stand-alone building (12% in agreement).

**Table 2: Opinions Regarding Potential Modifications to Project**

<b>Potential Modification</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Indifferent</b>
Postpone the project until the economy improves	58%	31%	12%
Reduce the overall cost	55%	17%	29%
Rely less on borrowing	44%	20%	36%
Design stand-alone building	12%	64%	24%
Replace geothermal heating with conventional	32%	30%	39%

Note: rows do not all sum to 100% due to rounding.

Many residents provided extremely thoughtful recommendations in their responses to the final, open-ended question. Recommendations related to the police station expansion project are summarized in Appendix B, while all responses are reproduced verbatim in Appendix C. As the survey was designed to be anonymous, we remove names from these responses in cases where the respondent voluntarily provided his or her name.

While responses to the open-ended question indicate that many residents strongly support the project, there were a few recurring themes among those who were opposed. First, many indicated that the town should reduce overall spending and be more creative in its use of existing space (both within the current police department and across all town-owned buildings). Second, many felt that the town could do a better job of providing information about the project to the public (including accurate information about the geothermal heating system) and explaining the need for additional police space. Many seemed open to supporting the project if they could be persuaded that a) the additional space is truly needed and b) the need cannot be met through creative use of existing town space (e.g., through the use of old library space or vacated superintendent's space). Although the state of the current economy was cited by some residents as a reason to postpone the project, others felt that the economy provides a unique opportunity to reduce construction costs.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

- ▶ Voters generally agree that the police station expansion project should be placed on the ballot again, but only after the economy improves and potential approaches to reducing the overall cost of the project have been explored.
- ▶ There does not seem to be strong opposition to the specific proposed design for the expansion. However, many voters noted that the town could utilize existing space more efficiently, thereby reducing or eliminating the need for newly constructed space.
- ▶ Voters seem to be evenly split regarding the proposed geothermal heating system. Many expressed a desire for more information about the advantages and disadvantages of a geothermal system (relative to a conventional system).
- ▶ There is very little support for a stand-alone police facility.

- ▶ Many respondents indicated that the town could communicate better with voters regarding (1) the need for additional police space and (2) the design details of the project.

## **APPENDIX A: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

# POLICE STATION EXPANSION SURVEY

---

**1** Before we ask you about the police station expansion, we would like to start with one general question about funding priorities for the Town of Gilford. In your opinion, should the town increase, decrease, or maintain funding in each of the following areas? (Check one box for each area)

	LARGE DECREASE	SMALL DECREASE	NO CHANGE	SMALL INCREASE	LARGE INCREASE
Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public works	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Library	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks and Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**2** Now we would like to ask for your opinion about the police department expansion project that was on the ballot in March. The exact wording of the warrant article was as follows:

*"To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of one million five hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$1,580,000) (gross budget) for the construction and renovation of an expanded police station, to include a geothermal climate control system, and to authorize the issuance of not more than one million two hundred thousand dollars (\$1,200,000) of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33) and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and to determine the interest rate thereon; with the balance of three hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$380,000) to come from surplus fund balance. (3/5 Vote Required) (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3 to 0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 7 to 2)"*

If an election were held today with an identical warrant article, do you think you would vote for or against the expansion?

- FOR → Please go to Question **4**
- AGAINST

**3** Which of the following reasons best describes why you would vote against the police station expansion? (Check one response.)

- I OPPOSE ALL SPENDING INCREASES
- I OPPOSE ALL SPENDING INCREASES FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT
- I DON'T THINK THE POLICE DEPARTMENT NEEDS MORE SPACE
- I DON'T SUPPORT THIS PARTICULAR PLAN OR DESIGN
- I THINK THE OVERALL COST OF THE PROJECT IS TOO HIGH
- OTHER \_\_\_\_\_

**4** In your opinion, should the town modify the police station expansion project and present it to voters again?

- YES
- NO
- NOT SURE

**5** If the town does decide to modify the police station expansion project, to what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following potential changes?

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
Postpone the project until the economy improves	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reduce the overall cost of the project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rely less on borrowing to fund the project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Design a stand-alone building rather than an addition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Replace the proposed geothermal heating system with a conventional design	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**6** Do you have any other comments or recommendations related to the proposed police station expansion? (Please provide comments on the back of this page.)

## APPENDIX B: STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES

**Question 1: Before we ask you about the police station expansion, we would like to start with one general question about funding priorities for the Town of Gilford. In your opinion, should the town increase, decrease, or maintain funding in each of the following areas? (Check one box for each area)**

	LARGE DECREASE	SMALL DECREASE	NO CHANGE	SMALL INCREASE	LARGE INCREASE
Schools	14%	26%	38%	19%	3%
Public works	4%	13%	58%	24%	1%
Police	6%	12%	52%	24%	5%
Fire	7%	13%	58%	21%	1%
Library	13%	20%	54%	11%	2%
Parks and Recreation	8%	18%	55%	17%	2%

**Question 2: Now we would like to ask for your opinion about the police department expansion project that was on the ballot in March. The exact wording of the warrant article was as follows:**

*"To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of one million five hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$1,580,000) (gross budget) for the construction and renovation of an expanded police station, to include a geothermal climate control system, and to authorize the issuance of not more than one million two hundred thousand dollars (\$1,200,000) of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act (RSA 33) and to authorize the Board of Selectmen to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and to determine the interest rate thereon; with the balance of three hundred eighty thousand dollars (\$380,000) to come from surplus fund balance. (3/5 Vote Required) (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3 to 0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 7 to 2)"*

**If an election were held today with an identical warrant article, do you think you would vote for or against the expansion?**

FOR	44%
AGAINST	56%
	100%



**Question 3: Which of the following reasons best describes why you would vote against the police station expansion?**

I OPPOSE ALL SPENDING INCREASES	27%
I OPPOSE ALL SPENDING INCREASES FOR THE POLICE	7
I DON'T THINK THE POLICE DEPARTMENT NEEDS MORE SPACE	18
I DON'T SUPPORT THIS PARTICULAR PLAN OR DESIGN	13
I THINK THE OVERALL COST OF THE PROJECT IS TOO HIGH	16
OTHER	19
	100%

Summary of comments provided by respondents who selected "OTHER" on Question 3:

Type of Comment	Number of Responses
Economy is not good	9
Town needs to use existing space more efficiently	6
Taxes are too high	4
Expansion is not needed	3
Design should be changed	2
Other	7
	31

**Question 4: In your opinion, should the town modify the police station expansion project and present it to voters again?**

YES	47%
NO	39
NOT SURE	14
	<hr/>
	100%

**Question 5: If the town does decide to modify the police station expansion project, to what extent would you agree or disagree with each of the following potential changes?**

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
Postpone the project until the economy improves	11%	20%	12%	24%	34%
Reduce the overall cost of the project	4%	13%	29%	31%	24%
Rely less on borrowing to fund the project	5%	15%	36%	31%	13%
Design a stand-alone building rather than an addition	37%	27%	24%	6%	6%
Replace the proposed geothermal heating system with a conventional design	14%	16%	39%	19%	13%

**Question 6: Do you have any other comments or recommendations related to the proposed police station expansion?**

*Note: This table summarizes open-ended comments that focused on the police station expansion; please see Appendix C for the exact text of all open-ended responses.*

<b>Type of Comment or Recommendation<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>
The town should focus efforts on reducing overall spending	20
The police need the additional space	14
Available town space (e.g., old library, superintendent's office) should be used more effectively rather than expanding the police station	11
The town needs to do a better job at providing information about the project to the public	9
It would be cheaper to complete the project now while construction costs are low (due to the economy)	9
The town should provide better information to the public justifying/explaining the geothermal heating system	9
The expansion plan should not be modified at all	8
The expansion plan should be postponed until the economy improves	8
The expansion plan is designed to create an unnecessary "trophy" building	8
The police should figure out a way to work within their existing space	7
The town/police need to provide information to the public that justifies the need for additional space	7
The geothermal heating system should be scrapped	7
The town should consider a smaller/cheaper expansion	6
The police do not need the additional space	5
The geothermal heating system should be kept in the plan	5
The size of the police force should be reduced	4
There is too much meeting space in the expansion plan	4
The town should construct a stand-alone facility	3
The town should investigate the availability of federal funds for the addition	2

### APPENDIX C: RESPONSES TO QUESTION 6

Survey Number	Comment
9	I believe it would be helpful to understand why the voters rejected the proposal. I was surprised it failed. If the heating system is a point of contention then maybe an alternative should be proposed. There has been a lot of confusing information on geothermal and the general public may not fully understand the concept.
11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More readily available information on the project – not just meetings and open houses. Many people don't have time to stop in or go to the meetings.</li> <li>2. Include in the information a cost comparison of the geothermal heating system vs. conventional both initially and over time.</li> </ol>
15	<p>I think the current building has adequate space, it just needs to be reworked:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The school superintendent wants out of the building. Allow him to do that...that opens space.</li> <li>2. The entry space can be reworked. The police space can be moved over into the entry area to add police space.</li> </ol>
17	If we had less police we wouldn't need an addition.
19	<p>Dear Selectmen;</p> <p>We appreciate the efforts that the town is going through in order to obtain relevant input on the Police Station Expansion as well as other town issues. We also appreciate the dedicated town employees of all Gilford's various departments. However we are struggling with answering the survey in the format presented and as such decline to answer in that manner.</p> <p>We have lived in Gilford over 25 years now and find that over time the people of Gilford usually get things right. In the specific case of the Police Station project the expenditures taken out of context to the entire needs of the various departments does not appear to be the right move now. The town has recently added the old Library to its inventory of available space. The Town of Gilford needs to put forth a comprehensive plan of all of the needs of all of the departments and in the process of doing this may find the needs of the Police Department to build more space might be reduced.</p> <p>We also struggle with the ideas that the School Administration is putting forward for the Meadows area fields. We have already seen one bad example of a high expenditure for low value softball field. We see declining school populations. We see the administration spending money, without debate, that should have been returned to the taxpayers.</p> <p>From an outsiders perspective we see most of the current endeavors of the town disjointed and with little regard to the ability of the taxpayers to fund the projects. None of these efforts should be taken out of context of the economic times. We will not elaborate other than to say it's difficult to determine if Concord or Washington is more out of control. Regardless the impact is huge to those that pay.</p> <p>Again, we thank you for the diligence you are putting forth in this process.</p>

22	There seems to be two schools of thought on the geothermal approach – so I would say, go with more insulation and use a pellet wood fired system.
27	The voters have spoken. How much did this cost to compile, print & mail? Is that a good use of taxpayer \$? I don't think so. There's empty buildings all over Town – some Town-owned – some not. Why not come up with a solution for an existing facility. Why build new – are they jealous over the firehouse (which is way too big too). Same for the school admin., same for the library. The Town should be looking to reduce budgets and expenditures everywhere (except maybe roads). That is your duty, not build new or spend because a dept. wants something. (hello F.D.!) Same goes for the Meadows Project. There's plenty of room on school property – quit spending money!
28	Show relationship of number of residents vs. the number of police requirements – nationally the pro's and con's
36	Why is the Selectmen's Office concerned about the School Budget ???
39	I am sorry to say I did not get sufficiently involved in the specifics of the planning or the details of the project so I am not able to make a real knowledgeable decision or comment; however, I did support the improvements and feel that if the need is there it certainly needs to be presented to the Town in a way that it could be passed – I feel that geothermal is certainly the way of the future and in the long run will save the Town more money; however, if discarding it is the only way to improve the station and the only way it will pass the voters that it should be considered.
42	<u>It's about public relations.</u> Of the 6,000 or so people living in Gilford, what percentage have actually had direct interaction with members of the Police Dept.? I've lived here 16 years and I've never had to call on the police for assistance (thankfully). Perhaps its time to "tell the story". Use "The Steamer" or other newsletters to let community members know what the police force is doing on a weekly or month basis. The library, parks & rec. and the Gilford Community Church are in the paper on a weekly basis. Tell use how the police benefit the community – then connect it to . . . we need a bigger facility. Articles on: DARE, what officers are doing in the schools (I've heard comments like "why do we need an officer in each school?"), why do we have a dog on the force? What new & creative strategies are being used to curb spending (I notice big flashing signs around town, but what about an explanation in the paper). Here's what we do – here's why we need a bigger facility.
46	I think the geothermal heating was a good idea not only for the cost saving but also for environmental reasons.
49	Those who feel so strongly about the need for the Police Station expansion are incapable of understanding the issue in any larger context. For them it is the police station, the police station, and the police station. These people ignored the library bonds being defeated, and they continue to ignore the other issues that revolve around the overall management of our town's affairs.  The last FPC paid no attention to anything but the Police Station. Any new effort around pushing this issue to fruition needs to focus on gaining the support of the community. This seems unlikely to happen as things now stand.  At the Town Deliberative Session someone inquired as to "Why do 'WE' need unions?" This person's question seemed rather uninformed. We the taxpayers have no need or lack of need for unions per se. The police department employees may very well need a union. It is their right to decide whether they want to be represented and

bargain collectively for wages, benefits, hours and working conditions, as the other town employees do. If the working conditions at the Gilford police station are substandard the police union should enter into their next contract negotiations with the intent to bargain for an improvement to these working conditions, as part of their total compensation package. This is impracticable but the taxpayers are told that the current police station is not a safe work place due to a lack of space? The police union will not bargain away any financial remuneration to help in the cost of this project. Just won't happen! We are never told how the current facility is inferior to the space that the police station was formerly located in. As far as the police union is concerned there are some registered voters that will not vote for the Police Station just because of the one really creepy police officer on our force. Any attempt to remove this officer for being creepy would justifiably result in a union grievance. Being creepy in law enforcement is sort of like identifying what constitutes pornography. We are not quite sure what the standards are for either but know it when we see it.

No FPC is going to discuss the fiasco of the current \$7 million Town Hall that went on to cost considerably more. As in \$3-4 million more! The taxpayers trusted the good 'ole boys on the numbers and now we have that fiasco haunting every new public works project. A FPC should be up front in explaining what happened and how it resulted in so many subsequent school building bond issues being voted down. Schools are a separate budget item so you can't talk about that. The town still has no temporary or otherwise seating facilities for the home football games. We can't/won't spend money on this issue to serve the hundreds of our town's taxpayers who show up to watch our young men play football on Saturday afternoons. The debate goes on over wetlands issues but most understand this as a smoke screen for the Lamborginis who are vehemently opposed to spending any money to fund our educational institutions.

Times have changed with the addition of a new stop light at Gilford Ave and Country Club Road. Now a new hotel is about to open. The DPW has as yet still taken no action to slow down the traffic from the Methodist Church to the Town line with Laconia. Those who speed up to make the light just keep on bearing down on the traffic entering and exiting into the several intersections. With the addition of the Hounsell Ave it seems incredible given the volumes of traffic between 4 & 6 PM there is virtually no police presence on this stretch of roadway during the busiest traffic patterns of the day. If the DPW or State could be persuaded to lower the speed limit a few hundred yards east of the Methodist church and the police would start enforcing the speed limits during rush hour some tax payers might feel that they are getting their money's worth from Town Hall. Hounsell Ave, where the street lights in the undeveloped stretches of roadway stay on all night to light up the crossings for the deer and coyotes. Some taxpayers wonder who pays to keep the woods lit up all night?

Hounsell Ave while not so far as spectacular a fiasco as the initial Town Hall site plan & project, stands out as another questionable public works project. Since the development of an industrial park there, many EXISTING businesses have moved there all right. So far the industrial has had to be abandoned and now the zoning has changed to permit office buildings so that the space can generate some tax money. Too bad about the existing space these tenants abandon. Some other use for those abandoned commercially zoned properties will surely be found. But if it is not, so what! Millions of dollars of taxpayer monies have been spent on sewers and

underground utilities. The taxpayers were promised jobs and growth for the future. We were told that our children would perhaps find jobs at the industrial enterprises that were to be attracted there. Of course that was just another big lie perpetrated on the taxpayers by the good 'ole boys with the same mentality that brought us the Town Hall fiasco year earlier. Our daughter after graduating college moved to Vermont and now works in Massachusetts. The planners of the Housell Ave industrial park paid no attention to the Concord Trailways Company permanently removing Laconia from daily service. The traffic and ever increasing numbers of stoplights made it impracticable to continue service. Any industrial enterprise has to take into consideration the same issues, as they contemplate how they are to efficiently get their materials into the area and then ship their finished product out. The commercial lots in this project may eventually provide for businesses of some kind to locate to. So far it has been mostly just another place for the real estate speculators. These are the same town mastermind geniuses that were years ago buying up "unbuildable woodlots" in the Acres. Subsequently one year an innocuous amendment was buried in the town warrant among 18 other zoning amendments to increase the slope of land specification on what would constitute a buildable lot.

The good 'ole boys are perhaps out but now we have the carpetbaggers in their stead. Property taxes (assessments) on Island properties recently saw some significant increases. In return for this extra tax burden the owners/families are now having their guest pass privileges at the town docks being reduced. Incredibly we still hear some grouching over these taxpayers receiving the meager service of "Free" trash collection! Not many of these are registered voters but those that are, are not going to be voting for any new police stations. The same cannot be said of those dozen or more persons/families who are now routinely abused while attending or choosing not to attend Gilford Beach. Most of these are year round tax paying registered voters. As long as the "Beach Witch" remains at Gilford beach they can be counted on to vote against a new police station.

The State is now engaged in a great fiscal war. A war that will test whether "The Pledge" can long endure. We already have seen a new capital gains tax piled onto the dividends and interest tax. In this case the "tweeners" are getting squeezed. Those between 50 and 62 find themselves having to take "early retirement" against being laid off anyway. Generally many of these are hit by the IRS with pre-59-1/2 tax penalties on what's left of their IRA/401-K funds. They are now further penalized with higher taxes on their non-tax sheltered assets. Most of these taxpayers are hurting as are the elderly retired. They are not interested in paying even more taxes to improve the lots off persons that still have good paying jobs.

Of course up until now this has only been happening in the private sector. It is certainly understandable that you would be in favor of a multi million dollar upgrade of the police station if you have a good solid town, county or state job. This is about to change. That is just the new economic reality. The reality is that no one has been paying attention to the State Pension system and no discussion of it was heard at either of the deliberative sessions this last spring. The current \$500 Million biennial budget deficit is getting all the attention. The Governor and the Legislators are already receiving the early warning communiqués from the annual audit of the state pension fund. That audit will be published in the next few weeks for the information of the general public. Besides being GROSSLY under funded you should pay no attention to the actuarial assumed rate of return, which informed sources indicate will be

	<p>maintained at 8.5%. There are impending huge shortfalls in this pension system to which the town's taxpayers have tax liability, therefore any FPC must not discuss this issue. Pay no attention to what is going on in California. After all they owe billions making our hundreds of millions insignificant. Right?</p> <p>Any FPC that does not embrace a plan for an upgrade in the Police Station that provides for integrating that plan into the overall management of the town, it's services, and over all anticipated tax burdens will and should fail. This week we find the Lambourginis, claiming that fuel savings in the school budget due to drastically lowered heating and transportation fuel expenses have disappeared down a rabbit hole. As long as these kinds of shenanigans are even alleged the taxpayer has to be very cynical about even a professional grifter's 20-minute power point proposal. At the end of the presentation, "The total cost...", we hear ends up not being the rest of the story we expect to hear of later. The expense of an addition to the police station could eventually fly but first things might need to marginally change so that more taxpayers feel that they are getting the services they are already paying for. You cannot put a price on the pastoral setting and wonderful vistas you get taking a ride up Morrill St. to Gunstock Hill Rd on your way to the Town Beach or Docks. This is something the community is willing to pay for to preserve and not have to restore or build. Maybe we should just take the sail boat off the town seal. The Town of Salem, MA seems to have no objection to having a witch on their town seal. Maybe a caricature of Peter Lorre or a carpetbag would be more original. Just because the carpetbaggers are coming here to escape higher taxes doesn't mean they are going to leave their big city ideas on non-tax issues behind.</p> <p>The 2008 US census report listed NH as the state with the highest per capita HOUSEHOLD income in the nation. Certainly economic times are tough. Still whether including or excluding property taxes NH still comes in near +/- 45<sup>th</sup> in the nation in per capita state and local tax burden. By these measures taxpayers in NH can and will be paying more taxes. Those who are now un-employed are not complaining about their Federal income and FICA taxes. Taxes are always fairest when someone else is paying more than we are. The issue is to have tax increases and taxes in general be part of some kind of solution rather than creating an even larger appetite for future tax increases.</p> <p>Too bad this took on too long a format. I suppose it may be perceived as a rant. I think however I have made a few worthwhile suggestions that could help get a couple dozen votes moved from one side to the other. Our daughter graduated Gilford High 6 years ago. My wife and I still voted for the hockey money for the high school. It is a sense of community that left us pondering what a terrible embarrassment it would be to have that voted down, if Belmont then approved it. Most taxpayers will spend money on worthwhile causes when they are empowered with a sense of community where the standards for what is reasonable and customary need not be subject to debate.</p>
52	<p>I find it difficult to believe that a town of Gilford's size with very low crime rate requires, or needs a large, fancy police facility. People are losing jobs and having to go without improvements to homes, etc., but yet public services, employees expect increases in wages, benefits and better facilities. I don't think this could be presented in any way that I would vote for it.</p>
54	<p>Scott, Just a short note to let you and the Board know I still support the new station. I have always been supportive of a "stand alone" type of building. I have been always</p>

	suspect of the geo-thermal type, because there is many more types of heating air systems out there. Hope this is what you are looking for, I am still a supporter.
57	People are still losing jobs. Everyone should cut spending.
61	The FPC did the job, the Board of Selectmen its job, the Budget Committee its job. Should this survey result in a clear cut change in direction, fine. If not, my recommendation would be to have this project on next March's ballot, with the same justification and explanations before next March's vote.
62	I would like to see a <u>super</u> insulated building with geothermal if the payback were reasonable 5 to 8 years.
64	<u>Strongly disagree</u> as existing space is adequate.
67	They need the space and something needs to be done.
68	<p>In my opinion, people like Jack Stephenson ruined this opportunity. This is because all that the public saw was his letters to the editor condemning the project. The general public has no clue how badly our officers need a new station. The current conditions for the men and women who have pledged to protect our town are appalling and worse, unsafe. The only reason that I personally know this, is NOT by the information put out by the town regarding the conditions of the P.D. It is because I personally know several of the officers and because my sister, back in 2004, interned at the P.D. and she (a high schooler) noticed how bad it was. If it were not for my inside information, I would have no clue how in need of a new P.D. these officers are. For this reason, I believe that the new P.D. was turned down. People don't want to see their taxes raised for no reason – so if they don't know how desperately in need of a new P.D. we are they are not going to vote for one. All the public sees are the opinions of people like Jack Stephenson who have nothing better to do (and no professional right for that matter) to blow holes in the project. People have no clue that the officers have to actually have their backs to criminals when they are processing them in the booking room, for example. Furthermore geothermal heating and cooling should definitely be included in the project. Yes, there is a high upfront cost to install one of these systems, but the payback period is short and better yet this type of system is environmentally friendly. There are state and federal grants for "green" projects. Perhaps this should be looked into, so that less of the total project cost is reliant upon borrowing. In summation, it is my opinion that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• greater public involvement/information should be relayed in regards to the conditions of the current P.D. such that the public will have a better understanding of what their raised taxes will be contributing to (let's fact it – it would really only be benefitting the town as a whole in the long run).</li> <li>• geothermal should be used in this project because of its short payback period, less reliance upon fossil fuels and overall environmental "friendliness".</li> <li>• state/federal grants should be considered based on "green" project inducements/carbon reductions, etc. to reduce the overall project cost.</li> <li>• try the vote again; it would be better for the officers, town and would make the most financial sense to carry this project out now rather than later; the current economy would keep the cost down and provide jobs for several people.</li> </ul> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to voice my opinion and for the continued interest in this project.</p>
69	Regarding questions #4 – Found it confusing. Yes, present it to voters again as a new station is obviously needed. However, in my opinion, no modification is necessary.
71	I voted for the project. However, in view of the fact that so many were opposed,

	perhaps the scale & cost of the project, as well as the funding should be re-visited. If I were building a home today, I would include geothermal heat & cooling. In speaking with folks who actually have these systems, I've learned that the long-term benefits far outweigh the initial cost. Just don't know how easy it would be to retrofit an existing building. Good luck with the project!
72	Gilford is a small <u>town</u> with a comparatively low crime rate. We are not Laconia which is a <u>city</u> with lots of low income housing and a fairly high crime rate. Without getting into particulars we were the victims of a crime and the Gilford PD did nothing about it beyond taking the initial report. The only reason Gilford wants the new police station is to play keeping up with the Joneses with Laconia and Meredith. The voters said "no" multiple times. The PD needs to understand that the voters do not support this project, but no one will speak out in public about it for fear of being singled out by the P.D.
74	I voted for the project as it stood in March. I felt it was needed from what I have read. I do not have enough knowledge of the technical facts in the project to challenge them. I try to have confidence in the people that have been elected or appointed to do these jobs. Sometimes I know that is not always true, but I will still stand with the people in positions to complete these projects. Comment on Question 1: Try to work within current budgets for time being. Avoid extra costs where possible.
75	Gilford is a bedroom community. We don't need a large police station. The fire department has too much already, are we safer than voters in Belmont, I don't think so. Are we less safe than the voters in Belmont, I don't think so.
76	The need has not gone away. We do not have enough room to handle teens and juveniles. We are lucky that we have not been sued. The mold and current conditions of our present facilities need to be stressed so that residents understand what currently takes place when people are arrested. There is only one (1) cell to hold anyone in. There is a toilet in this cell that is used by both male and females. There are times when there are multiple arrests and less than ideal conditions for anyone having to use this toilet. People also vomit during the arrest process. Gloves and universal precautions are taken but in a small space, everything spatters. People are sometimes bloody from a fight, etc. How do we convey this message to taxpayers? Safety issues exist when you bring prisoners up the stairs and thru the office area just to EXIT the building. There is a liability issue for the town when people under the influence of liquor or drugs and using the stairs and could fall. The areas that have to be used for booking and fingerprinting and Breathalyzer are not accessible for the handicapped . . . The current Booking Room is narrow and when you squeeze in the officer and sometimes two, along with one or two of more defendants, it is less than safe. The officer searches the people, enters data into the computer, tests for intoxication, finger prints and then the Bail Commissioner arrives to perform duties and complete paperwork with the cooperative/uncooperative person. The Dispatch area is very warm due to all of the equipment that is running now that was not around many years ago when the building was constructed. Outside windows have to be opened for fresh air or the air conditioner is running while the rest of the building is being heated and I am not sure what the quality of air is in this small space. You also eat where you pee, as you do not always have the ability to leave the area for breaks when you are alone. Vehicles should be under cover during Winter. Time is spent trying to keep the snow removed and fuel is burned to keep cruisers from icing up. As so that they can respond at any time. How do we educate our town without shooting ourselves in the foot by revealing things that show that we are not in compliance? If you never get arrested or need the police, you probably do not have any idea about what takes place in their building. Drugs, booze, sex crimes, domestic violence, shoplifting, we have it

	all. Detectives working hard on investigations to solve crime and they need space. The current offices are overflowing with stuff as well as the evidence that we have to store. Thankfully we have people who want to do this kind of work. We have to help make the job easier, more efficient and cost effective. Give them the space and tools to work with.
80	Do it now. It will never be cheaper.
82	Do it now.
85	If you want to be more fiscally conservative a million dollars for a walking right of way so the already wealthy Bean family don't have to pay taxes. Maybe people would vote for more things for Town buildings if our money went for better use. You told us this wouldn't affect our taxes much – yeah right! Let them build. Unregistered cars that sit on sides of streams leaching what into the water right off police & town offices, ride further and a truck hidden on the edge of the woods, one up on jacks of years, trash from whatever these people rip apart thrown over this back hill are piles of junk. Get out and look around you want money start using laws we have and start fining these people.
86	(1) If we (the Town) could buy the old library building, could the Police Department or ½ the Town Hall use it? (2) Add onto Town Hall on opposite side of Police Department and have the Town Offices moved to the add on. Police could just have more space? (3) Make a second story of the whole building – use what we have.
87	This survey, in my opinion, should never have been sent. Our votes are private and why we reach our decisions are private. No more surveys.
88	This has been the most challenging period I have experienced in 35 years. I have had to cut back and do without many necessary purchases and employees. Several of those employees also live in Gilford. Municipalities must live within their means as the private sector knows all too well. The argument can be made that costs to build now are less, however, that is a flawed option. Ex: If someone can't afford a \$1.00 per hundred tax increase, will \$.95 make it more affordable? I think not!
89	I don't think we need a bigger Police Station. The population of Gilford is not growing.
93	Use the Sheriff's grant.
99	I don't believe the design for the building is as efficient as it could be and I am basing this opinion partly on what Jack Stephenson has written in the paper. I do not want his opinions ignored and I want his ideas to be thoroughly investigated. I believe he is watching out for the taxpayers. I am not happy in the least with the way we were forced to have a new library and now have to pay the maintenance of a much larger building. The parking is still minimal and the added employees and general costs is what I was voting against when I voted against a new library. I also voted against the sprawling, outrageous design which seemed so inefficient for New England. I am not thrilled with the library that was shoved down our throats. Just because we didn't pay for the building cost does not mean we are not paying more in the long run. Because of the way a library was forced upon us that we were unable to vote on the design of, I am leery of the newest design of the police station expansion. I believe we need more space and I'm not unhappy with the basic design and layout. I just want to be sure that Jack's ideas, and the spirit of his ideas, which is efficiency and frugality, are incorporated in the final design. When Jack is satisfied, I will be, too.
102	Unfortunately, I don't feel the community will get off their couches and vote. Doug Lambert isn't a help for the cause. You have done everything correctly. We just need to keep trying to get people to vote.
103	A building does not make a Police Department. We have a wonderful group of people

	in our police department and they are doing a fine job. Basic function is all that is necessary. While the present plan is pretty good – it can be improved upon – in order to bring the cost down – under \$500,000 would be nice. There seems to be too many meeting rooms and hallways, and a few odd entry/stairways. Keep trying – eventually it will work out.
105	Get it done!
108	When all is said and done we support better police facilities. We are pleased the Selectmen have attempted to solicit opinions from the taxpaying residents of Gilford. Thank you for this chance to reply. House values have <u>nosedived</u> across the country yet the Town of Gilford recently sent us an increase of over \$30,000.00 in our assessment! We have made no improvements and we are retired and elderly. We demand that increases in our assessment and in other’s assessments throughout the Town of Gilford be unequivocally <u>RESCINDED!</u> <u>Stop</u> granting teacher raises! Cut their pay, teachers are being laid off everywhere. This small school system does not need seven more playing fields!!! How many of these kids are from Gilmanton? How much are they contributing?? Enough is <u>MORE THAN ENOUGH!!</u> If federal, state and Belknap County taxes are going to skyrocket upwards then Gilford needs to cut spending <u>NOW!</u> In our experience, the departments in town such as the Police, Fire, Highway and even the Library serve or potentially serve every taxpayer in the town. In our experience the School Department serves <u>only itself</u> . They even monopolize all the chairs in the room while us elderly taxpayers have, at times, been forced to stand in hallways where we cannot hear the proceedings. We do not buy into the lame argument that we <u>must be</u> anti-education if we are opposed to unending spending increases. THANK GOD FOR SB-2! We need a tax cap!!
110	I have an issue with the behavior of certain “Budget Committee” members that control the Town votes by their actions behind the scenes. Many people follow their remarks, which are usually not accurate, and vote the same way. I think they are a disservice to our town. I think it is an abuse of power. If we don’t have a “code of ethics” we should. The Gilford Grok asked voters to vote against the police addition!
113	The police station building has had many problems over the years. I question the wisdom of putting on an addition. I think a new structure would be a better choice.
116	I cannot understand why the ambulance is not run by LRGH except to get jobs. I believe they made that offer awhile ago. The thousands we would save would go along way to pay for a new police station. I would like to see the manpower comparisons of like towns and let us know the results. Just a note to thank all the volunteers that help make Gilford the town it is. I personally was on the Budget Committee for several years.
118	Design a more efficient heating system to be used by Police and all of Town Hall. Provide a better insulated building. Do not use poor design like Town Hall. This is clearly faulty.
119	I believe the project is necessary and will become steadily more so to the point of urgency if not pursued diligently.
124	We feel it definitely needs to be done – doing it now may seem hard, but it will only cost more in the future, it will stimulate local economy giving people jobs to build it. It seems that additions seem to cost more than new, free standing buildings. Having to adapt to existing structures can cost more. Unfortunately, the same group that nickel and dimes everything in this town will do the same here. If we can’t afford something, possible prep for it, i.e. ductwork, to add to in the future. Every time the negative group cuts things out to save money, it always seems to have negative impact later down the road. i.e. school floorings, AC, etc.

125	Hold the line on raises for 1 or 2 years to offset expenses. These are hard times financially.
138	Expansion would be more acceptable if it incorporated some <u>real</u> cost reduction/savings. In the present economy the overriding factor is what the project will cost the town and ultimately the people who make up the town.
140	We simply don't want the police station expansion! How many times do we have to vote it down before you get the message? Let them get along with what they've got.
143	Move the SAU or Building Dept. to the old library and use more of the existing building to keep the costs down. We need a better facility but not at the cost of a bigger building now. Use some of the space such as the old library for the SAU or Building Dept. Try to keep the cost lower to the taxpayer so it will pass. I am in favor of it but most people are scared at the cost. Good Luck!
145	This town needs to stop and think about all of its citizens, not just the wealthy and those with the second homes. We do not need to "keep up with the Joneses" and their new glamorous safety complexes. We have several unused town owned buildings and plots of land that we could utilize those and create space by shuffling around offices and some light remodel. Had our town fathers actually thought during the Gilford Middle School process, the school superintendent's office could have moved over to the "new" middle school, thus freeing up some space for the Police Department. Or we could shuffle the superintendents offices and/or tax collector's offices to the former library and utilize an existing structure that we currently own and needs very little remodeling. Maybe even bring the park and rec office over there as well instead of town hall and free up the original town complex for the police station. Town fathers no longer want to save the residents tax money, but would rather have a good old fashioned "mine is bigger than yours" comparison as they take their marching orders from second home owners and those who have amassed the amount of wealth it takes to say I don't care how much taxes go up, instead of listening to all residents of the town, including those who are barely making it and struggling to hang onto their homes. This town has bigger issues in it such as toxins under the ground, every increasing homeless population and welfare population and out of whack property values with no real employment to help them afford them, please stop spending our money loosely. Maybe we should look at the buildings over by Sawyer's Dairy Bar to be utilized as a new police station if we really do need one. Or maybe we can stop spending money on labor, printing costs, and postage to keep trying to pressure the public into saying yes to an unneeded police station. And just place the money in a slush fund in hopes of someday just paying cash for the new station.
146	I voted for the project and would again. Again, I question the overall size of the PD, and should stop looking to expand eg. looking in on elderly.
149	In tough economic times, interest rates, labor costs and possibly materials tend to be lower. Do we wait and pay more or do we bite the bullet and go for it? I would go for it. If it does eventually pas, I would hope that local trades people would be considered for the job (reputable, of course!) Instead of putting money into new playing fields (really, how many do we need!) it would better serve the town if it were used for a police station. I realize we are talking about 2 different budgets, but it eventually comes out of our pockets!
153	Thanks for asking!
154	We should reduce the size of the force by using PT to replace FT officers for summer duty. We should operate on what we can afford not what some want. In these difficult times we should do more with less, and not try to keep up with "Meredith, Moultonboro" and others with new police facilities, but rather make better use of

	<u>existing</u> town property.
158	I can't understand <u>why</u> we are being <u>forced</u> to build another police dept. when the building they are in is practically <u>new</u> ! Gilford seems to think they can replace buildings every 25 years or so – <u>Why</u> is it that we allow buildings to be built that only last this long? I've already paid for a new police station, new town hall, new FD and <u>two</u> new schools – enough is enough! Buildings should last 50+ years – Laconia High is still standing! I just think we <u>have</u> to use what we have – it is not the taxpayers' fault that the "town hall/pd" wasn't built right – fix it! PS – I would love a <u>new</u> house every 25 years – just tear down the one I have because it's old and start over – as long as someone else is paying!
163	Our government needs to become smaller so that our taxes are less and the people that have supported our town can afford to live in our town once we retire. We have been here since 1975 when we paid \$800 a year in taxes. Now we pay \$5,000 plus and I don't see any more services that I did in 1975. If the town continues on its path we will be forced to sell. All I see is too many <u>high paid town employees</u> .
165	My wife first filled this out. I changed some answers because I know more details about the <u>police station expansion project</u> .
167	I did vote for the police station expansion this year. However, I have voted against it in the past. I have felt that it was too much money. It is my opinion that the school superintendent offices should be in another facility, that spaced can be added to by the police station. My concerns are for the privacy of juvenile offenders and safety of the officers if they have to question or bring an offender into the police facility. It might be a <u>good idea to inform the public more about geothermal heating</u> .
170	Eliminate the 2 meeting rooms that were proposed. Everyone doesn't need with own office. Make storage more efficient. <u>STOP THE SPENDING!</u>
171	I'm afraid its time we all recognize that the world is changing and much of financial ability of our citizens has been lost and probably never to be recovered. We, as Americans, have always been on top with our dreams and have been able to obtain them. However, I believe those days are gone. The average American has lost 20-30% of his net worth, through investments or property devaluation and I believe we as people should ask for or <u>demand a 10% cut</u> in every area that is operated by town, state and federal authorities. We as business have <u>had</u> to cut 20-30% of our operating budgets to survive. It's time of all government agencies to join in the battle!!! Stop spending – put cuts in your vocabulary!!
179	This is no time to be spending the taxpayers' money. People are having a hard enough time trying to make ends meet, and it isn't going to get better for a long time. As a matter of fact, when interest rates start to climb, it's going to get much worse.
182	Being a realist, my opinion is that there is no good reason to oppose the new police building at this moment in time. During the delays, that have help up the construction, costs have increased and will continue to increase with time. The need is here, realistically, for the need to be met. Also, it will ensure jobs for some, so ...
184	The controversy about the heating system created enough heat (as opposed to light) to heat the police H/Q for years! One constant letter written became abusive in his zealoting and I think skewed the debate to the point where people "turned away" from the discussion. That, plus the recession, plus the steady drumbeat of the anti-taxers killed a project that needs to proceed. The police station is a bit crowded – not a "crisis" but in need of a more efficient and larger facility. I would prefer it to be adjacent to or "on campus" with town offices as I think the police should not be isolated or in their own "bunker". It's not just a bad image, the police need to be as connected as possible to the community, visible, accessible and close to other

	departments. The heating system is a red herring. Just insulate it well and use a modern conventional oil burner. The geothermal technology is OK but it probably will take a long time to realize savings and it politically hindering the overriding need to get an improved expanded facility for the police. I would vote for the geothermal system but I am not convinced it is critical.
186	First of all, I checked the box for a large decrease in the school budget. Increasing behavioral problems and low test scores prove that more money is <u>not</u> the answer. Regarding the expansion to the Police Station: I believe that most people understand the need for more space. With the current economy, most families are now learning that just because something is needed or desired, it cannot just become a reality. People are now expecting the same from their government. The "same old, same old" method of operating (i.e. ask the taxpayers to foot the bill) is fast becoming insulting to the average person. Thinking "outside the box" and being creative to get the job done will go a long way in earning a person's respect. When people know something is unjust "because we've always done it this way", they become very uncooperative (i.e. the Boston Tea Party), and will vote down something <u>without</u> care. The Police, Fire and Public Works departments do a <u>great job</u> – they are <u>always</u> very responsive and professional.
190	It certainly seems justifiable to increase the space for holding prisoners so men and women can be separate. I don't know anything about geothermal heating – was it ever explained to the residents? The wording of the vote seems much too complicated. I voted in favor since both the Board of Selectmen and the Budget Committee were in favor.
196	The geothermal system should reduce future heating and/or cooling costs. Look to the future. Well educated and well read people generally are less likely to need police.
197	Ask everyone to come see the present station. (I know you have – but try again?) It changed my mind.
199	20,000 sq. ft. All 23 cops in there at once – 870 sq. ft. a piece. Wake up! It's the money stupid. Police voted for a union. I guess they were not getting enough taxpayer money. Town needs to learn to live within its means. New buildings get old – take care of what you have got.
201	At the March elections a vote was cast and results should stand. I feel the Town Administrator and Board of Selectmen should let it be. Stop wasting tax dollars trying to keep jamming it down our throats.
202	Because the economy is not great, it is the best time to build – will probably <u>never</u> get the materials & labor at the current prices. Also interest is at an all time low for borrowing. Things will get better and then it will cost the taxpayers even more. There might be a possibility of getting help from the federal government also. Taxpayers need to hear more regarding this project other than the so called "columnist" and letter writers (weekly if not daily), because unfortunately, that is the only place they get their info and then they go out and vote without having the full picture.
203	I feel the building committee met the sentiments of the town electorate. The present economy hurt the process and will continue to, until things settle out.
207	There are 2 reasons I voted no for the police expansion: (1) There was no evidence provided to the public to support the need for more space. It was also very difficult to discern if the project was truly energy efficient given the amount of opposing views expressed by the public. (2) I would prefer to have the schools staffed appropriately to provide hands on education to the students.
210	Apply for federal stimulus funds to complete the project.
211	Be glad for what you have now. No more spending. I don't know why the Police

	Dept., the FPC and the other Town Officials can possibly think of spending any more funds on this request. The Police have adequate facilities for what they need. When our property taxes increased 6%+ this fiscal period I would hope the Town would consider the economic health of its residents and not the selfish glory of another "trophy" building!
212	It seems like the committees have done very extensive research on the police station needs. With the increased demands on our officers, I feel it is important for their safety, and the safety of those they serve, to have an adequate and secure facility in which to conduct their business. The issue has been studied enough, the need has been well documented, and the finances have been kept to the bare minimum. I would strongly recommend another proposal to the voters in Gilford. Thanks to all the committees who have worked on this. It is no easy task and demands a great deal of time and attention.
213	Regarding question #4, the word "modify" changed my response as I do not believe that the original plan should be compromised (modified)! If #4 asked whether to present <u>again</u> the original plan my answer would be "yes"! Also, with downturn in economy, loan rates are at an all time "low". Why not focus on educating voters as to potential savings by financing loan <u>now</u> vs. at higher, future rates. Residents are fearful of poor economic conditions . . . many already suffering job losses. I think fear of future economic disasters is what defeated the proposal. Proponents of the plan <u>cannot</u> communicate or educate voters too much! Examples of specific improvements that new facilities would provide to our police department and residents might be helpful? The more voters can relate to a personal (or <u>potential</u> personal) benefit, the more likely they will re-consider their "no" vote. Good luck! And thank you for the opportunity to address this issue. "PS" Re: #5 question: my "neither agree nor disagree" responses are because I think experts should be making those decisions. The average taxpayers should not be modifying or changing plans that Police Department and local government has already determined and recommended!
215	Question #4 – modify the police station expansion project – no; present it to voters again – yes.
217	Complete while building costs are at a record low. The project will be needed eventually (sooner rather than later). <u>May as well save supply costs immediately.</u>
219	Remove school dept. offices. Clean storage area by doing away with old equipment and other used articles. Use some of the storage area for offices. Move storage area to area under Fire Dept. office or to cold storage building.
222	It is our family's belief that a good police department depends more on the officers out in the field patrolling our community rather than a beautiful structure to hand their hat. With that said basic building requirements need to be adequate. There are less expensive options, i.e. storage facility for evidence, etc. . . . that could be considered. It is our belief that we as taxpayers need a break in these economic times. We need to live within our means as well as our community services.
223	Every one of us must make cuts wherever and whenever we can – at least at this time.
225	I'm extremely upset (as with the school) to be hiring and/or soliciting bids from out of state contractors, engineers, architects, etc. Also, so many games are played with numbers, that you really need someone who knows what they're looking at. Example – the police station built in Meredith – 1 <sup>st</sup> of all, it's ridiculous the amount of money spent on that. This is not New York City – But, "forgetting" the elevator required? Come on! That's as bad as "forgetting" the asphalt years ago for the Town Hall. You need someone extremely capable of looking at quotes and make sure they're bidding "apples for apples". Regarding architects & engineers – Costs are ridiculous, 9 times

	out of 10 they end up getting fired from a job – an in-state reputable contractor is more than qualified. I feel a police station addition at this time is not necessary.
226	Move some town functions to old library when matter is settled. Seek relief from state antiquated law on paper and document storage. Reorganize space and renovate existing space for police.
228	This town needs a new police station – my wife and I prefer a <u>stand alone</u> building. Good luck to you gentlemen -
236	I voted for this expansion with geothermal hearing. However, I think with a conventional heating system more people might vote for the project.
237	How much more expensive is geothermal heating? What is payback? This should be made clear to voters.
238	(1) As far as heating goes, voters were hit hard with one individual's disagreement with geo. I wasn't sure what to believe was correct! (2) This economy is a great time to obtain very competitive quotes for the project. Material costs are very low – waiting until things pick up will just increase costs. (3) I am <u>not</u> in favor of an expanded police department as far as personnel and police coverage. I do agree they need more space <u>but</u> if more space means an expanded station then I flat out vote no. We have more than adequate police protecting in Gilford.
241	The police station does not need to expand – Why do you have two new meeting rooms when there are more than enough meeting rooms or conference rooms for the town? Use those meeting rooms for your needs. Get organized and get those boxes out of the halls – we pay very high taxes and the town can't even afford to fix our roads. This town just spends, spends, spends. Use what you have and enjoy it and be thankful. This is getting ridiculous the fire station looks like Beverly Hills. You need some people in there to organize what you have.
243	I really don't have suggestions, but want you to know you have my complete support and trust you will propose whatever is best for the Police Dept. The police have one of the most difficult jobs and exceedingly dangerous jobs – and often deal with people and situations no one else wants to deal with. They put their lives on the line everyday for the citizens of Gilford and I feel very strongly we need to support them as well. And <u>thank</u> them! Thank you for sending this survey!
245	To Gilford Selectmen, response to Police Station expansion survey 5-27-09 In my opinion, this survey was almost designed to AVOID finding the REAL reason the project failed. Having been VERY vocal in SUPPORT of doing the project RIGHT so that it would be passed, and being closely involved for 7 years on the project, I got LOTS of feedback and suggestions from the public, MUCH of which I was assured was also given to the FPC and totally ignored by the FPC! Most common was “yes, police need a bit more space, BUT----”. A comment on the last above: several members of the FPC were all in favor of those suggestions from the public, but ALL was blocked by MULL as acting dictator. Early on most of the feedback was “we don't need so much area” and “we can't afford it”. “WE” won several rounds, and thought the originally intended (when Town Hall was built) expansion add on would solve all problems. BUT, the FPC (or maybe just Mull), greatly increased size of the project by REJECTING much of the existing Police Station, and turning that area into totally unneeded “meeting space”. With the grossly increase Library space, and soon available excess space in Gilford Community Church, and extra space in the old library, and lots of space in the schools, the last thing we need is more meeting space! (Note, ALL the information about excess meeting space was available before the last FPC started). Now that the School Admin is moving out, the police can expand into that area as well! BEFORE YOU JUMP IN WITH A KNEEJERK

	<p>RESPONSE about that area not being “secure”, just remember the police are supposed to be a PART of Gilford, open to Gilford, and very little of their operations have to be “secure from Gilford”!! Many times I have provided the FPC with good engineering information on ways they could build more efficiently, and get 20 to 30% more space for the same structural cost, and in the process get better insulation at lower cost (sorry, but being Scotch, I must get at least 2 extra benefits from each improvement). They ignored ALL! So much for their non-interest in space or energy efficiency. At times I felt like John the Baptist, preaching to the heathens in the wilderness, when trying to educate the FPC to use insulation: “The heat you HAVE is the cheapest (zero cost) so SAVE it”. Like John, I saved almost none! You can’t make progress with mindless heathens. With CHEAP simple insulation they could reduce heating costs to less than 5% of previous, and in the process eliminate cooling costs! But would those idiots listen? No way! Mind made up, locked in cement of dictator Mull, can’t improve! Up to that point I thought it was just a tough sell to a total idiot, but with some slight support from some bright guys on the FPC. THEN Idiot Mull dumped on us with the totally flawed, never understood or researched, myth of using “geothermal heating”. Note that we already had 2 examples in town of how it was a total failure (ie, cost more than oil for the heat recovered, and the interest cost on system cost was 10 times the cost of oil heat!). Worse, Mull LOCKED the project to the flawed Geothermal system, which is the MAIN reason the project failed. Without that MULL flaw, we might have won. The Good news is that since Mull caused the project to fail, we now have a chance to do it correctly, at much lower cost, and without Mull and his yes man sidekick. The current correct answer is for the Selectmen to pick a NEW FPC, without the perpetual bad guys, and GIT’er done! I’m still available as an engineering consultant, but too old to be a committee member.</p>
247	<p>I heard that the reason some voted against the police station was because many <u>in the Police Department</u> were against it because the preferred design wasn’t adequate. Maybe we should survey the officers and command staff by secret ballot to ascertain if that’s correct, and if so, or if not, publish the results so that we can either make necessary changes or discredit that rumor. I’m not a police officer, nor am I related to any police officer, nor do I even know any police officers. And I think it’s a disgrace that this town can’t find a way to give our cops a descent place to work.</p>
248	<p>Forget the project and make do with what we have. This town is ridiculous in its spending practices. Each department could, and should, be reviewed for excess and unnecessary spending.</p>
257	<p>Our economy is a huge factor. I am sure some people have lost their jobs. Some may also have a big chance of losing their homes. Plenty may have lost a good chunk of money with the stock market. A new police station or an addition to the old one is the furthest thing, I think, that are on people’s minds. The timing is not right. If it was on the ballot in November I would vote <u>no</u>. In March <u>no</u>. A better economy – why not yes! But not now! After some changes.</p>
261	<p>If the engineers could convince us in a more aggressive way that geothermal is far superior than conventional as a way of heating and cooling and that pay-back on that system would bring a substantial savings – that would be a help!</p>
262	<p>Replace every police staff with new, better people. They are out to ruin people.</p>
266	<p>We are <u>way</u> over-staffed and over-equipped. Especially at the Town Hall. Over the past 30 years our population has increased a little but our staff at the Town Hall and Selectmen and Finance and Planning and Assessing has multiplied exponentially. And you may be called “Town Administrator” but you are really the Selectmen’s Assistant with <u>way</u> too much staff! And <u>way</u> too much authority! And way too big a</p>

	salary. I am ashamed at how badly the heirs to the Library were treated and stolen from. We have enough hiking trails and enough "green space" off the tax rolls.
267	It's ironic that this survey came in my mail the same day as my tax bill arrived – with a sizeable increase. I strongly feel that we need to look closely at the present economy and hold back expenses until things improve. I also feel that there should be a freeze on <u>all</u> wage increases and incentives. Those that disagree should be thankful they have their jobs. Half of my retirement is gone, but I am thankful for what I still have. I am proud to be a resident of Gilford!
268	I suggest a more aggressive public information and communication program be developed. Some suggestions: (1) Have a link on the Town website for this project. Develop content. (2) Develop a short video outlining the need for a new facility and showing differences in the existing facility – post it on Town website. (3) Develop a trifold of frequently asked questions and place it in regular Town mailings to residents. Use it to explain deficiencies, solution to address deficiencies and costs. (4) Hold "neighborhood meetings" to make presentations before the community.
272	<p>We would like to see more involvement from the men and women who work for the police, fire depts. etc. Examples could be dinners, bake sales, car washes. If I need to expand or purchase something I, as most people, either have to work extra hours or work extra jobs, etc. We came from a poor section of New York State. We would attend may different fundraisers for different organizations. To help support different areas of Fire, Police, Boy Scouts, etc. <u>Ideas for fundraisers:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pancake Breakfasts/Dinners</li> <li>• Spaghetti Dinners</li> <li>• 50/50 raffles</li> <li>• Chicken barbecues</li> <li>• Ice cream socials</li> <li>• Car washes/detailing</li> <li>• Dances</li> <li>• 2<sup>nd</sup> cleanup day (in fall? \$5-\$10 to drop stuff to be taken away)</li> <li>• Rummage sales</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to share our thoughts and concerns. (No self-addressed stamped envelope was included in the mailing).</p>
	We saw no need to fill out the survey! Please go ahead with the special meeting so we can get this expansion of the police station voted through and built as planned. So much time and money has already been wasted and we are happy to support this very important and necessary project.