

**New Hampshire Municipal Association**

THE SERVICE AND ACTION ARM OF NEW HAMPSHIRE MUNICIPALITIES

# LEGISLATIVE BULLETIN

**Legislative Bulletin 10**

**2025 Session**

**March 14, 2025**



[Live Bill Tracker](#)  
[Bill Hearings Schedule](#)

---

**Editor's note:** Many local officials completed their terms of office this week, and some will next week. Whatever the timing, we thank all of you for the time and energy you have devoted to public service, including your work on behalf of NHMA. For those who have never served in local government, it is difficult to appreciate how much work and time are involved, and how thankless the task can be. We hope you will enjoy your time off. Meanwhile, we enthusiastically welcome all of the new officials. We look forward to working with you in the coming years.

## **Keeping Score of Zoning Mandates**

There are so many zoning mandates under consideration this year that you need a scorecard to keep track of them. These proposals, broadly framed as a response to the state's housing shortage and the ever-rising costs to own or rent, could significantly shift control away from local voters and municipal authorities.

Focusing primarily on zoning and planning downplays the fact that the lack of affordable housing stems from a combination of complex economic factors, the majority of which cannot be addressed through statewide mandates, including low inventory, sky-high home prices and monthly rents, higher interest rates, rising construction costs, and rising labor and materials costs.

NHMA's overarching concerns with these zoning mandates include:

- **Loss of Local Control:** Municipalities may lose the ability to manage zoning and planning effectively, impacting the character and development of their communities. This includes loss of voter rights, as voters approve or reject zoning in most New Hampshire municipalities.
- **Increased Administrative Burdens:** New mandates, particularly those allowing more ADUs and high-density developments by right, could increase administrative workloads and costs.
- **Parking and Infrastructure Strain:** Removing parking requirements and promoting high-density developments could lead to parking congestion and overburdened infrastructure.

**It's essential for local officials and residents to engage with legislators, share their concerns, and advocate for balanced, practical approaches to zoning and housing development.** For detailed instructions on ways to share your position on these and any other bills, see "*How to Make Your Voice Heard*" below.

Here's a status update on the bills NHMA has been following.

### **Priority bills**

**[HB 382](#)** (oppose), as amended, would restrict the ability of municipalities to require more than one parking space per residential unit in a development removing. NHMA opposes this bill, as well as a similar bill, **[SB 284](#)**, because it eliminates local control, creates potential planning issues including traffic management concerns, community aesthetic concerns, health/safety concerns, snow removal, and potentially more neighbor disputes, which could require law enforcement presence. Passed by the House as amended (25-0687h); sent to the Senate.

**[HB 410](#)** (oppose), as amended, prohibits municipalities from enforcing or adopting any "extraordinary restriction of residential property" unless the ordinance is directly necessary for the health or safety of the community, based on empirical evidence published by a non-partisan source. Bill recommended ought to pass with amendment (25-0979h) and will be on the House consent calendar at a future session.

**[HB 432](#)** (oppose) redefines the term "recovery house" and mandates that such facilities be treated like family housing in zoning ordinances, which could undermine municipal zoning authority. The bill is in the **[House Municipal and County Government Committee](#)**.

**[HB 577](#)** (oppose), allowing either one detached or attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) by right on single-family lots. The bill clarifies tools municipalities can use to regulate ADUs by being able to determine aesthetic requirements and mandate one of the

structures remains owner-occupied; however, the bill would repeal several other provisions that provide for local regulation in the current ADU statutes and would essentially turn single-family residential zones into two-family residential zones. Passed by House as amended (25-0449h); sent to the Senate.

**HB 631** (oppose), as amended permits residential building in commercial zones by right, pushing for mixed-use developments. While promoting urban density, it may lead to conflicts over land use priorities and contradicts one of the key purposes of zoning in RSA 674:17: to “consider the character of the area involved and its peculiar suitability for particular uses.” Bill recommended ought to pass with amendment (25-0667h) and in on the **Thursday, March 20**, House consent calendar.

**SB 84** (oppose), mandates zoning ordinances to allow smaller lot sizes for single-family homes, overriding current zoning regulations. The bill also requires municipalities to provide empirical evidence that the sewer system cannot support the lots, which adds a layer of complexity and burden on local governments. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on **Thursday, March 20**, with an ought to pass as amended recommendation; however, further amendments are expected.

**SB 163** (oppose) prohibiting local moratoria and limitations on building permits. In rare circumstances, municipalities need to delay or restrict the issuance of permits. Municipalities do this when they have infrastructure failures, typically water and sewer systems, and can no longer sustain increased development. These municipalities must do several things to abide by RSA 674:23, which permits these ordinances and requires providing information, in writing to the state. This is a comprehensive and last resort option for municipalities struggling with failing or already failed infrastructure that cannot support new development. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on **Thursday, March 20**, with an ought to pass recommendation.

**SB 170** (oppose), as amended (2025-0807s) limits various development and related requirements in cities, towns, and municipalities. The bill significantly reduces municipal autonomy and undermines the ability of local governments to address the needs of their individual communities. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on **Thursday, March 20**, with an ought to pass as amended recommendation.

**SB 188** (oppose), as amended, the bill allows property owners or developers to use licensed, insured private providers for building code plan reviews and inspections related to the state building code and any local technical amendments, excluding fire prevention and fire safety codes, and requires a municipal regulatory body to review and approve, or provide written notice to the independent provider of any specific deficiencies or compliance issues, within a required number of days (3 days or 5 days for code inspections depending on the type of building and 8 days for reviews of development documents and permits). Approvals will be considered granted as a matter of law if the municipal

regulatory body fails to respond within the mandated time limit. NHMA believes **SB 188** creates a troubling “building permits by default” model and would have multiple impacts on municipal revenue and expenses. Passed by Senate with amendment (25-0563s); sent to the House.

**SB 284** (oppose), prevents municipalities from setting the maximum residential parking spaces per unit to more than one parking space per residential unit, except that studio and one-bedroom units under 1,000 square feet that meet the requirements for workforce housing, and multi-family developments of 10 units or more may require up to 1.5 parking spaces per unit. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on **Thursday, March 20**, with an ought to pass recommendation.

**The above bills are the most concerning of all the zoning mandates and we really need members to speak out against them; however, there are many more proposals that could impact local autonomy.**

#### **Other bills (with NHMA position)**

**HB 229** (neutral), repealing the alternative procedure for adoption of zoning ordinances. Bill is in the [House Municipal and County Government Committee](#).

**HB 272** (oppose), exempting certain agricultural practices from municipal noise regulation. Passed the House and Referred to [Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee](#).

**HB 342** (oppose), as amended (25-0579h), allows property owners to build on their property without seeking a variance for minimum lot size or lot coverage if the proposed building density conforms to that of the surrounding neighborhood. Passed by House; sent to the Senate.

**HB 413** (oppose), relative to subdivision regulations on the completion of improvements and the regulation of building permits. Bill is in the [House Municipal and County Government Committee](#).

**HB 428** (oppose), prohibits municipal amendments to the state building code. Bill is in the [House Executive Departments and Administration \(ED&A\) Committee](#).

**HB 457** (oppose), as amended, prohibits municipalities from adopting any ordinance that discriminates based on the familial or non-familial relationships or marital status among the occupants of the dwelling unit or restricts the number of occupants of any dwelling unit to less than 2 occupants. Bill recommended ought to pass with amendment (25-0917h) and will be on the House consent calendar at a future session.

**HB 568** (support), allowing planning boards to request water supply studies to ensure adequate water availability as housing density increases, and mandates that provisions be included to guarantee sufficient water quantity for existing and future land uses. Bill

recommended inexpedient to legislate and will be on the House calendar at a future session.

**HB 685** (oppose), mandating manufactured housing by right in residentially zoned areas. Passed by House with amendment (25-0892h); sent to the Senate.

**SB 78** (oppose), setting the zoning board of adjustments appeal period at 30 days. Passed by Senate; sent to the House.

**SB 94** (oppose), prohibits municipal amendments to the state building code like **HB 428**, albeit with different wording. Passed by the Senate and sent to the House.

**SB 174** (oppose) prohibits planning boards from considering the number of bedrooms a given unit or development has during the hearing and approval process. Municipalities often regulate the number of bedrooms per dwelling unit in dense zoning districts to ensure the infrastructure capacity exists to support the developments and housing in those zoning districts. Also, there is no definition of bedroom in the building or fire code in the bill. These requirements also limit the number of parking spaces required for the development, which might be necessary if there is limited land for parking. Finally, the bill unintentionally creates new definition of planning board and planning board authority, giving planning boards authority to review and approve building permits instead of select board or building official. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on **Thursday, March 20**, with an ought to pass recommendation.

**SB 281** (oppose), prohibits municipalities from denying building or occupancy permits for property adjacent to class VI roads under certain circumstances. Municipalities currently may restrict building on class VI to prevent overdevelopment of undeveloped infrastructure and, in this case, unmaintained roads and to control scattered and premature development. While the bill requires that landowners sign a liability waiver, it does not consider whether the class VI roads and abutting properties can sustain new development. Additionally, it increases the chance that property owners who live on the class VI road request the road become regularly maintained, which increases costs. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on Thursday, March 20, with an ought to pass as amended recommendation (25-0947s).

**SB 283** (oppose) relative to the calculation of floor-area-ratios under local building ordinances. The Senate is scheduled to vote on the bill on **Thursday, March 20**, with an ought to pass recommendation.

**Bills that have been killed, tabled, or re-referred/retained in committee:**

**HB 459** (oppose), mandates certain acreage requirements and zoning regulations for single family properties depending on whether they are serviced by public water and sewer. This bill is similar to SB 84, as introduced. Retained in House Housing Committee.

**SB 90** (oppose), requires municipalities to allow high-density residential development on land zoned for commercial use, provided that adequate infrastructure, including roads, water, and sewage systems, is available or provided to support the development. This bill takes a one-size-fits-all approach that does not work for all communities; it also does not take into account the potential impact high-density developments could have on municipal revenue and expenses. Rereferred to Senate Commerce Committee

**SB 231** (oppose), relative to road frontage requirements and setbacks for wetlands. Rereferred to committee.

Finally, the governor this week signed **HB 399**, which establishes a commission to study the historical evolution of the 100-year-old New Hampshire Zoning Enabling Act. Its objectives include evaluating the relevance and effectiveness of the current zoning powers, assessing the appropriateness of existing regulations, and exploring potential legislative alternatives.

Hmmm ... wouldn't it make more sense to let this commission do a deep dive on zoning issues outside the time constraints of the legislative session, rather than passing dozens of mandates now and seeing how it works out? The fact is, under current zoning laws, nearly 20,000 units have been added in the state between 2020 and 2024 according to the NH Department of Business and Economic Affairs, and approximately 5,000 more unit will be added by later this year.

## **Weigh in on Anti-Lobbying Amendment NOW!**

The **House Legislative Administration Committee** will hold an executive session on a **non-germane amendment** to **HB 456** that essentially allows the legislature to dictate the speech and decision-making authority of local officials by limiting organizations like NHMA to providing “information” only to the legislature, while prohibiting such organizations from registering a position, nullifying NHMA’s member-adopted policies and principles. Under the amendment, other organizations similar to NHMA would be prohibited from using any public funds from engaging in lobbying. The session is scheduled on **Wednesday, March 19 at 1:00 p.m. in LOB Room 203.**

**We are urging local officials to contact members of the Legislative Administration Committee and tell them to reject the amendment.**

While the amendment specifically permits “an individual public official” to register a position, this is a red herring. As local officials know, organizations like ours are formed because it is not possible for individual local officials to follow the pace of the legislative session or attend hearings regularly; in fact, delegating such responsibility to a voluntary organization is by far the more efficient and responsible manner of engaging in the legislative process while ensuring local officials can focus on serving their communities. Therefore, the amendment is a hampering of local efficiency that would lead to one of two



outcomes: Less local government perspective and input in the legislative process or more time for local officials spent away from their regular duties to follow and engage in the process. Either result is to the detriment of local governments and their taxpayers.

**If any of your representative sits on the committee, please reach out to them directly.**

## **Risk Pool Regulation Bill Advances**

The Senate Finance Committee this week approved an amendment to SB 297, which relates to the operations and oversight of risk management pools. The bill will go to the Senate floor on **Thursday, March 20**, with a unanimous recommendation of ought-to-pass.

Pools are created by cities, towns, counties, and school districts to reduce risks and associated insurance costs, shifting risk from an individual political subdivision to the pool. NHMA supports the ability of members to establish and govern the pools and understands that clear regulations that protect the members and allow the pools to operate are necessary.

NHMA is opposed to **SB 297** because it contains provisions that will affect city and town expenses and change the terms of membership with risk pools.

- **Creates additional costs for members:** Pools would be required to collect additional funds from municipalities, in the form of special assessments, if losses fall below certain minimum reserve amounts specified in the statute or if the pool is deemed insolvent.
- **Establishes a new mandate for municipalities:** Municipalities would be required to create a non-lapsing reserve fund (a health care stabilization fund) to participate in a health pool. These reserve funds would be used to pay for assessments that may be levied during the year if the pool's reserves fall below the mandated levels in the bill or the pool becomes insolvent.
- The bill requires the municipal member to fund the reserve fund in amount equal to at least 1% of the municipality's health contribution, until the fund is equal to 4% of contributions. If the reserve fund is used to pay a special assessment, then the municipality must again rebuild at the rate of at least 1% per year until the fund is at 4%. In the end, this is a state mandate to appropriate more money than would otherwise be required to be a member of the health pool.
- Additionally, although the bill does say the municipality cannot participate in the health pool if the reserve fund isn't in place, we do not know what would happen to a health pool member if the legislative body did not appropriate the necessary minimum amount, especially since, for most municipalities, pool membership

renewals each year occur before the annual meeting at which reserve fund appropriations are approved.

**Changes to pool members' responsibilities:** These changes include that municipality must agree in writing that they are ultimately the responsible party for any potentially losses incurred while participating in a risk pool and that municipalities that terminate coverage are **responsible** for losses that occurred during the prior year.

## Chiming in on the State Budget

The [House Finance Committee](#) held a lengthy public hearing on [HB 1](#) and [HB 2](#) (the state budget) on Wednesday in Representatives Hall. In advance of the hearing, NHMA submitted written testimony urging the committee to recommend a budget that continues to maintain and build on recent legislative efforts to strengthen a state-local partnership that delivers property tax relief to New Hampshire citizens.

While we are pleased that HB 2 does not contain any adverse changes to the meals and rooms tax distribution formula\* or other dedicated funds from which municipalities receive a percentage, there are several areas of concern in the budget, as introduced.

**\*Note: On Friday, March 14, House Division I began a conversation about reducing the meals and rooms distribution from 30% to 25% and altering the distribution formula. It was stated that under the proposed new formula, some municipalities would get no distribution at all. Please contact [House Finance Committee members](#) and remind them about the history of this important state aid, particularly that municipalities only began receiving 30% in 2021, after more than a decade of receiving far less than the statutory amount of 40%.**

You can read the [full testimony here](#). Below are some key points:

- **Ensure full state funding for any retirement system changes:** HB 2 proposes to roll back various retirement reforms instituted by the legislature in 2011 that impact Group II (police and fire) members of the New Hampshire Retirement System (NHRS) who were hired prior to July 1, 2011. Unlike similar legislation in prior years, HB 2 does propose funding the full cost of these changes, including the municipal costs, by appropriating \$27.5 million in each fiscal year of the upcoming budget. HB 2 also calls for that amount to be funded annually through FY 2034; however, we are concerned that commitment could be changed by a future legislature. The revenue needed to insulate municipalities from the cost of these changes would be generated by a new revenue stream from legalizing video lottery terminals (VLTs). We recommend that the House send this portion of the revenue into a dedicated fund or otherwise restrict the revenue to ensure that the



long-term, ongoing cost of these retirement changes is not borne by property taxpayers.

- **Continue funding for the state's share of wastewater projects:** We urge the House to add back additional, nonlapsing funding for new SAG projects, and recommend at least \$5 million per biennium, so that we do not return to days of a “delayed and deferred” list.
- **Granite Advantage changes:** HB 2 proposes changes to CHIP, Medicaid, and Medicaid Advantage programs that will add new out-of-pocket costs for participants. NHMA opposes these changes because of their impact on local welfare budgets.
- **Keep RSA 31-A revenue sharing in the law:** We were disappointed to see that House Finance Division I voted to recommend repealing RSA Chapter 31-A, as opposed to simply suspending it. Although we support reinstatement of RSA 31-A with necessary statutory revisions, we understand that 2025 is not the year for such an action. However, in the future, revisions to RSA 31-A would be possible and could bring much-needed revenue to municipalities to offset property taxes and provide relief at the local level
- **Restore the state share of municipal employer pension costs:** For more than 30 years the law required the state to fund 35% of the municipal employer's contributions to the NHRS for teachers, police, and firefighters, all of whom are mandatory members of the retirement system. Reduction and then ultimate elimination of the state contribution in FY 2013 have created incredible strain on municipal budgets.

The House deadline to pass a budget is April 10. The three divisions of the House Finance Committee have been meeting regularly to review sections of the budget and make recommendations for the full committee to vote on.

The House phase is on the second step in a grueling four-month marathon. After they wrap things up in April, the Senate takes its turn to weigh in. If the House and Senate can't see eye to eye – which is often the case – they hash out their differences in a committee of conference. After all that, the budget lands back on the governor's desk for either approval or rejection sometime before the state fiscal year ends on June 30.

Some outstanding issues that could significantly impact the budget between now and June 30 include:

- The growing cost of settlements tied to abuse at the state's youth detention center decades ago.

- The availability of federal funds in light of recent executive branch efforts to reduce or eliminate various programs.
- The education funding lawsuits currently with the NH Supreme Court.

In summary, the budget process is fluid and requires close, ongoing scrutiny to ensure municipal interests are protected.

## Funding Cut Flying Under the Radar

On **Tuesday, March 18**, at **10:00 a.m.** in **LOB Room 201**, the [House Public Works and Highways Committee](#) will hold a public hearing on [HB 25](#), the capital budget.

This hearing particularly relevant for the [two dozen communities](#) that have public airports, as the governor's proposed budget did not include funding for NH's National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS) airport projects in FY 2026-2027. This omission impacts the future of airport capital funding in the state.

The NHDOT/Bureau of Aeronautics had requested approximately \$62.6M in FAA flow-through funding and \$4.7M in state matching shares for FY 2026-2027 airport capital projects, which has not been included in the budget. For more than two decades, with one exception, the capital appropriations for airport improvement projects have always included the FAA and NHDOT matching shares.

While the budget does propose extending the lapsing dates for certain previously appropriated accounts, these funds are likely to run out by the end of this year, leaving a funding gap until July 1, 2027.

This hearing provides an opportunity for stakeholders to voice their concerns and advocate for airport capital funding needs. We are urging local officials to attend the hearing or [contact](#) the Public Works and Highways Committee.

If your representative sits on the committee, please [reach out to them](#) directly.

## Ground Ambulance Rates Saga Continues...

It's clear that legislators and ground ambulance service providers agree that eliminating balance billing—*i.e.* billing a patient for the difference between the full cost of the service and the amount their insurance plan pays—is a good thing; however, the House and Senate have sharply different opinions on how much private insurers should reimburse providers.

This week, the Senate passed [SB 245](#), which NHMA supports, eliminating balance billing with the reimbursement rate set at [325%](#) of the current urban, rural, or super-rural Medicare rates, depending on the geographic area where the ambulance service

originated. As amended, the bill clarifies balance billing prohibitions, removes co-pay caps and waivers, and points to statute regarding prompt pay requirements. The Senate also passed [SB 130](#), which as amended, establishes a commission to study the issue.

Municipal ambulance services are essential services and not profit-driven; thus, appropriate reimbursement rates are crucial for their sustainability.

Meanwhile, on **Wednesday, March 19**, at **10:00 a.m.** in **LOB Room 302-304**, the [House Commerce and Consumer Affairs Committee](#) will report out two competing bills that set reimbursement rates for private insurers at different rates.

A subcommittee of the full panel met earlier this week and endorsed [HB 316](#), which would set a reimbursement rate for non-Medicare/Medicaid health insurance carriers at approximately 200%. NHMA opposes this rate because in many cases reimbursement is much lower than the actual cost. The argument some committee members made for a 200% reimbursement rate was that it was recommended by the NH Department of Insurance and a higher rate would unfairly burden the private insurance industry. Regarding any budget shortfalls municipal ambulance services could face due to the inadequacy of a 200% reimbursement rate, the response was that it would become the responsibility of the *local property taxpayers!* The subcommittee also recommended tabling [HB 725](#), which set the reimbursement at 325%. NHMA supports **HB 725** because it strikes a fair balance between competing interests.

Last Monday, the insurance department hosted an information session to review the [New Hampshire Ground Ambulance Cost Study](#) completed last year pursuant to **SB 407**. Public Consulting Group LLC (PCG), which conducted the study, presented its methodology and answered questions, but would not discuss the financial impact of a 200% reimbursement on ground ambulance services. The questions from participants, who included representatives, senators, ground ambulance service providers, and fire chiefs, highlighted the confusion and concerns with the methodology of the report.

The debate over this issue will continue the next two months, as the competing bills cross over to the other chamber.

## House Roundup This Week

The House met Thursday and acted on 14 bills NHMA has a position on, including four priority bills.

[HB 123](#), an NHMA-supported bill modifies the existing yield tax on cut timber in RSA 79, often called the “timber tax,” to include taxing the yield of the metric tonnage of carbon sequestered from standing timber, passed as amended (25-0654h) on a roll call vote, 197-158. **HB 123** supports the North Country and other heavily timbered areas where less

timber is being cut and, instead, being put into carbon sequestration agreements. The bill will promote local property tax relief.

The bill was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee.

**Other Priority Bills:**

[HB 185](#) (support), relative to reimbursement rates for ambulance service providers. **Inexpedient to legislate (ITL).**

[HB 382](#) (oppose), removing authority for municipalities to regulate mandatory on-site parking requirements. **Passed** with amendment.

[HB 572](#) (Support), establishing the “partners in housing” program, a low-interest loan and grant program under the housing champions fund to assist municipalities, counties, and developers in building workforce housing. **Passed** with amendment and referred to House Finance Committee.

**Other Bills (with NHMA position on the bill):**

[HB 149](#) (oppose), relative to warrant article approvals at ballot referenda form of town meeting. **ITL.**

[HB 185](#) (support), relative to reimbursement rates for ambulance service providers. **ITL.**

[HB 247](#) (support), authorizing municipalities to hold a referendum on whether to allow historic horse racing. **Passed** with amendment.

[HB 342](#) (oppose), relative to the approval process for new construction. **Passed** with amendment.

[HB 451](#) (support), establishing the paint product stewardship program. **Passed** with amendment.

[HB 490](#) (support), relative to indemnification for municipalities adopting policies to address homelessness. **ITL.**

[HB 512](#) (oppose), relative to preventing municipal employees from being paid under multiple municipal contracts simultaneously. **ITL.**

[HB 521](#) (support), authorizing online voter registration. **ITL.**

[HB 536](#) (oppose), relative to a cost-of-living adjustment in the state retirement system. **Tabled.**

[HB 562](#) (oppose), relative to the filling of vacant positions on elected municipal boards and school boards. **ITL.**

[HB 569](#) (oppose), relative to the establishment of county-wide communication districts. **Passed** with amendment.

[HB 668](#) (support), authorizing municipalities to hold a referendum to rescind the licenses of historic horse racing facilities. **ITL**.

[HB 688](#) (support), authorizing municipalities to tax charitable gaming facilities based on their enterprise value. **ITL**.

## Senate Roundup This Week

The Senate met Thursday and acted on seven bills NHMA has a position on are on the agenda, including two priority bills.

### Priority Bills:

[SB 231](#) (oppose), relative to road frontage requirements and setbacks for wetlands. **Rerefer** to committee.

[SB 245](#) (support), prohibiting surprise ambulance billing and regulating ground ambulance reimbursement. **Passed** with amendment (25-077s). *See related article above.*

### Other Bills (with NHMA position on the bill):

[SB 44](#) (oppose), relative to hand counts of ballots in elections. **Passed**.

[SB 103](#) (oppose), relative to the number of polling stations that are available for certain towns. **Passed** with amendment.

[SB 218](#) (support), relative to absentee ballot outer envelopes. **Passed**.

[SB 259](#) (support), creating an exception to physical attendance and quorum requirements under the right-to-know law for individuals with disabilities. **ITL**.

[SB 279](#) (support), establishing the housing champion business loan program and making appropriations to the department of business and economic affairs and the business finance authority. **Passed and tabled**.

## House, Senate Sessions Next Week

On **Thursday, March 20**, beginning at **10:00 a.m.**, the House and Senate are both meeting. To see what's coming up for a vote, see the [House Calendar](#) and [Senate Calendar](#). NHMA will send out a priority bill alert on Monday listing any key proposals that we are asking members to contact their legislators about.

## How to Make your Voice Heard

The adage goes that “life is all about showing up.” The same can be said for legislative advocacy. If a bill is of importance to your municipality, it’s always best to make your case – for or against – in person. Every Friday, NHMA posts a [Bill Hearings Schedule](#) for the upcoming week. However, if you can’t make it to Concord, you can use the Legislature’s online portal to put your position on the hearing record.

The House has an [online testimony submission system](#) that allows you to indicate your position on the bill with an option to attach testimony. If you want to email all the members of a House committee, you will have to copy their email addresses individually from the [committee page](#).

The Senate has [a remote sign-in sheet](#) where you can indicate whether you are supportive of a bill, opposed, or neutral. Written testimony can be submitted via the “Email Entire Committee” link found on the [Senate committee page](#).

If you have time to follow along, livestreams of [House](#) and [Senate](#) sessions and committee meetings are available on YouTube. Prior sessions and committee meetings are also archived.

Finally, if you just want to contact your legislators, there are [Contact a Senator](#) and [Contact a Representative](#) links on the [General Court](#) website.

Because the House and Senate have moved to digital calendars, committees can now reschedule when there is bad weather, absences, or when issues with bills haven’t been worked out. If you are planning to attend a hearing or work session in person, we strongly recommend checking the [House Digital Calendar](#) and [Senate Digital Calendar](#) before heading to the State House. For those of you with an interest in a particular bill or set of bills, please use the ‘subscribe’ feature on [FastDemocracy](#) to get email updates when those bills are scheduled or rescheduled.

## Reminder: Sharing is Caring ... About Good Public Policy!

If you know of anyone who may benefit from the NHMA Legislative Bulletin feel free to pass this email along and encourage them to sign up!

Members can subscribe to the Bulletin through our member portal at: <https://nhmunicipal.weblinkconnect.com/portal>

Once you are logged in, click “edit this profile” and “newsletter management.” You can sign up for the *Legislative Bulletin*, *Newslink*, and *Town & City* magazine in one place! (If you are having trouble logging into your account, [follow these steps](#).)



Nonmembers can email [info@nhmunicipal.org](mailto:info@nhmunicipal.org) to be added to our email list for the *Legislative Bulletin*.

---

**NHMA Events Calendar**  
**2024 Final Legislative Bulletin**

---

**Editorial Staff:**

**Margaret M.L. Byrnes, Executive Director**  
**Marty Karlon, Editor in Chief, Policy & Research Analyst**  
**Sarah Burke Cohen, Legislative Advocate**  
**Brodie Deshaies, Legislative Advocate**

**Layout & Communications:**

**Miranda Augustine, Communications Coordinator**

---

**New Hampshire Municipal Association**  
**25 Triangle Park Drive**  
**Concord, NH 03301**  
**Tel: 603.224.7447**  
**Email: [governmentaffairs@nhmunicipal.org](mailto:governmentaffairs@nhmunicipal.org)**  
**Website: [www.nhmunicipal.org](http://www.nhmunicipal.org)**