"RIGHT TO KNOW" REQUEST

The public information identified below is requested forthwith, pursuant to New Hampshire RSA 91-A.

NFORMATION REQUESTED FROM:			
Name of Public Body			
Address			
Person Making the Request (print):			
Name:	Phone:		Date:
Once payment is received*, if requested in	nformation is not in	nmediately av	ailable; I would like to have it:
o Sent to me via U.S.P.S. mail to:			
o Held for me. Call me at		and I will	l pick it up.
Signature of person making the request:			
Description of Information Requested:			
hereby attest that I have received a copy	-	rmation reque	st on behalf of the public body
named above ata.m. or p.m. or (Circle C		(Month, Da	ny and Year)
Name of the person accepting the request (Print)	Signature		
$\circ \qquad \text{The requested information is NOT AVA}$		-hl4 *e	
o The information may not be available. V		ch explanation if fy you of our resul	
 The information is available, and the cos Per audiotape. Larger documents or re 	st to reproduce will be _	per 8	3.5 x 11 photocopy \$

*Black and White photocopies of documents and of black and white computer—printed documents will be charged at \$0.50 per page for the first 10 pages of any document for letters (8.5 x 11) size, legal (8.5 x 14) size and ledger (11 x 17) size and \$0.10 per page thereafter. For example, since each document is treated separately for purposes of these charges, if a person wanted copies of both a 10 page document and a 20 page document, there would be a \$5.00 charge for the first document (\$0.50 x 10) and a \$6.00 charge for the second document (\$0.50 x 10 + \$0.10 x 10), not a \$7.00 charge for the two documents.

Colored photocopies of letter, legal and ledger size documents and colored computer-printed documents will be charged \$1.00 per page for the first 10 pages and \$0.25 per page thereafter. If necessary, employees may need to indicate in writing that a document requested to be reproduced in color will require additional time consistent with the City's personnel and other capabilities within which to produce a colored copy of the document.

"[W]e observe that this dispute has consumed an inordinate amount of time, energy, and resources—judicial and otherwise. The salutary purpose of the Right-to-Know Law—to 'ensure both the greatest possible public access to the actions, discussions and records of all public bodies, and their accountability to the people,' RSA 91-A:1—is best served when the members of the public and the governmental bodies are guided by a spirit of collaboration. We take this opportunity to encourage all public bodies, and members of the public making Right-to-Know requests, to embrace that spirit, and work together to efficiently and effectively resolve disputes involving RSA chapter 91-A.This case, on remand, presents just such an opportunity." *Marianne Salcetti, et al v. City of Keene,* New Hampshire Supreme Court Case No. 2019-0217, June 3, 2020.