

Minutes of the Town Deliberative Session of February 10, 2018
Community Center, Lions Avenue
Hudson, New Hampshire 03051

1. **CALL TO ORDER BY THE MODERATOR**, the Honorable Paul Inderbitzen called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.
2. **POSTING OF THE COLORS** by the Hudson Police Honor Guard
3. **THE NATIONAL ANTHEM** sung by Officer Taylor Morin
4. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** recited by Selectman Ted Luszey
5. **REMARKS BY THE MODERATOR**

Moderator Inderbitzen

Please be seated. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Deliberative Session of the Hudson Town Meeting. You will act as a legislative body to determine the final form of the warrant articles that will be voted on March 13, 2018 at the election. All of the articles by law must be placed on the ballot. The rules we'll follow today are the Moderator's Rules which were one of the handouts that you picked up when you came in and got checked in. If you have any questions about the rules please feel free to ask. You can ask for a point of order at any time if what I'm doing doesn't make sense. You may also vote to set any rules you would like as well by a majority vote, and you can overrule the decision of the Moderator. As a legislature we will be discussing the warrant articles before us. These discussions will be respectful to everyone's opinion. Please be courteous and respectful of all the comments and opinions as you would want yours to be respected, and to keep personalities out of the debate. Please use terms such as "the previous speaker, the Selectmen member, the Budget Committee member" when referring to others instead of by name. If you are a registered voter of Hudson you were issued a red voter card when you came in through the Checklist. We will use this to take any votes that we need to do. Don't lose it, you won't get another one. If you need to leave the meeting and come back take it with you and bring it back. After the meeting there's a box on the check in table where you can recycle them. Put them in the box, thank you. Only registered voters of Hudson are allowed to participate in the discussion of the warrant. There are some non-voters and staff members of the Town who will be allowed to speak and answer questions to assist us in the meeting. So right now, please turn off your phones and pagers or put them into silent mode so as to not interrupt the meeting. We'll take a few breaks after some of the articles. Refreshments are for sale at the Hudson Junior Women's Club and the Hudson Community Club in back. We appreciate their help. They also have valentines that they will be making out in the back. You are free to take one and fill one out. They are being given to veterans in the Harbor Homes Group as a community project. Feel free to sign a card for Valentine's Day for the veterans. Also, this meeting is being televised live on Hudson Cable and will be available for viewing or streaming after today on HCTV. We appreciate that the Hudson Cable Committee and staff do for keeping the citizens of Hudson informed. Let us begin.

6. **BOARD OF SELECTMEN**
Thaddeus Luszey, Chairman
Marilyn E. McGrath, Vice Chairmen
Roger E. Coutu
Angela Routsis
David S. Morin
7. **BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS**
Ted Trost, Chairman
Normand Martin, Vice-Chairman
Jim Barnes

Shawn Murray
Joseph Fernald
Robert Guessferd
Lori Robicheau-Pagan
Grace Hopkins
Malcolm Price, School Board Representative
Patty Langlais, School Board Alternate

8. STAFF/OTHERS

Patti Barry, Town Clerk/Tax Collector
Steve Malizia, Town Administrator
Kathy Carpentier, Finance Director
Lisa Nute, IT Director

Non-Voters

Robert Buxton, Fire Chief
Jason Lavoie, Police Chief
George Theborge, Land Use Director
Atty. David LeFevre of Tarbell and Brodich
Members of the Press

9. DELIBERATIVE SESSION OF TOWN MEETING

Moderator Inderbitzen

To the inhabitants of the Town of Hudson, in the County of Hillsborough, in the State of New Hampshire, qualified to vote in town affairs are hereby notified and warned that the two phases of the Annual Town Meeting will be held as follows: The first session of the Annual Meeting, the Deliberative Session, February 10, 2018 at 9:00am in the Community Center, 12 Lions Ave, Hudson, NH. The second session of the Annual Meeting by official ballot voting will be Tuesday, March 13, 2018, here at the Community Center, between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m., for the warrant.

Article 1 is the election of the officers, which will be posted on the warrant. Articles 2 through 6 are Zoning Amendments. We don't discuss the zoning amendments at this meeting since they had two public hearings by the Planning Board and they're not amendable at this point. However, in the warrant, you have the description of the amendments. However, on the ballot you will see, it has to be in the form of a question, a lot like Jeopardy. It has to be a yes/no question. So before the description you see in the warrant today will be a question "Are you in favor of the adoption of amendment no. ___ as proposed by the Planning Board for the Hudson Zoning Ordinance as follows:" and then each of these descriptions will follow that. That's how the ballot will appear. It's supposed to be by law those words have to be on the ballot, not necessarily on the warrant. We'll correct that next year. So articles 2 through 6 are zoning amendments. Mr. Theborge, the Planning Director, is in the back during the breaks if you have any questions about the zoning amendments, and there's handouts there. They are all wording, they're not map changes, they're all wording changes. So if anyone has any questions you can approach him during the breaks and we'll deal with that.

Article 07: General Fund Operating Budget

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate as the General Fund operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$25,905,878? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$25,560,233, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Hudson or by law; or the governing body may

hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will recognize Mr. Trost, Chairman of the Budget Committee, to present the Operating Budget, Article 7.

Ted Trost

Good morning, thank you all for coming. The Board of Selectmen directed the Department Heads to submit level funded budgets. Other major items or new initiatives were to be addressed separately for the Board's consideration either as a request outside of the department's budget or in the form of a warrant article. The Board reviewed each major item and adjusted the department's budget for those that were deemed essential to the department's operation. The Board voted to send to the Budget Committee the general fund operating budget of \$25,905,878, the sewer fund operating budget of \$2,243,192 and the water fund operating budget of \$4,022,907. The Board also approved the general fund default budget in the amount of \$25,560,233, the sewer fund default budget in the amount of \$1,702,566, and the water fund default budget in the amount of \$3,362,420.

After reviewing the general fund operating budget, the Budget Committee is recommending a general fund operating budget of \$25,905,878. The projected tax rate for the operating budget is \$5.52/thousand, which is a \$0.20 cent increase from fiscal year 2018. The Board of Selectmen is recommending this 4-0, the Budget Committee is recommending this article 11-0.

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the Budget Committee for this year. The Vice-Chair Normand Martin, the Clerk Joe Fernald, Jim Barnes, Bob Guessferd, Lee Lavoie, who's the Chair of the School Board and representing the School Board today, Shawn Murray, Lori Robicheau-Pagan, Grace Hopkins, and absent today is Andy Levin who could not make it. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. My mistake for not asking the Boards to introduce themselves. I'll ask Chairman Luszey to introduce the members of the Selectmen as well.

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator and just a slight correction on the last speaker. The tax rate is a \$0.20 cent decrease over FY18, not increase. Thank you. Now to introduce this year's Board of Selectmen. To my right we have Selectman Marilyn McGrath, Vice-Chair, Selectman Roger Coutu, Selectman Angela Routsis, Selectman David Morin, Town Administrator Steve Malizia, and our Finance Director who makes this all possible, Finance Director Kathy Carpentier. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. On Article 7, the Operating Budget. We will now open the article up to questions, comments, amendments. Anyone wish to speak on Warrant Article 7, the Operating Budget? Seeing none, I'll close the discussion on Warrant Article 7.

Article 08: Sewer Fund Operating Budget

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate as the Sewer Fund operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$2,243,192? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$1,702,566, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Hudson or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will recognize Selectman Moring to present Warrant Article 8, the Sewer Fund Operating Budget.

David Morin

Good Morning everyone. Warrant Article 8 raises and appropriates the sum of \$2,243,192. The Sewer Utility is funded by the user fees and charges. There will no changes in the sewer rate for fiscal 2019. The default budget for the Sewer is \$1,702,566. This warrant article has no impact on the tax rate. The Board of Selectmen recommended it 5-0, the Budget Committee recommended it 11-0. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. At this time we will open Article 8, the Sewer Operating Budget, to questions, comments, amendments. Anyone have any questions on the Sewer Operating Fund? Anyone wish to speak on it?

Ray Gendron, 7 First Street

What does it mean no impact on the budget? What do you mean by that? It changed from last year.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Malizia will yield to the question.

Town Administrator Steve Malizia

So the Sewer is paid for by the users so there's a sewer rate. If you have sewer you pay a certain rate. Based on the budget we've proposed there is no rate change.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Any other questions, comments on the Sewer Operating Budget?

James Wilkins, 112 Belknap Road

I would like to know what we get for the additional funding.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question. Mr. Malizia will respond.

Steve Malizia

As you can see right up here (slide) there is a delta between the budget that is being proposed and the default budget. There's some capital projects that need to be accomplished in the next fiscal year, chiefly replacing the pumps down at the Sagamore Pump Station. They were installed in, I believe, the 80's. They're getting worn. As you recall this year we replaced the Industrial Drive pumps. It's integral to the system to keep things moving, so there's a proposal to replace those pumps. There's also a proposal to replace the sewer under the Melendy Road bridge, it's not really a bridge but it serves as a bridge. We need to replace that, that's starting to fail. And then the balance is basically we've got some lease purchases of some pickup trucks that we use in that division. So these are all in the budget, no rate increase. We're paying for them either through Capital Reserve Funds or surplus in the budget, but in essence, that's the difference.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion, Warrant Article 8. Seeing none I will close the discussion on Warrant Article 8. It goes to the ballot.

Article 09: Water Fund Operating Budget

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate as the Water Fund operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$4,022,907? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$3,362,420, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Hudson or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will recognize Selectman Morin to present Article 9.

David Morin

The Water Utility is funded by the water users, fees and charges. There are no changes to the water rates for fiscal 2019. The warrant article has no impact on the tax rate. It is recommended by the Board of Selectman 4-0, the Budget Committee 11-0.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Are there any comments, questions or amendments on Warrant Article 9, the Water Fund Operating Budget?

Kara Roy, 46 Marsh Road

I guess I have the same question as the previous person that asked about the Sewer. What do we get for the increase?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Malizia will yield.

Steve Malizia

Again, we have some other capital projects proposed for the Water Utility. If you take a look over here (slide) we are looking to put a surge valve at the Sullivan Road Meter Pit. That's where the water leaves Hudson and goes into Pelham and Windham. We want to be able to have a shutoff valve over there, we currently don't have one. We need to paint the Gordon Street tank. It's a metal tank and it's showing signs of wear, so that needs to be taken care of. We're also looking to put a backup propane generator over at the Dame/Ducharme Wells in Litchfield. Right now if we lose power we don't have a robust enough generator to keep our system running. So what we're looking at is doing those capital projects. We're looking to taking it from Cap Reserve funds or surplus in the utility so it has no impact on the rates. These are necessary projects.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Any further discussion on Warrant Article 9. Seeing none I will close the discussion on Warrant Article 9.

Roger Coutu

I'd like to make a motion to restrict reconsideration of Warrant Articles 7, 8 and 9.

MOTION BY ROGER COUTU, SECONDED BY MR. MORIN, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF WARRANT ARTICLES 7, 8 AND 9.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Mr. Coutu moves to restrict reconsideration. Seconded by Mr. Morin. Restriction of Reconsideration means that these articles could no longer be brought up at this meeting and they will go to the ballot as they are printed. We'll use our voting cards for this. Everybody understand restricting reconsideration? It's to cut off debate and not to allow them to be brought up later. If you are in favor of restricting reconsideration of Warrant Articles 7, 8 and 9 please raise your voting cards. Thank you. Those opposed to restriction. Thank you, the ayes have it. Articles 7, 8 and 9 are restricted.

MOTION CARRIES

Article 10: Wage & Benefit Increase for Town Clerk/Tax Collector

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$1,333 which represents an increase in wages and benefits for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will recognize Selectman Luszey to present Article 10.

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. Warrant Article 10 proposes a wage increase for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector. This is a combined position. This is an elected position and requires a vote at town meeting to change a salary. The annual salary for this position is currently \$56,014. This article proposes a 2% increase which would raise the annual salary to \$57,134, which is an increase of \$1,120. The balance of \$213 is raised for FICA and pension costs. The last salary increase for this position was in fiscal year 2018 when the voters approved a salary increase of 2%. The current Town Clerk/Tax Collector has held this position since 2007. This warrant article would add less than \$0.01 cent to the tax rate. The Board of Selectmen recommended this article 4-0, the Budget Committee recommended this article 11-0. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open Article 10 to questions, comments, amendments. Anyone wish to discuss Warrant Article 10, salary increase for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector? If not, I'll close the discussion on Warrant Article 10.

Article 11: Town Clerk/Tax Collector Salary Scale

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to approve a salary schedule based on years of service for the office of Town Clerk/Tax Collector pursuant to RSA 41:25 and 41:33? If adopted, the annual salary for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector shall be established in accordance with the following salary schedule:

Years of Service	Salary
Year 1 (Minimum)	\$54,921
Year 2	\$56,843
Year 3	\$58,833
Year 4	\$60,892
Year 5	\$63,023
Year 6	\$65,229

Year 7	\$67,512
Year 8	\$69,875
Year 9 (Maximum)	\$73,320

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-1)

I will recognize Selectman Luszey to present Warrant Article 11.

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. Warrant Article 11 proposes a salary schedule for the elected Town Clerk/Tax Collector position. The Board of Selectmen wanted to establish a salary schedule that takes years of service into account. The scale was developed by reviewing salaries from area communities that have combined Town Clerk/Tax Collector positions. Each step on the schedule represents one year of service. A newly elected Town Clerk/Tax Collector would start at year one, the minimum, and move up the scale for each step. The warrant article has no impact on the tax rate. The Board of Selectmen recommended this 5-0, the Budget Committee recommended it 10-1.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open Article 11, the Town Clerk/Tax Collector Salary Scale for discussion. Anyone have any questions, comments or amendments?

Tracy Stevens, 42 Adam Drive

I was just curious if this would be retroactive for the person who currently holds the position? So would they automatically be at year 9?

Ted Luszey

The answer is they would not automatically be at year 9, but that does get at why we want to do this is because if we bring someone in today they would start at the salary that's there, not the minimum, and that has been a problem throughout the years in this town.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Any additional questions, comments on Warrant Article 11, to setting a salary scale. Seeing none. I'll recognize Selectman Coutu please go to the mic. Oh, do you want me to close 11 first? I will close the discussion on Article 11 and it goes to the ballot. Now, Selectman Coutu.

Roger Coutu

I'd like to make a motion to restrict reconsideration of Warrant Articles 10 and 11.

MOTION BY SELECTMAN COUTU, SECONDED BY SELECTMAN ROUTSIS, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF WARRANT ARTICLES 10 AND 11.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Motion made by Selectman Coutu to restrict reconsideration of 10 and 11, seconded by Selectman Routsis. Again, this would be cutting off further debate on this. It couldn't be brought up later in the meeting. If you're in favor of restricting reconsideration of articles 10 and 11, those in favor? Thank you, those opposed? The ayes have it. Articles 10 and 11 are restricted.

MOTION CARRIES

Article 12: Wage and Benefit Increase for Library Personnel

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$15,980 in wages and benefits for the Library Director, five Librarians and two Assistant Librarians of the Rodgers Memorial Library in an effort to move the rate

of pay for these positions closer to the average hourly wage rate reported by New Hampshire Libraries serving comparable communities? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-2)

I will recognize Selectman Morin to present Article 12.

David Morin

Warrant Article 12 proposes a wage increase for eight full time Library employees, the Library Director, five Librarians and two assistant Librarians at the Rodgers Memorial Library. An effort to move the pay for these positions closer to the average hourly rate reported by the New Hampshire Libraries serving comparable communities. Of the \$15,980 being raised, \$13,425 is for salaries, \$2,555 is for payroll, taxes and pension costs. The warrant article would add less than \$0.01 cent to the tax rate. The Board of Selectman voted in favor of this 4-0, the Budget Committee voted in favor of this 9-2. I would like to yield to the Chairwoman of the Rodgers Library Trustees to speak on this article.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Mr. Morin yields to Robin Rodgers

Robin Rodgers, 16 Mountain View Drive

What the Library is doing is trying to bring the full timers into line with the rest of the communities around us, and also with our own community. They are the lowest paid people in the town. They don't have a union, they don't have anyone to stand up for them except for the Trustees. So we put in this warrant article to see if we can bring them up and raise them to a rate that is comparable with communities. And also, once we get them to those rates we want to put in a step situation so that everybody knows, kind of like what you did here with the Tax Collector, so that you know where you are, where you stand, and what you are going to make when you do your job. So I'm asking that we approve this warrant article.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Opening the discussion of Warrant Article 12 to questions, comments, amendments. Yes, sir.

Ted Trost, 63 Rangers Drive

I rise in support of Article 12 and the comment that I'm about to make applies to all town employees. If we pay an average rate, it's difficult to keep anything but average employees. We need to be paying above average, not a lot, but we need to retain good people. We need to recognize that they are good people. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion Warrant Article 12, Wage and Benefit Increase for Library Personnel. Anyone else wish to ask questions or speak on Warrant Article 12? If not I will close the discussion on Warrant Article 12.

Article 13: Hire Four (4) Firefighter/AEMTs

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$349,548, which represents the cost of wages and benefits to hire four Firefighter/AEMTs, with 75% of the salary and benefits being subsidized by the Federal Government, with the sum of \$262,161 to come from the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grant, and the balance of \$87,387 to be raised from general taxation? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-1)

I will recognize Selectman Luszey to present Warrant Article 13

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. This Warrant Article 13 seeks voter approval to hire four Firefighter/AEMTs at a total first year cost of \$349,548. 75% of this salary and benefits costs totaling \$262,161 will be subsidized by a federal grant. The remaining balance of \$87,387 will be raised by general taxation. The Fire Department estimates that it will respond to over 4,000 emergency incidences this year out of the three stations. By adding these four new positions the Fire Department will be able to provide peak time staffing by raising the day time coverage to a staffing level of eleven on duty Firefighter/AEMTs. The grant requires a 25% match from the Town for the first two years, a 35% match in the third year, and in the fourth year of the program and beyond the Town would be responsible for 100% of the funding for these positions. The tax impact for this warrant article is \$0.03 cents per thousand. The Board of Selectmen have recommended this article 4-0, the Budget Committee has recommended this article 10-1. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I will open Article 13, Hiring of Four Firefighter/AEMTs to questions, comments, amendments.

Fred Giuffrida, 14 Pinewood Road

Could somebody address what the population of the Town of Hudson has done in the last five years? Has it gone up, gone down, stayed the same? Why do we need four new Firefighters?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question of the Board. Selectman Luszey will yield.

Ted Luszey

I don't have the exact numbers but about five years ago we were sitting roughly at 25,000, today we're roughly 28,000. The majority of that increase in population is elderly/over 55 type communities. Don't know what the projection is five years out from right now.

Fred Giuffrida

A second question is this means that four years from now we're looking at a tax increase, actually we are looking at a tax increase every year to absorb the federal portion of this?

Ted Luszey

Yes, up to 100% of it.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Further discussion, Warrant Article 13.

Ted Luszey

If I may Mr. Moderator, just so a point of clarity on that last one. In the fourth year we don't have to keep them. We could choose not to, but. The point is we own it.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Yes, sir

Alejandro Urrutia, 9 Campbello Street

Good Morning, my name is Alejandro Urrutia. I am a resident of Hudson. My address is 9 Campbello Street. I am living here for twenty plus years, probably 27, 28 years. I am a medical doctor. I have doing training of advanced (inaudible) life support, basic life support to professional rescuers. That is something that I know. When there is an

emergency it's time related. A fast response is the key. A couple of minutes of difference can be the difference between life and death. What is extremely important is to have a person that is very well trained and very well prepared. They must be in shifts and should not be extremely long so they are not exhausted. The Fire Department needs to have the right personnel and the right equipment to be able to respond to an emergency. Also, we are facing the Opioids emergency. That is also time related. When we have people that are well trained and well prepared, that is when we increase the chances for a victim to survive. Furthermore, we are aging. I know that every day when I let my beard grow I can see that, so it's whiter and whiter. And the reality is that we are getting older. The chances to face a life threatening condition are more. When we chose to live in a town, in a place, it's because it's safe, and Hudson, so far, is a safe community. And we want to keep it that way. So I ask everyone to support Article 13. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 13.

Mary Joy Gasdia, 4 MacCann Road

I'd like to also support exactly what the previous speaker said. I think that having the right personnel is extremely important. Safety is a huge concern all across the country and I don't think Hudson should be any different. I think that our citizens should never have to face the possibility that there's two or three emergencies that happen to be at the same time and we don't have enough people to go to them. I think that this could only benefit and enhance the security and safety in Hudson. I think it will benefit and round out the Fire Department and I would urge people to vote in favor of this.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 13.

Kate Messner, 10 Third Street

I just want to know from a logistic standpoint how does it work then? Does it become an article every year automatically to revote it in with this matching system?

Moderator Inderbitzen

My understanding is that if we vote this then for the next four years it will be in the budget, the percentage that we have to cover. At the end of four years I'm not sure whether they would put that in the budget or not. The future Board of Selectmen would have to do that, I believe, beginning of the fourth year.

Ted Luszey

The beginning of the fourth year when it's 100%.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Right. They would make a decision at that point if they just put that in the budget that would be fine. They wouldn't have to have a formal warrant article. Further discussion Warrant Article 13. If not, seeing none, I'll close the discussion on Warrant Article 13. Selectman Morin.

Dave Morin

I rise to restrict debate on Articles 12 and 13.

MOTION MADE BY MR. MORIN, SECONDED BY SELECTMAN COUTU, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF ARTICLES 12 AND 13.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Again, this motion will cut off the ability to bring this up later in the meeting. Since we only have one Deliberative Session that would be today. If you are in favor of restricting reconsideration please raise your voter cards. Those opposed? Thank you. The ayes have it. Article 13 is restricted. I'm sorry, 12 and 13. Everybody got that? That was for 12 and 13. Anybody want me to revote that?

MOTION CARRIES

Article 14: Hire Associate IT Specialist

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$93,943 which represents the cost to hire a full time Associate IT Specialist to work in the Information Technology Department? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3-1) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-2)

I will recognize Selectman Luszey to present Article 14.

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. Article 14 proposes to hire a full time Associate IT Specialist. The IT Department supports all of the town's IT infrastructure from the Town Hall to all of the Fire Stations, Senior Center and other remote buildings such as this and others, including integrating all State and Federal databases. During the last twenty years the number of devices connected to the IT infrastructure in the Town has increased more than five times. This includes now wireless and all cellular devices. The network and data security has become a full time task by itself. Article 14 is requesting \$93,943 for wages and benefits. This article adds approximately \$0.03 cents to the tax rate. This article was approved by the Selectmen 3-1 and approved by the Budget Committee 9-2.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I will now open Article 14 to discussions, comments, amendments. Anyone wish to speak on Article 14, the Hiring of IT Specialist? Seeing none, we'll close the discussion on Article 14.

Article 15: Widening Lowell Rd from Wason Rd to Sagamore Bridge

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$1,500,000 for the design and construction of an additional lane on the south bound side of Lowell Road from Wason Road to the Sagamore Bridge ramp? This project will be funded with \$1,200,000 (80%) from NHDOT federal grant and \$100,000 from the Lowell Road Corridor Fund, and \$200,000 from the Undesignated Fund Balance. This is a Special Warrant Article, per RSA 32:3 VI, reflecting an appropriation that will not lapse until the monies are expended, or June 30, 2023, whichever is the earliest. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will now recognize Selectman McGrath to present Warrant Article 15. I think we'll take a break after this if that's ok with everybody.

Marilyn McGrath

Good Morning. Warrant Article 15 is for the design and construction of an additional lane on the southbound side of Lowell Road from Wason Road to the Sagamore Bridge ramp. The total cost of the project is \$1,500,000. The New Hampshire Department of Transportation is funding \$1,200,000 of the project. \$100,000 is coming from the Lowell Road Corridor account, which is CAP fees that are collected by the Planning Board for impacts to the roadways. The remaining \$200,000 is coming from the Town's undesignated fund balance. The project should reduce traffic delays, particularly in the morning rush hour, and Wason Road particularly during the morning commute. This is a non-lapsing warrant article and the funds will be available until the project is completed or June 30, 2023, whichever comes first. There is no tax impact for this warrant article. The Board of Selectmen has recommended this article 4-0, the Budget Committee has recommended as well 11-0.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I will open Article 15 for questions, comments, amendments. Anyone wish to discuss Article 15, the Widening of Lowell Road from Wason Road to Sagamore Bridge? No questions. I will then declare the discussion of Article 15 closed.

Ted Luszey

Mr. Moderator, motion to restrict reconsideration of articles 14 and 15.

MOTION BY SELECTMAN LUSZEY, SECONDED BY SELECTMAN COUTU, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF ARTICLES 14 AND 15.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Motion by Mr. Luszey, seconded by Mr. Coutu, to restrict reconsideration. Ready for that vote? All in favor of restricting reconsideration of 14 and 15, raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed? Thank you. The ayes have it, Articles 14 and 15 are restricted.

MOTION CARRIES

At this time I'd like to take a little break if that's ok. There are pictures in the back of the Lowell Road corridor and also the next one we are going to discuss, the Benson Park one. If anyone wants to ask questions, they're back there. We'll take a ten minute break and we'll get back into business. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Let's come back to order. To continue with Article 16.

Article 16: Benson Park Restroom Facility

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$240,000 for the design and construction of a permanent restroom facility in Benson Park and provide for operational costs for the first year? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0) (Not Recommended by the Budget Committee 5-6)

I will recognize Selectman Morin to present Article 16.

Point of order (from unknown audience member), article 15?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Article 16, we did Article 15, the Widening of Lowell Road.

David Morin

Warrant Article 16 is for the design and construction of a permanent restroom facility at Bensons Park. This warrant article also includes the operating costs for the first year. The cost of constructing the restroom facility is approximately \$221,000. The first year operating cost is estimated to be \$19,000. The proposed facility will be located in the rear of the gorilla house building. The location is in the highest traffic area of the park and near existing water and sewer lines. Operation of the facility will be seasonal, open from early April through late November when the park has its most use. The facility will not be heated. The tax rate impact of this warrant article is \$0.08 cents per thousand. The Board of Selectmen recommended this article 5-0, the Budget Committee did not recommend this article and the vote was 5-6. I would like to yield to the Chairman of the Benson Committee Jim Barnes to speak on this article.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Selectman Morin yields to Mr. Barnes.

Jim Barnes

Good Morning. So just a little background on how we got here. In 2009, I think most everybody is aware, the Town acquired the property and began opening it up. Since that time we've used portable toilets for everybody, all the visitors in the park, all the workers in the park and so on. Sometimes, as people have said, they've been abused or overused but this is what we have. We do have a service company that has given us good service for the last couple of years. In 2016 we switched to the current company and they have provided good regular service and additional service when required. In 2016 the Town voters approved a warrant article to bring utilities into the park. This warrant article approves some money for water and sewer and for some electric utilities. This past year, 2017, the Town Highway Department did a lot of work getting the water and sewer lines extended and the elephant barn is now connected to those utilities. The restroom facility will be making use of those extensions and that's partly why we have chosen the location that we did.

About a year ago the committee started looking at the feasibility of a permanent restroom facility. The current master plan that was adopted by the Town in 2002 did include line items for permanent restrooms. So that's partly why the Benson Committee went forward with that. So we looked at several different locations, including near the elephant barn, near the playground, and we chose the proposed location at the gorilla house because it is central to the highest traffic areas in the park, the playground obviously, the 911 Memorial. The dog park is not too far away and also it gets a lot of traffic in and out of the park going to various places for picnics and things like that. We did look at the top of the hill as well as a possible location near the elephant barn office but that puts it into the historic conservation area, and so that puts additional restrictions and we have to go through additional steps in order to put something up in there. So we decided that the gorilla house location would be the best. We also looked at developing a new structure which would add additional costs. There are some prebuilt buildings that some of the manufacturers make but delivering that into that location could prove a challenge. So we decided to go with a renovation of the back part of the gorilla house and use that as the location for the restroom facility.

Over the past year, as I've said, we contacted a few contractors and utility companies looking at trying to get estimates for what the construction would be. These are estimates, these are not bids. What we're trying to do is come up with something that we think is feasible and allow enough money for that. So we've got a structure cost construction of \$98,000 and utilities extensions. Water and sewer are right nearby already. Electric has to come down from the hill, so that's why that's more expensive. The operating costs as noted before, this would be a seasonal facility so we don't have to heat it. It would be open from April through November. The last slide is hard to see. We do have the diagram in the back if you want to take a look at more details, but this would be what the proposed facility would look like. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. We will now open up Article 16 to questions, comments, amendments who wish to speak on Article 16. Yes, ma'am.

Laurie Jasper, 83 Old Derry Road

I rise in support of this. I believe it's always been part of the master plan to have permanent bathroom facilities and I can only see this as a positive for the gem that is Benson Park. As someone who is part of annual tours for the third grades I am absolutely certain that the third grade teachers would be thrilled to have a real bathroom to bring the students to because that is the bathroom facilities during our annual tours. I do have a question, have they decided how many they can accommodate, the men's and women's bathrooms, so it would accommodate a large crowd in a short amount of time? That's one of my questions but I think it is short money very well spent and I encourage people to vote for it. I'm sorry that the Budget Committee did not recommend this but I feel that maybe they should think about it and change their vote because Benson Park is what Hudson is. When everyone talks about Hudson the first thing they say is Benson Park is so beautiful. So let's keep it beautiful and let's make this a permanent structure. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. There was a question on that discussion about the breakdown of the men's and women's accommodating it. Mr. Barnes will yield.

Jim Barnes

Yes, if you look at the floor plan diagram you'll see that there's a toilet and three urinals on the men's side and four toilets on the women's side. There is one of the toilets on each side is ADA accessible. That would be the volume. It certainly would be better than the four or six portable toilets that we have in the park today. It would handle a larger volume than that.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion. Yes, sir.

Normand Martin, 3 Edgar Court

I rise in opposition to this. We have other things in this town that \$240,000 can be spent on. My only question is do the porta potties go away totally with this brand new facility?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question: Do the porta potties go away if this facility is built? Mr. Barnes will yield.

Jim Barnes

In the winter time obviously there will be a portable toilet in the park because that's the only service that will be available, just like today. There would be one unit up near the elephant barn. As I said, this is seasonal, it is not heated. We don't plow down there so that's why we need something there. Portable toilets could be added if they have different events. You could bring additional portable toilets in if you're going to have a large number of people there, so that would be an option.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion.

Zachary Phillips, 7 Hickory Street

My only question, would this facility be locked at night time when the park closes?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Indicated, will it be locked?

Jim Barnes

Absolutely, absolutely. In fact, what we've been looking at is an automatic timer to unlock in the morning and lock in the evening. So you could secure it without having someone actually go there and do it every day.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion.

Ed Duchesne, 10 Spruce Street

I have a question. What are the operational costs for the first year in the event this should be approved? What are we looking at for future years?

Moderator Inderbitzen

The operational costs were in one of the slides.

Ed Duchesne

Oh, I see it. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Does that answer your question? Thank you. Further discussion, yes sir.

Alejandro Urrutia, 9 Campbello Street

I understand that is investing a lot of money but at the same time it is more friendly for families at Benson Park. Benson Park is very well known everywhere in New England. A lot of people years ago when they came here, and they told me where do you live? I went to live in Hudson, oh where Bensons Park is. The fact that Benson Park is open, a lot of families come from everywhere and that is good for business. I believe we have a more friendly park for families. That could attract even more people to come here with children. Children go to the bathroom all the time. So I believe it is a good idea to have the bathrooms to be over there. Also, I am not quite sure, I want to just have a question that was probably already answered. How much is the cost of the portable bathrooms they are using today?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. He asked a question about what is it costing us for the porta potties today? Maybe we should have pay toilets. We could get a little revenue.

Finance Director Kathy Carpentier

In fiscal 2017 they paid \$9,000. They are budgeting \$10,000 this year. If the warrant article doesn't pass we would need the \$10,000 to have the porta potties.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion.

Lindsey Benson, 13 Par Lane

My name is Lindsey Benson, no relation to the Park. I am in support of this article. I know there aren't a ton of young parents in the room but I hope I speak for all them and representing them when I say that this is very much needed. I have three kids. When I had one kid it wasn't a huge deal. I'd bring him on with me and it was fine. Now I also have twins, so I have three kids all in all. I remember myself a couple of years ago literally not being able to go to the bathroom because they were in their strollers. I can't really imagine myself holding both of them while going to the bathroom in a porta potty. I won't get too graphic, but this really is much needed. It's not safe to tell my six year old to just make sure you stay out here for one minute guys, all three of them. That's a safety thing as well. So I would just encourage everyone to vote for this article and I would also encourage hopefully the Budget Committee, those who voted against, to maybe reconsider. Because this is much more of a concern than you might think. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion.

Fred Giuffrida, 14 Pinewood Road

I have a couple of questions. The first one is, a restroom is not a porta potty. Who's going to actually clean and visit these restrooms and make sure that they're functioning and not destroyed a couple of times a day? Who's going to do that now? What town employee is going to do that?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question. Selectman Luszey will yield.

Ted Luszey

The Parks and Recreation Committee. In this last couple of years we created a virtual parks division underneath the Highway. There is a part time person assigned to the park to check everything and part of it would be this.

Fred Giuffrida

To clean the restroom? Great. My second question is what percentage of park visitors are not Hudson residents?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Selectman Luszey will yield.

Ted Luszey

Unknown. We do not have an accurate way of determining that. We had many discussions a couple of years ago about putting some type of monitoring system to gather that information. We had a warrant article, I think it was last year, about pay to play in the park and that failed more than two to one. So we really do not have a good idea of the number of non-residents to the Town. The reason I say that is because based on the deed anyone from New Hampshire is entitled to use that park even though it's in the borders of Hudson. Because we can't lock it up, we can't lock it up for anybody.

Fred Giuffrida

Ya, that's my problem. Before we start adding increased costs into the budget for the facility, I think we should look at the idea of charging non-residents a parking fee or something like that to use it. Spending this money for a restroom facility for people who don't live in Hudson seems like it shouldn't be in our budget.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion.

Lori Robicheau-Pagan, 7 Catalpa Drive

Lori Robicheau- Pagan of 7 Catalpa Drive, which is off of Kimball Hill Road, as some of you may know. So it's a daily occurrence that I pass by Benson Park and see the usage. I am very proud of that park that we have here in Hudson for our residents, as well as other people. However, I have to say that I am standing in opposition of this warrant article. When we looked at this I found that again, across the board, as a Town I think the Boards need to communicate more. We have contracts with so many porta potty companies. They range from like \$70 a day to \$105 a day, depending on who's renting them. So I think that if we kind of looked at that overall and comparatively shopped we would definitely get better rates for our porta potties. However, with that being said, we are paying \$9,000-\$10,000 a year right now for porta potties at Benson Park, which if you go to any parks around us in Nashua, you experience a porta potty. That's what you do when you go out to parks. Spending \$240,000 to put in bathrooms doesn't seem prudent at this time. That money is being spent not only for our residents but for all of the residents that visit that aren't even from Hudson. In doing that we could accomplish the same thing by staying with that \$10,000 contract or looking or shopping for a better one. However, we've increased the porta potties in Hudson to address some of the issues that are happening and that's why we're at the \$10,000 a year. We're going to spend \$10,000 a year just maintaining the new bathrooms from April to November. So from April to November we're going to spend just as much money having those bathrooms cleaned as we would as having the porta potties for a full year, on top of the infrastructure expense. That is why I am in opposition. The last comment if we did build this structure and these bathrooms they would far exceed the quality of the bathrooms in our own schools. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 16. Yes ma'am.

Mary Joy Gasdia, 4 MacCann Road

I rise in support of Article 16. Looking at it the Board of Selectmen recommended this 5-0. There wasn't one person on this board of elected officials that we elect to kind of think of these things ahead of time, and they recommend it fully, which makes me think a lot of thought went into that regarding this issue. I'm kind of surprised that it's 5-6 on the Budget Committee. I'd like to ask a couple of the people that were in favor of it to say why they were in favor of it from the Budget Committee. We've heard two people come up in opposition. As a resident I don't think it's about us versus out of town people. I think that's an easy excuse to use to say that people come from out of town. We still need to look at it as Hudson. We're proud to be here. Benson Park does happen to be, whether people like it or not, a focal point of this town. It's a great, phenomenal, positive thing that we have. There's nothing negative about Benson Park from a visitor standpoint. You can quab about little things like small things, parking, and different things. This morning, 8:00am this morning, to have a parking lot a quarter full of people that are there off-season speaks volumes to the use of the park. So I think a permanent bathroom facility is something that would be cleaner, I think it would be safer as to Ms. Benson, a previous speaker's point earlier. I think that it's something that's needed and the park committee looked into. I don't think it's just a matter of it's inconvenient to use a porta potty. I think the park is that well used that this bathroom would be supported. And I don't believe putting the decision based on outside people that visit the Town. We're here in the Town regardless of who visits. It's our responsibility as a town to make sure we're providing the best in our town. If other people get to use that so be it. But I would like to hear the Budget Committee if there was anybody for it that was willing to say why I'd love to hear that because the Selectman were 5-0. Not one of them opposed it which makes me shocked and happy and makes me want to vote for it.

Moderator Inderbitzen

The members would be able to address it if they so wish. I'll recognize Selectman McGrath and then the next lady there.

Marilyn McGrath

I just wanted to clarify for everyone here the reason why I voted in favor of putting this before the voters, and it was strictly for that reason. So that the voters could have the option of voting in favor or not. Don't assume by my vote that I'm in favor of this because I am not.

Mary Joy Gasdia

Can I just say thank you for that clarification and I appreciate the consideration to even say to put it in front of the voters and let's let the mass people in the town decide. So thank you for clarifying, I do appreciate you being honest.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Further discussion.

Tracy Stevens, 42 Adam Drive

I guess my question or comment, it doesn't really need a response. I talked to the gentlemen in the back about apparently they looked at the spots up near the barn and things like that. But watching different meetings throughout the year I don't think that the Benson Committee has yet done a numbers count for how many people are actually in the park day to day, and what size facility they actually need. I know that they're using the back of the elephant barn because that's the spot they feel is best cost area and they're picking four stalls in each because they fit. Do we really need two stalls each? Also, as a safety aspect, as another mother said, a lot of places are going to more of the family style restrooms. Three separate facilities with doors, they say family on them, they are not gender specific. A mom with a six year old boy probably doesn't want to send him into the men's room by himself. Opposite true for a dad

bringing a little girl, not wanting to bring her into the men's room. So I think that there are some other thoughts that the Benson Committee could maybe think about. One is size, do we really need that much? Two is, maybe going more towards a family style instead of a gender based, because it is a family event. And if you're feeling that you're putting in these facilities for the families with the kids then maybe you should think a little bit about that part of it. I'm not hugely in support of spending this much money on real bathrooms. I think that a porta potty for most of us who live in Hudson is fine. If you really, really have to go you can always go home, most of us live close enough. But just something for Bensons, even if it passes, could you please think about maybe a unisex family stall, or something different in your plans. Since these bids haven't been done maybe you could modify the plans. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion

Phyllis Appler, 62 Glen Drive

I left my apron on this time because the GFWC Hudson Community Club and the GFWC Hudson Juniors spend a lot of time digging in the butterfly garden. You know, a porta potty doesn't do much for cleaning up after you've been doing that. It would be lovely to have soap and water. I imagine there are more than a few parents who, after a peanut butter picnic, would be very happy to have a little soap and water available. So let's not forget about that plus side of having permanent bathrooms.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion

Mike Coumas, 16 Oban Drive

My only concern with building this, I think it would be a great idea with the use. We have property up north on a lake and the town property had a bathroom at the beach. After ten years with all the vandalism that was going on the Town tore it down. So I just want to make sure that if we do spend \$240,000 that the Town has something in place to monitor the building because vandalism is going to happen. Just look what happened to the barn recently with the fire inside. So I just want to make sure that the Town has a plan. We don't see a plan for Bensons in place where, are we going to have a full time person monitoring the park in the future? What are the future plans for Bensons just to make sure it's safe for what we're spending there. We spent a \$100,000 in the parking lot to pave it, cost is increasing, and it's all on the burden of Hudson. So I just want to make sure that the Town steps up and puts something in place to monitor that park. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion. Mr. Morin, you'll yield to that comment?

David Morin

In reference to the vandalism and that type of situation. They went forward with the locks that automatically unlock and lock it up. We don't have to deal with people there. We did visit a lot of area towns that have these types of bathrooms to see what they have done in reference to vandalism. The interior will be used all with a tile or cement block so they can't really damage that. There will be no paper towels for hands, it will be air blowers. They do make specific equipment to go in these type of bathrooms to limit the vandalism. So they have looked at that. That was one of the major concerns before they started the project. And every possible non-vandalism piece of equipment they can get will be put into the bathroom to make sure this doesn't happen. We did talk to the Police Chief when we started the process and he talked to the Nashua Police about vandalism in all their parks, which doesn't take place that often. They don't have many reports at all of that happening. So that was one of the major concerns of the committee before they started the project.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you, further discussion. Yes, sir?

Bob Guessferd, 39 Flying Rock Road

I do support the idea of the bathroom. I understand the concerns of young families. We, as the Budget Committee, however, are tasked with looking at the entire budget. That means the Town, the School, and trying to make decisions to best spend the money right now. I support the idea of a bathroom at some point at Bensons. Just this year my view was, I felt it was money that we could spend somewhere else. I think one of the other Budget Committee members made the same points. So that's really from my perspective why I voted in opposition to this particular warrant article and I would hope at some point it will be brought up again, because I do think it is something that eventually we will need to do. Just to me it wasn't as cost effective and there's a lot of other things we had to consider this year as a Budget Committee overall. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion

Vinny Pagan, 7 Catalpa Drive

I also live very close to Benson Park. I absolutely love the park. It's a beautiful facility and really with every community organization that puts their time and effort into beautifying it, it gets that much better. That said, I rise in opposition to this warrant article. I do not believe that this facility that's being designed is safe. Any multi-unit bathroom without eyes on security is inherently unsafe. There is no way to prevent someone being in that bathroom waiting for someone to get in that bathroom to prey upon them. Sexual predators exist, they will exist, and that is a magnet for potential crime and assault on our citizens, our children. As most people know, what I do for a living, I work in the schools. I can guarantee you that with a bathroom there will be graffiti, there will be vandalism. The operating costs is less than \$6,000 for these bathrooms, I guarantee you this operating cost is underestimated. These bathrooms will be vandalized within the first day they are open. They will be graffitied within the first day they are open. There is no plan for a daily, hourly maintenance of these bathrooms. They will be severely vandalized. If you look at the bathrooms, even in bathrooms at I93 North just before exit 2 there is State rest stop here in NH. There's eyes on security in that facility 24-hours a day and yet the bathrooms are still graffitied, constantly. They are on top of it. You're talking about a facility that will not have a full time person watching. It will not have a full time person giving any level of security. We're going to be told that these bathrooms are not going to be filthy, disgusting, vandalized and graffitied within a day. I guarantee it, absolutely guarantee it. With that said I am also opposed to the level of security that's even being proposed right now. The automatic locks are nice but without eyeballs on the situation, at least, in the very least, security mounted cameras with direct feeds to the Hudson Police Department so that someone can record who is going in and out of these bathrooms so that someone can actually be paying attention and crimes can be effectively investigated and prosecuted. Without at least some form of security camera system to make sure we know who's using it, when they're using it, how they're using without putting cameras in the bathrooms of course. But at least something outside these bathrooms, and that's not in the plan. I don't see it in the plan and I would never support anything that is inherently unsafe as I believe this plan is.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 16. Selectman Luszey. Mr. Gendron's going to make a comment and then we're going to take a vote to limit debate.

Ray Gendron, 7 First Street

One quick comment. I think the bathrooms are a good idea but this idea of a family type unit would seem to me a very favorable idea for a total picture, that all the bathrooms should be family admissible. The other comment I would make is Bensons is the center point for Hudson, and more than Hudson. I was in Tijuana on the way back to San Diego and there were some friends from California. The transportation of liquor from Mexico to California was

forbidden so they check you out, and I was bringing some drinks from Mexico to San Diego. So they asked me where I was from at the border and I said New Hampshire and the guy said Bensons Animal Farm.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Mr. Luszey, if you wanted to make that motion. I didn't hear a second so Mr. Luszey moves the question to cut off debate. Is there a second to that? Yes sir, Mr. Battis. Requires a 2/3. This is to cut off debate, we will no longer debate article 16 and it will move to the ballot. If you wish to cut off debate and no longer discuss Article 16 please raise your voter cards. Those opposed, please raise your cards. I give it the 2/3, ayes have it. We will cut off debate on Article 16 and it will move to the ballot.

MOTION BY SELECTMAN LUSZEY, SECOND BY MR. JAMES BATTIS, TO MOVE THE QUESTION.

MOTION CARRIES

MOTION BY SELECTMAN LUSZEY, SECONDED BY SELECTMAN ROUTSIS, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF ARTICLE 16

Moderator Inderbitzen

Motion to restrict reconsideration of Article 16, Mr. Luszey, seconded by Mrs. Routsis. This will prevent Article 16 from being brought up again at this meeting. All those in favor of restricting reconsideration of 16 please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed? The ayes have it, Article 16 is restricted.

MOTION CARRIES

Article 17: Funding for Fire Apparatus Refurbishment & Repair CRF

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$20,000 which will be added to the Fire Apparatus Repair/Refurbishment Capital Reserve Fund previously established? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will recognize Selectman Luszey to present Article 17.

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. Article 17 seeks to appropriate \$20,000 to put funding into the Fire Apparatus Refurbishment and Repair Capital Reserve Fund. This Capital Reserve Fund was established in 2008 for the purpose of refurbishing and repairing fire apparatus. This Capital Reserve Fund currently has a balance of \$58,145 in it. The tax impact for this warrant article is \$0.01 cent per thousand and as previously mentioned, it was approved by the Board of Selectmen recommended 4-0 and the Budget Committee 11-0. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I will now open Article 17, Funding of the Fire Apparatus Refurbishment & Repair CRF. Anyone wish to discuss Article 17? Any questions, comments, amendments? If not, I'll close the discussion on Article 17.

Article 18: Funding for Property Revaluation CRF

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$10,000 which will be added to the Property Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund previously established? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I'll recognize Selectman McGrath to present Article 18.

Marilyn McGrath

Warrant Article 18 seeks to appropriate \$10,000 to put funding into the Property Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund. This Capital Reserve Fund was established in 2008 for the purpose of conducting future property revaluations. The

Capital Reserve Fund currently has a balance of \$111,166. The tax impact for this warrant article is less than \$0.01 cent per thousand. The Board of Selectman has recommended this article 4-0 and the Budget Committee has recommended this article 11-0.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open up Article 18 to questions, comments, amendments, the Funding for the Property Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund. Any questions, any comments? Seeing none, we'll close the discussion on Article 18 and it moves to the ballot.

Article 19: Funding for Communications Equipment & Infrastructure CRF

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$200,000 which will be added to the Communications Equipment and Infrastructure Capital Reserve Fund previously established? This sum to come from the June 30, 2018 Unassigned Fund Balance. No amount to be raised from taxation. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

I will recognize Selectman Routsis to present Article 19.

Angela Routsis

Warrant Article 19 seeks to appropriate \$200,000 to put funding into the Communications Equipment and Infrastructure Capital Reserve Fund. This Capital Reserve Fund was established in 2013 for the purpose of repairing, replacing or improving the town's radio, communication system, equipment and infrastructure. This Capital Reserve Fund currently has a balance of \$499,894. This appropriation is coming from the General Fund unassigned fund balance. There is no tax impact for this article. The Board of Selectman recommended this article 4-0. The Budget Committee has recommended this article 11-0.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open up Article 19 to questions, comments, amendments. Yes, sir.

Fred Giuffrida, 14 Pinewood Road

First the usual disclaimer that no tax impact isn't exactly right. This money would go back to taxpayers in the non-expended fund balance, so it affects your taxes. Second question is purpose of Capital Reserves, a comment actually. The purpose of Capital Reserves is you put a little bit at a time away into a Capital Reserve Fund so that when you have a capital expense you have saved up this money that you can now use. So you see all the other capital reserve questions on this ballot you see \$10,000, \$20,000, \$30,000. \$200,000 that you're going to put into a Capital Reserve Fund? That's not a capital reserve fund contribution, that's a project. There is some expenditure that you are looking for \$200,000 for, and it just happens to be that the way of doing that is coming through the Capital Reserve Fund. \$200,000 into a capital reserve is a lot of money.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Mr. Trost will yield to the question.

Ted Trost

I'd like to address that. Public safety radio systems are incredibly expensive for municipalities. A system like ours can cost a million, a million and a half, to replace. If someone can correct me if I'm wrong but I believe ours is very close to end of life already. So that's why the amount is so large, both because of the size of the expenditure that we're going to have to make to replace our system, and because it's coming very soon and we'd like a large amount in that Capital Reserve Fund so that when that happens there's less of an immediate impact on the taxpayer.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 19? Selectmen Luszey

Ted Luszey

Thank you. To the previous speaker, he's absolutely correct. We have been talking about replacing all of the radio, Fire communication equipment, communication towers that are obsolete. The last project that we took a look at to try to get a handle on what it might cost was close to three quarter of a million dollars. This is not a large amount considering the amount it's going to cost to upgrade the communication infrastructure. We've been working to put fiber in the communications loop, if you will, for the Town of Hudson. The last segment, and if the IT Director can correct me if I'm wrong on this figure, to go from Alvirne High School back to Town Hall is about \$70,000, it's up now. What's the latest number? So it's close to \$90,000 now just for that one piece. If you take a look at all the pieces that goes into making all of that work, it's not an inexpensive item. It's very costly.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion Warrant Article 19, Capital Reserve Fund for Communication Equipment & Infrastructure. Further discussion? None seen, I'll close the discussion on Warrant Article 19. Selectman Coutu.

Roger Coutu

I'd like to make a motion to restrict reconsideration of Articles 17, 18 and 19.

MOTION BY SELECTMAN COUTU, SECONDED BY SELECTMAN ROUTSIS, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF ARTICLES 17, 18 AND 19.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Selectman Coutu moves to restrict reconsideration of Articles 17, 18 and 19. Seconded by Selectman Routsis. Restriction of reconsideration means they can't be brought up later in the meeting. Are you ready for that vote? All in favor of restricting 17, 18 and 19 please raise your cards. Thank you, those opposed to restriction. The ayes have it. Articles 17, 18 and 19 are restricted.

MOTION CARRIES

Article 20: Funding for Library Improvements CRF

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$30,000 which will be added to the Library Improvements Capital Reserve Fund previously established? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 6-5)

I'll recognize Selectman Morin to present Article 20.

David Morin

Warrant Article 20 would raise and appropriate \$30,000 to be added to the Capital Reserve Fund previously established in March 2007 for the purpose of improving and renovating the building, replacing and repairing capital equipment at the George H. & Ella M. Rodgers Memorial Library. The Library Trustees have proposed this warrant article. Hudson voters would be the agents to expend from this fund. This warrant article would add \$0.01 cent to the tax rate. Recommended by the Board of Selectman 4-0. Budget Committee recommended it 6-5, and I would like yield to the Chairwoman of the Library Trustees Robin Rodgers to speak on this article.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Selectman Morin yields to Mrs. Rodgers.

Robin Rodgers

Last year we put together a Capital Reserve Fund and we put \$1 into it to start the fund. The building is currently going to be nine years old, seems like it goes by really fast. Things happen. We've had trees that need to come down, we've had air conditioners that need to be fixed, and all of those things has just come out of our budget, which

you know how that goes. So what we want to do is just put a Capital Reserve so that when things break down we can maintain the gorgeous library that we have.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open up Article 20 to questions, comments, concerns. Mr. Trost, you can speak up here. You don't have to run all the way down the other end. I'll recognize Mr. Trost.

Ted Trost

A small correction. This was established in 2017, a year ago roughly, not 2007. We the voters of this town established this so that when there is a major cost for renovation or improvements to the Rodgers Memorial Library there would be money there in order to do it to reduce the major impact all at once on the voters, on the taxpayers. So it's kind of a pay it now or pay it later. I want to remind the voters that this fund is accessible to be spent only upon vote of the voters. It isn't something that the Library Trustees can vote to do, so you still maintain control of this money. But it's a good investment to make sure that when something does happen or when the voters decide that an improvement needs to be made that money is there for them.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion Warrant Article 20, Library Capital Reserve Fund, Library Improvements Capital Reserve Fund. Seeing none, we will close the discussion of Article 20.

Article 21: Establish Municipal and Transportation Improvement CRF

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to establish a Municipal and Transportation Improvement Capital Reserve Fund under the provisions of RSA § 35:1 and RSA § 261:153, VI, to collect an additional motor vehicle registration fee in the amount of \$5.00 for the purpose of supporting said Fund? The additional fee shall be collected from all vehicles, both passenger and commercial, with the exception of all-terrain vehicles and antique motor vehicles or motorcycles. The funds may be used for improvements in local or regional transportation systems, including roads, bridges, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, parking and intermodal facilities, electric vehicle charging stations, public transportation, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction costs of transportation facilities, including electric vehicle charging stations, and for operating and capital costs of public transportation. The funds may be used as matching funds for state or federal funds allocated for local or regional transportation improvements, but may not be used to offset any other non-transportation appropriations. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 6-5)

I will recognize Selectman Coutu to present Article 21.

Roger Coutu

Thank you Mr. Moderator. If I might Mr. Moderator, we've had a discussion about making a couple of statements. I want to thank the Budget Committee this year for doing an outstanding job. This is one of the most productive Budget Committees we've had in a long time and I appreciate all of the work, though I don't always agree with your final recommendation or not recommending. But you've done due diligence for the taxpayers and I hope you will reconsider your votes on some of the matters. The Board of Selectmen are very proud to serve. We too have done, I think, an outstanding job in preparation of our budget this year. So thank you to the help of the Town Administrator and the Finance Director who assists us every day with all of the money that we have and all the money that we need and make recommendations and we're proud of our department heads. And I appreciate you Mr. Moderator and the work that you are doing.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Let's skip to Article 21.

Roger Coutu

An awful lot of language in the warrant article. I didn't get to speak much today. An awful lot of language in Article 21. We're given scripts, I'm going to get off the script just to raise \$5. Initially I was opposed to this and I've changed my mind. I voted, along with my peers, to recommend the warrant article but I did so at that time because I thought it was a decision the voters should have to make, whether or not you're willing to pay an additional \$5 at the time of registration. If the voters pass this we will raise approximately, based on the number of vehicles we know that are registered every year in the town. We will raise approximately \$150,000 which will be set aside in a Transportation, and that's a key word, Improvement Capital Reserve Fund. We can't take the money and willy-nilly just go out and do something like build something or whatever, unless it relates to transportation improvements. Those of you who always applaud the work that the Road Agent does in this town with regards to how he maintains our roads. He's always involved in construction projects on our roads and you've seen the refurbishment of an awful lot of roads in the Town of Hudson. Thanks to the voters of Hudson who realized that the Road Agent was falling behind in his plan to keep our roads modern and safe. This \$150,000 isn't an awful lot of money, it probably won't even pave a mile of roadway. However, a long period of time we can accumulate enough money that should a major project need money, like a bridge, we know that those are very expensive. We'll have a Capital Reserve Fund that we can fall back on. We could also use the money to improve intersections in our community. So I agree that the voters should decide whether or not they want to pay the additional \$5. The State of New Hampshire, through a couple of RSAs, have granted municipalities the ability to do this. A lot of municipalities have undertaken it. Manchester raises over half a million dollars a year because obviously they have a lot more cars to register every year. So it's something for you to consider. If you vote no and the majority is no, you won't have to pay the additional fee. But if the majority say yes the \$5 fee will be put into a Capital Reserve Fund for Transportation Improvements only. I now support it and I hope you will as well. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

I'll open up Article 21 to discussion, comments, and amendments. Mr. Trost.

Ted Trost

I'd like to propose an amendment.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Trost to propose an amendment.

Ted Trost

I'd like to strike the words "electric vehicle charging stations" from the warrant article.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Hold on, let me find that. It's in there twice, isn't it? Yes, it's actually in there twice. Did you want to strike both?

Ted Trost

Yes please.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Trost moves to strike the words "electric vehicle charging stations" twice in the article. Seconded by Selectman Luszey. Speak to the amendment. We are now on the amendment.

MOTION BY TED TROST, SECONDED BY TED LUSZEY, TO REMOVE THE WORDS "ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATIONS" TWICE IN THE ARTICLE.

Ted Trost

So I do not believe it's the Town's responsibility to be subsidizing a particular method of fuel or powering vehicles. We should leave that up to the individual drivers. We don't subsidize gasoline stations. I'm definitely in support of this as far as building roads, bridges, and so on but I don't think that electric vehicle charging stations should be within the scope of this warrant article.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. On the amendment now to strike the words "electric vehicle charging station". Who wishes to speak on the amendment? Anyone wish to speak?

James Battis, 6 Potter Road

As I read that it just offered the electric vehicle charging station as an example. By striking the words, are you going to say that we should not do them? It seems to me that if they're not included then that's still part of a potential use of this. If you intend to remove it why don't you say "not including"?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Question of the maker of the amendment.

Ted Trost

That's a great point. I think it would be my intent to prevent spending money on electric vehicle charging stations. I think I'd have to add language to that in there in order to prevent that. Simply leaving that out might leave that open to interpretation that it would allow that so that would be my next step then.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Well we're still on this amendment so let's deal with amendment to strike the words.

James Wilkins, 112 Belknap Road

While you're looking at what drivers should or should not support I would suggest that motor vehicle owners should also not be forced to pay for public transportation, even though it may be valuable.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. So you are in favor of the amendment? This is just the amendment now.

James Wilkins

I'm in favor of the amendment and I'm in favor of extending it.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on the amendment to strike the words, twice, "electric vehicle charging station". Selectman Coutu.

Roger Coutu

With all due respect to the Chairman of the Budget Committee I oppose the amendment. There's nothing in here about bridges but we can do something for bridges. It's anything that's related to transportation. I mean, it doesn't mean that we are going to build bicycle paths either. One of the things that we get accused of, and that's all three, the Budget Committee, the Board of Selectmen and the School Committee, is that we don't have foresight to the future. We neglect to take into realization sometimes in the outlying years how things are going to change. We all know that electric vehicles are a thing of the future, the immediate future. Some of the major automobile manufacturers today, General Motors in particular, made an announcement that they are going to increase by 20%

the amount of vehicles that they make that are co-powered with gas and electricity. I've seen charging stations in many municipalities. There's some in Chelmsford, Massachusetts that comes to mind. There are one or two here or there. They are coin operated. They are not subsidized by us. They're paid for by coins that are placed in the meter and the coins or amount of money determines how much charge you are going to get, whether you're going to refuel the power by 20%, 30% or 60%. The more you want to charge, the longer you keep your vehicle there, the more expensive it gets. And there are companies, and we'd research this if we were going to go in that direction., it doesn't mean we're going in that direction. We would have a company come in hopefully that would put the machines in, the power stations in, they would own them, they would maintain them and they would keep the money. We don't want anything to do with it. That's the right way, the right approach to do it. I don't like parking meters. I don't want to be in the parking meter business and I certainly don't want to have to have somebody going out collecting money out of a coin operated power station. So we would look at those aspects. To remove the language simply is just not giving thought to what the future needs are going to be for our community. If five years, ten years down the road there are a lot of people in the Town of Hudson who have electric vehicles and they're suddenly coming down School Street, which is where Town Hall is located, or Library Street, wherever it's located, and all of a sudden they realize they're running out of power, they can just pull in and get a charge and get themselves back home because that's going to happen. So I'm going to oppose it. I don't think it's necessary to remove any language. Though lengthy, it's well written and it's in conformance with the RSAs that the State has recommended.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Mr. Battis you asked a question. Mr. Luszey and then Mr. Battis.

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. I'm actually rising in favor of this amendment. The electric charging station, as one of the previous speakers stated, is nothing more than a gasoline station for the electric vehicle and that will be driven by the free market. If electric vehicles become popular and demand to have refueling stations every mile or two miles or ten miles, the Exxon's and Mobile's and whoever will put those charging stations where they make sense economically. What this is, this is nothing more than the government trying to persuade the population in a particular use of technology or behavior. Government uses taxes to modify the social behavior of its citizens and that's why I am actually in favor of this. If the free market wants to support the electric cars and charging stations, so be it.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Battis, you had a comment? No, okay. Selectman Routsis and then Mr. Lavoie

Angela Routsis

I actually just want to say that I'm in opposition of the amendment and I think it's because when everyone so far has talked about this they've talked about it in regards to public and the people of the town, and we haven't taken into consideration if our municipality happens to get electric vehicles. So if we happen to, as a municipality, get electric vehicles for our employees, our Police Department, anything like that, this will help cover the cost of having those installed.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Mr. Lavoie

Lee Lavoie, 58 Windham Road

I'd like to move the question.

MOTION BY LEE LAVOIE, SECOND BY TED LUSZEY, TO MOVE THE QUESTION.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Okay. Mr. Lavoie moves the question, seconded by Mr. Luszey, to cut off debate on the amendment. The amendment is just to the removal of the words, but the vote right now is to stop debate and move to a vote on the amendment. If you wish to cut off debate on the amendment #1 please raise your voter cards. Thank you. Those opposed please raise your cards. It's 2/3, the ayes have it. Debate is limited.

MOTION CARRIES

We are now going to take a vote on the amendment, to remove the words "electric vehicle charging station" in the two sections in the warrant article. If you are in favor of removing that wording please raise your voter cards. Thank you. Those opposed? I think those opposed have it. The nays have it, the amendment fails

AMENDMENT #1 FAILS

We are now back on Article 21 as written for further discussion.

Normand Martin, 3 Edgar Court

I just want to point out that the State of New Hampshire collects taxes when you pump gas at the gas station. Those taxes are supposed to be used for road improvements. The State of New Hampshire now passes laws that you see listed in this Warrant Article so municipalities can now collect \$5 from every person who registers a vehicle to repair the roads that the State has an obligation to repair with that gas tax. So it's an additional tax to you folks, it's an additional tax to me, but remember, not everybody is paying for it. It's the people who are registering their vehicles and, let's go back, people from out of state who use these roads as well. Thank you.

Mary Joy Gasdia, 4 MacCann Road

I'd like to make an amendment to Article 21. I'd like to make an amendment to strike the words "and to name the Board of Selectmen as the Agents to Expend". My point of that would be similar to what we heard the previous speaker on the Library say. This would go into a Capital Reserve Fund but it would have to go in front of the voters any time there was a question as to how to use those funds. So therefore, if something happens similar to what Mr. Trost on the Budget Committee suggested regarding the question of electric cars, it would then go to the voters to decide if that's something we needed or not. That would be my reasoning for the amendment.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Let's get a second first. Do we have a second for that? Yes, Mrs. Benson seconds.

Mary Joy Gasdia

So that's my reason for the amendment is it would then allow it to go to the voters.

MOTION BY MARY JOY GASDIA, SECONDED BY LINDSEY BENSON, TO AMMEND BY REMOVING THE WORDS "AND TO NAME THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN AS THE AGENTS TO EXPEND".

Moderator Inderbitzen

The amendment is to strike the words "and to name the Board of Selectmen as the Agents to Expend". We'll talk about the amendment only at this point. Mr. Trost.

Ted Trost

So I think I'm in favor of this. It seems that most of the projects that are listed there would be something that we would be able to see in advance and have time to vote on, and not something urgent enough that we would need to name the Selectmen as agents to expend, unless I'm wrong.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Oh, you wanted to speak on the other thing. Yes sir, Mr. Battis.

James Battis

Point of Order. If that amendment carries does it have to be replaced with something that says the voters are the agents to expend? Does an agent have to be listed?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Capital Reserve Funds, unless the agents to expend are listed, then it has to be the Town Meeting, the voters, that would make that determination and it would have to be brought forward.

Lindsey Benson, 13 Par Lane

I'm in favor of this amendment. I think it's a great idea to build a Capital Reserve Fund specifically for transportation. I think by this amendment it will more likely be passed through in this way as well from the Town. It's given more power to us to decide where that money goes, as opposed to, with all due respect, the Board.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on the amendment to remove "Board of Selectmen as Agents to Expend". Mr. Coutu.

Roger Coutu

Again, with all due respect to the previous speakers who support the amendment, I oppose the amendment and I'll tell you why. There was, I thought, some misrepresentation or some clarity, something that needs to be said. The State does collect money at the gas tanks in order to repair roads, State roads. I don't know where you live, I live on Rita Ave. The State has no responsibility for Rita Avenue. The Town of Hudson does. This money will go to improvements to roads and intersections that are not funded by the State. They are maintained by the Town of Hudson, so I wanted to make that point clear. In terms of the amendment on the recommendation to expend, in the past it had been... An awful lot of Capital Reserve Funds, in order to be expended, had to go before the voters. As you know, if an emergency were to arise in April, May, June and we had to wait for the voters in the next election, which would be the following March, to make a decision on expending money that was put aside for a specific purpose, and the need for that specific purpose arose. If you ran your budget at home like that and your plumbing went, would you want to wait until the following March and this happens in August, because you didn't appropriate any money to fix any plumbing? This is a greater magnitude than plumbing, I understand that. It's not being greedy or controlling to have the Board of Selectmen. You elect us to represent your best interest. I hope I've done that. I hope that this Board has done that. From my observation I think we have. We don't, again and I hate using the term but I will use it, willy-nilly just grab your money and spend it. We give due diligence and consideration for any requests that come before us. A road project would be something that would come before us through the Engineer or the Road Agent. Again, if we have to put off a project because we have 100 year flood in May and we don't have monies readily available, but we have them in Capital Reserve Funds, and we have to wait until the following March to come to you and say Oh by the way we need to take this money to repair that road that has a huge pothole in it that's been there for seven months. So I hope you will respect our decision making process. You've elected us to represent you and to manage our money. I think we've done a damn good job and I hope and trust that you will trust that we will make the right decision by allowing us to be the Agents to Expend. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

On the amendment to remove "Board of Selectmen as Agents to Expend". Yes sir.

John Knowles, 51 Quail Run

I just have a question about the previous speaker what he said. I've read this like five times and all I see in there is it's used for improvements, not for repairs. So it seemed to me is it fair to say that those are probably not going to be emergencies?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question of the Board. Selectmen Coutu

Roger Coutu

My understanding is that under RSA 35:1 and 261:153, the Transportation Improvement Capital Reserve Funds, if a portion of a bridge should collapse, I think fixing it will improve the bridge. I think it would be allowable. I understand it's a question of interpretation, most RSA's are. Some of them are subjective at best. I think that it has been our intent, this sitting Board anyway, when looking at this particular warrant article, that this money would be used primarily to assist the Road Agent with expanding on paving the roads in the Town of Hudson. I think that's going to be its primary use. Other than that, unless the Town Engineer comes in and tells us that a certain intersection needs improvements, I don't see any other reason that we would just spend this money.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on the amendment.

Lee Lavoie

I'd like to make a motion to move the question.

MOTION BY LEE LAVOIE, SECONDED BY LEO BERNARD, TO MOVE THE QUESTION.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Lavoie moves the question, seconded by Mr. Bernard, to cut off debate. A motion has been made to cut off debate on the amendment by Mr. Lavoie, seconded by Mr. Bernard. Are you ready for that question? If you are in favor of cutting off debate and taking a vote on amendment #2 as I've got it, cutting off debate, raise your voter cards please if you are in favor of cutting off debate. Thank you. Those opposed to cutting off debate? I think we have a 2/3, it passes. We've cut off debate.

MOTION CARRIES

ON THE AMENDMENT #2, TO REMOVE "AND TO NAME THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN AS AGENTS TO EXPEND".

The amendment is to strike the words "and to name the Board of Selectman as Agents to Expend". If you are in favor of that amendment please raise your cards. Thank you, those opposed to the amendment? Ooh, Chair's in doubt. I'm going to do a count. Mrs. Guessferd, could I impose on you to do a count for me? Mrs. Gasdia? I'm going to ask some people, Mr. Knowles? I'm going to ask people, I'm going to do a standing count. Who made the motion? Oh Mrs. Gasdia made the motion, you don't have to, that's ok. Lisa Nute will do it. Mr. Knowles, Lisa Nute and Mrs. Guessferd. I think all I need is three people. I'm going to tell you what to do. I'm going to ask you to raise your cards again when we're ready and they are going to count them so we can get a count. I was in doubt as to whether it was pretty even. Mrs. Guessferd, if you would do this section here and the people standing back there. Nobody move! Mr. Knowles, would you do this up here, this section in here with the table over there, and then Mrs. Nute, if you would do the front up here and in the back where the selling is. So everybody stay where you are. We're going to ask you if you are in favor of the amendment to remove the words "and to name the Board of Selectmen as Agents to Expend" please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed please raise your cards. We have 37 yes votes, 36 no votes, the amendment passes by one. Shows you every vote counts. The amendment passes. Excuse me, please be in order

AMENDMENT PASSES

Article 21, as amended, with “and to name the Board of Selectmen as Agents to Expend” has been removed. We will continue our discussion on Article 21, as amended.

James Battis, 6 Potter Road

I just have a question on why certain vehicles were exempted from this fee. Is that in the RSA?

Moderator Inderbitzen

The response is yes those vehicles were excluded within the RSA itself. Yes, sir?

Fred Giuffrida, 14 Pinewood Road

I just heard the Selectmen say that we’re going to use this for paving. There’s a paving budget, you have paving in your budget. So this basically amounts to being about to say, Look we didn’t raise your taxes but we’re going to institute a \$5 fee on your registration. So I find it amusing. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 21 as amended. Anybody else wish to discuss Warrant Article 21?

Question from the audience on the vote on the amendment if it requires 2/3?

Moderator Inderbitzen

No it’s a simple majority. This warrant does not require a 2/3, it is not a bond. Capital Reserve Fund creation is by simple majority at the ballot. Mr. Trost then Mr. Wilkins.

Ted Trost

I’m generally in favor of user fees as it more closely sends the cost of items to the people who are using it. That’s all I have to say, so I’m in favor.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Mr. Wilkins, on Article 21

Jim Wilkins

I just have a comment. It looks to me like this is kind of a back door way to fund the Nashua Rail extension. Would it be applicable to that? Could this money be applied to that?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question, does this apply to extension of rail? I don’t know if we have any rail in Hudson.

Ted Luszey

I don’t think we have any specific rail here.

Jim Wilkins

It’s regional which would include Nashua I think.

Ted Luszey

It could include Hudson, right? Depending on where they put stations and rails and all that.

Jim Wilkins

Right, but the wording says local or regional transportation systems.

Ted Luszey

Exactly, right, so I believe, unless our attorney states otherwise, the answer is yes, it could be used for that.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Further discussion, yes sir.

Richard Empey, 104 Musquash Road

Out of curiosity I'd like to ask the Town Clerk what the approximate number of registrations we sell per year so I have an idea of what kind of money I'm talking about here.

Town Clerk Patti Barry

30,000 excluding the exempted vehicles.

Richard Empey

30,000 registrations times five. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I think that number came up before. It'd be about \$150,000 per year. Yes sir.

Ray Gendron, 7 First Street

This seems like a permanent tax to me. If we have work that's needed in the transportation area I don't know why we can't consider them as additional articles on the budget. We must have, after all these years, emergency funds that we use for taking care of these things that pop up between elections. Isn't there such a thing, such a device?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question of the Board, is there such a method of handling of emergencies. Selectman Luszey will yield.

Ted Luszey

The answer is yes, we do have a contingency fund for a major emergency should arise.

Ray Gendron

So this seems like an extraneous kind of permanent tax and there's no fixed amount, it just goes on forever. I don't think that's a good idea at all.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 21. Seeing none I will close the discussion on Warrant Article 21.

Article 22: Revised Property Tax Exemption for the Elderly

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to modify the elderly exemptions, pursuant to RSA 72:39-b, from property tax in the Town of Hudson, based on assessed value, for qualified taxpayers, to be as follows: for a person 65 years of age up to 75 years, \$105,000; for a person 75 years of age up to 80 years, \$125,000; for a person 80 years of age or older, \$150,000? To qualify, the person must have been a New Hampshire resident for at least three consecutive years, own the real estate individually or jointly, or if the real estate is owned by such person's spouse, they must have been married for at least five consecutive years. In addition, the taxpayer must have a net income of not more than

\$45,000 or, if married, a combined net income of not more than \$55,000; and own net assets not in excess of \$160,000 excluding the value of the person's residence. If approved, this article shall take effect for the 2018 property tax year. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0)

I will recognize Selectman McGrath to present Article 22.

Marilyn McGrath

Warrant Article 22 seeks to revise the Elderly Exemption for those property owners who meet the qualifications. Property owners must be at least 65 years old and have been a New Hampshire resident for at least three consecutive years and owned the real estate individually or jointly. This article raises the annual net income level from \$35,000 to \$45,000 for a single property owner and it raises the annual combined net income level from \$45,000 to \$55,000 for married property owners. This article also raises the net asset level from \$150,000 to \$160,000 for both single and married property owners, excluding the value of the residence. The exemption amounts remain the same, only the income and asset amounts have changed. If approved the new exemption amounts take effect on April 1, 2018. There is no tax impact for this warrant article. The Board of Selectmen has recommended this article 4-0.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open Article 22 to discussion, comments.

Gary Gasdia, 4 MacCann Road

I know I'm going to make a ton of enemies when I say what I'm about to say so I apologize in advance. This has a very nice feel to it. It sounds good but if I play this out in my head this seems to me that we would now be attracting people who struggle to pay property tax into this town based solely on their age. We struggle year after year. I came up here in the School session and talked about how we have to attract families to this town. And we need to attract families that want progress and all these things. If we're looking to help people who don't have the money to pay property taxes then let's strike all the age requirements and say, if you make less than x amount of money we're going to give you an exemption. I would sort of be in favor of that. I wouldn't feel great about it but I'd be like, ok we're helping everybody that doesn't have money. But what this says to me is we're just going to get 55+ community after 55+ community after 55+ community and our school budget is going to collapse. All the services that keep us progressing into the future are just going to go away. This has a nice kumbaya feel to it, and my heart goes out to anyone that can't afford it, and if we want to help everybody that can't afford it I'd love to see that amendment. But this is just attracting the wrong people to town. I'm sorry, this is a death knell to this town. To me I am against it more than I've probably ever been against anything I've seen up here before. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 22. Selectman Luszey

Ted Luszey

Thank you Mr. Moderator. To the previous speaker, most people that live in 55 and over communities that have been built will not meet the criteria for an exemption, so that's not a 100% true statement, because it talks about the net assets except for their living residence if you will. To live in some of these 55 & older, your net assets, so they are talking about their 401k's and pensions and stuff like that. They will not meet this exemption.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Yes sir?

Ed Duchesne, 10 Spruce Street

Most people who live in the over 55 communities pay taxes. They pay the school taxes and they don't have children attending those schools, so they're being taxed twice in a sense. But my other point is my understanding of this tax

break is that it's not a gift or anything like that, it's a deferment of taxes so that when a property is sold those taxes that were exempted have to be paid at that time.

Moderator Inderbitzen

No, that's not true.

Ed Duchesne

I got that information from our Finance Director.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Then we'll ask the Finance Director, Mrs. Carpentier, to respond.

Finance Director Kathy Carpentier

There is a separate program that some exemption is given to defer, disabled or elderly people, but it is a whole different process. This is a tax exemption that's given every year to the taxpayer who qualifies under these things. But there's other homeowners that can come and plead their case to the Board and that's called an Elderly Deferral, so when their house is sold (the deferment is paid). But there's only 20 or so people who fall into that.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion. Yes sir, Mr. Battis.

James Battis

I'd just like to know, do we know the number of exemptions that we grant every year versus the number of people who meet this age category?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Question of the Board. Do we have a number of people who are getting exemptions right now? We do not.

Laurie Jasper, 83 Old Derry Road

A clarification? Is this just increasing the amount as allowable net income for single and married people? And is that because of cost of living? I want to know that, and then the other thing I want to make a statement. I'm tired of hearing that it's schools versus town. I'm tired of hearing that if they can't afford it, get out of town. We have people who have lived here all their lives, have worked hard and made this town what it is, and I don't think it's right to say then they should just leave because they can't afford it anymore. We have a responsibility for all people who live in town, from the youngest to the oldest. I respect my elders and I wish everyone could stay in their houses as long as they are able to, and if this is going to help them then I'm in favor of it. I also wonder in the 55 & older communities people are saying those are building more, we're getting more of those than ever. Who decides whether the 55 & older are allowed to have children and grandchildren living with them? Is that something that's put a stipulation by the town? Do we have that stipulation? So I'm wondering if some of those 55 & older places have children living in them which is also affecting the town and school.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. There's some questions in there, Mr. Malizia will yield.

Town Administrator Steve Malizia

So the first part that you asked, what we changed was the income and net asset level. They have not been changed since 2008, so that's been ten years. So it's approximately every ten years the Board looks at those numbers and proposes a change. It's just the income and the assets. The exemption amount and the ages remain the same, they

have not changed, to answer that. And that's the same on the Disability one which follows. There's a second one here for Disabled. It's the income and assets, and again, that was ten years ago for the one too.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you, and Ms. McGrath will yield.

Marilyn McGrath

To clarify on the 55 & older developments, and the 62 & older developments. 55 & older only one of the residents has to be 55 and they can have younger children. So those developments can have school age children in that area. 62 & older both residents of the home have to be 62, they can't be younger than that, therefore it eliminates any school age children.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 22.

Lee Lavoie, 58 Windham Road

I'm in support of this first off and second of all we do send school buses, I'm putting my School Board hat on, we do send school buses to 55 and older communities, so just to clarify.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 22, to Revise the Property Tax Exemption for the Elderly.

Jim Wilkins

What are we changing this from? What are the current numbers?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Ms. McGrath will yield.

Marilyn McGrath

I'll read both paragraphs again so it's clear. The article raises the annual net income level from \$35,000 to \$45,000 for a single property owner, and it raises the annual combined net income level from \$45,000 to \$55,000 for married property owners. So it's a \$10,000 delta. The article also raises the net asset level from \$150,000 to \$160,000 for both single and married property owners, again, a \$10,000 increase.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 22.

Michael Drouin, 6 Coll Street

I've lived in Hudson all my life. My father who is not with us anymore was 90 years old. He couldn't afford to live in the place anymore. After a while, he built the house, he worked all his life, fought in World War II, and eventually was faced with the choice of selling or you know. I gave him part of my pay from the Navy when I joined. I think that should not be dollars but a percentage instead. When you build your house, if you have some land in Hudson, you got an old farm, that's a lot more than the average property. I think we should protect our elderly.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 22.

Alejandro Urrutia, 9 Campbello Street

I support this article. I don't really believe this is a way to bring out the wrong people to the town. I believe it's a way to protect our elderly because there are restrictions. If there is somebody that needs to live here for a period of time or several years. Nobody is going to move to Hudson from another town to have a benefit of three years, especially if you are an elderly person. So I really believe to be friendly with our elderly people, especially those that have a very limited income. I believe it's the right thing to do. So my opinion is to support Article 22. Thank you.

Lori Robicheau-Pagan, 7 Catalpa Drive

First I want to say that I'm in support of this article. The Budget Committee doesn't vote on it because it doesn't have a tax impact but if we had I would have supported it. I would hate to think that we're valuing our residents based on how much they make a year, and I don't feel that the quality of people who will be attracted to town has to do with what their yearly income is. Secondly, I would just like to point out that for the elderly and disabled, which is in the next article, they're on fixed incomes which is different than the general population. So because they're on fixed incomes sometimes it's more difficult for them to make those payments and that's why we give them this break, I guess I would say. I'm in support.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Ms. McGrath

Marilyn McGrath

Again, just to clarify for the previous speaker. The article raises the net asset level from \$150,000 to \$160,000 for both single and married property owners. The part that I want to clarify and be clear about, it excludes the value of the residence. So the property and the home, it excludes that value, so it's 401k's and other assets that would exceed that.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Yes sir, Mr. Battis for a second time.

Jim Battis

For clarification, Mrs. McGrath discussed the asset values and income values. I assume the exemptions themselves have not changed, is that what you're telling us?

Moderator Inderbitzen

That is correct. Any further discussion on Warrant Article 22.

Glenn Della-Monica, 30 Bush Hill Road

When my father-in-law moved here, he just passed away last year, but when he moved here, he's a World War II vet and he was getting probably close to 10% on investments he had in the bank account for his retirement. By the time he died they were down to about 3%. So for a lot of older folks, especially in this particular financial market, any little bit we can give them to help is really appreciated.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 22

Ted Trost, 63 Rangers Drive

I'd like to move the question.

MOTION BY TED TROST, SECONDED BY TED LUSZEY, TO MOVE THE QUESTION.

Moderator Inderbitzen

A motion's been made, seconded by Mr. Luszey, to cut off debate on Warrant Article 22. If you are in favor of cutting of debate on Warrant Article 22 please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed to cutting off debate? The ayes have it by 2/3, it passes. Warrant Article 22 will move to the ballot.

MOTION CARRIES

MOTION BY SELECTMAN LUSZEY, SECONDED BY LEE LAVOIE, TO RESTRICT RECONSIDERATION OF ARTICLES 20, 21 AND 22.

A motion is made by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Mr. Lavoie, to restrict reconsideration on 20, 21 and 22. You all know what we're doing here? They can no longer be brought up. We only have three more articles. If you are in favor of restricting reconsideration of Articles 20, 21 and 22 please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed to restricting? The ayes have it, 20, 21 and 22 are restricted.

MOTION CARRIES

Article 23: Revised Property Tax Exemption for the Disabled

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to modify the exemption, pursuant to RSA 72:37-b, for the disabled? The exemption based on assessed value, for qualified taxpayers shall be \$105,000. To qualify, the person must have been a New Hampshire resident for at least five years, and own and occupy the real estate individually or jointly, or if the real estate is owned by a spouse, they must have been married for at least five years. In addition, the taxpayer must have a net income of not more than \$45,000, or, if married, a combined net income of not more than \$55,000; and own net assets not in excess of \$160,000, excluding the value of the residence. If approved, this article shall take effect for the 2018 property tax year. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0)

I will recognize Selectman McGrath to present Article 23

Marilyn McGrath

Warrant Article 23 seeks to revise the Disabled Exemption for those property owners who meet the qualifications. Property owners must have been a New Hampshire resident for at least five years and own and occupy the real estate individually or jointly. This article raises the annual net income level from \$35,000 to \$45,000 for a single property owner and it raises the annual combined net income level from \$45,000 to \$55,000 for married property owners. That's an increase of \$10,000. This article also raises the net asset level from \$150,000 to \$160,000 for both single and married property owners excluding the value of the residence. Again, a \$10,000 increase. The exemption amounts remain that same, only the income and asset amounts have changed. If approved the new exemption amounts take effect on April 1, 2018. There is no tax impact for this warrant article. The Board of Selectman has recommended this article 4-0.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll now open Warrant Article 23 to comments, questions, and amendments. Anybody have questions on Warrant Article 23? Seeing none, I'll declare Warrant Article 23 closed.

Article 24: Ratify Agreement between Board of Selectmen and Hudson United Soccer Club

Shall the Town of Hudson, pursuant to RSA 41:11-a, vote to ratify an agreement between the Board of Selectmen and the Hudson United Soccer Club (HUSC) renewing an agreement for the HUSC's semi-exclusive use of "Freedom Field I" soccer field on Route 102 adjacent to the Hills Garrison Elementary School during the regular soccer season, March 1st thorough November 30th, for a period of 15 years beginning September 1, 2018. Copies of the full text of the Agreement are available at the Town Clerk's office. (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0)

I'll recognize Selectman Coutu to present Article 24.

Roger Coutu

Thank you Mr. Moderator. Simply stated this is an agreement with the Hudson United Soccer to extend their use of the land that they presently use. I'm going to tell you from first-hand knowledge they have been great tenants of the property. They have contributed much to the community and have assisted a lot of kids who want to get into a soccer program besides having their own competitions. I urge you to vote to allow us to extend the contract and allow Hudson United Soccer Club to stay in Hudson and continue the fine work and great athletic activities that they have pursued on that property. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. I'll open Article 24 to questions, comments, amendments. Anybody wish to address Article 24? If not, I'll close the discussion on Article 24.

Article 25: Allow Keno Games in Hudson (by Petition)

Shall we allow the operation of keno games within the town? (Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0-1)

Is there any of the petitioners here? I wasn't able to reach anyone. Are the petitioners present who would like to address Article 25, allowing Keno games in Hudson? There being none, I will open Article 25 to questions, comments. This is wording prescribed by law and it will appear on the ballot just the way it's worded here. Anybody have any questions? Yes sir.

Alejandro Urrutia, 9 Campbello Street

I just have a couple of comments about this. First, this really has a good benefit to the town, to the business. Second is what I see is the people who have more economic challenges, they tend to go to the lottery and play the lottery and gambling. I can see people, there is, I go to other places to buy something, water or something, and they are playing Keno. Sometimes they spend a lot of time over there. So my doubts are if, what are the benefits for the Town to have Keno in the town? My second thing is we are giving to people who are struggling for economic reasons an opportunity to spend time over there just gambling money. My second question is if we do not have Keno in Hudson, we are not going to receive the benefits that Keno can give to the State for education purposes? Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

I'll answer some of those. There is a hand-out, questions and answers on Keno, prepared by the New Hampshire Municipal Association in the back of the room you can pick up that were on the hand out table. The Keno is to be spread among all the towns whether they approve Keno or not. They will be spread to all of them who have full day Kindergarten. So you have to have full day Kindergarten in order to get the benefit. If Keno isn't allowed in Hudson we still get the benefit but we'd have to have full day Kindergarten. If we vote for it then yes, we would get the benefit, but we wouldn't get the benefit unless we change from half day Kindergarten to full day Kindergarten. So that's where the benefit is going. So right now Hudson wouldn't get anything out of it unless we made a decision later next year to expand to full day Kindergarten and then we would get some of those monies back from the State based on what they collect. That's my understanding of it. If you read the questions and answers, it explains all of that.

Any further discussion on Warrant Article 25?

Stuart Schneiderman, 10 Third Street

I couldn't help myself, I tried not to but... This was a petition?

Moderator Inderbitzen

This was a petition article, I should have mentioned that up front. I'm sorry.

Stuart Schneiderman

And none of the people who ran this petition drive showed up here, am I correct?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Well I asked if anyone was here from the petition.

Stuart Schneiderman

Who are willing to take responsibility? I'd like to propose an amendment that allow the operation should be struck and shall we study the operation?

Moderator Inderbitzen

The amendment is out of order. This wording is prescribed by State law and cannot be changed. It's one of those things where you cannot change it because that's the way the State wrote the law.

Stuart Schneiderman

Ok, so we can only amend it, we can't strike it down?

Moderator Inderbitzen

You can't amend it, you can't add anything to it. You can only discuss it and then the people will vote on it. That's the way the law was set up.

Stuart Schneiderman

It seems so moot without the Kindergarten full day.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Well then you can talk to our State Representatives about that.

Stuart Schneiderman

If they answer my call I will. Thank you.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 25, Allowing Keno Games in Hudson? Mr. Guiffrida.

Fred Guiffrida

You present a great question Mr. Moderator. Are any of our State Representatives here today to discuss this?

Moderator Inderbitzen

Are any State Reps here today? I don't know them all so I don't know if they're here or not. I don't see any. They were not at the School District meeting either. Thank you. Further discussion on Warrant Article 25? If there is none, I'll declare Article 25 closed.

Mrs. LeVasseur, do you have a count of the check-ins?

Sandi LeVasseur

Moderator Inderbitzen

71? Ok, we had a few more because our standing count was 73 so you might have missed in your count but we'll check that out. We're going to have to check their totals, and some people left too.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do want to remind you that we have voting on March 13th. A little quote from Plato that I like to use reminding everyone that voting counts. As you know from that split vote we had today, every vote counts. So I urge you that we have voting on the 13th in this building from 7:00am to 8:00pm and I urge everyone to come out and vote. It's an important issue. We have a very low turnout at Town Meeting, sometimes down to 15%, whereas our last federal one was 72%, 73% for a federal election. This determines your taxes. Mrs. Appler and then Mr. Della-Monica

Phyllis Appler

If you want to know more about your candidates you might want to come to Candidate Night on February 20th at 7:00pm right here.

Moderator Inderbitzen

Yes, it's here, it's in the Community Center. We also have people who can answer questions on the Zoning Amendments in the back if anybody has any questions. You've got some of the diagrams for Lowell Road and the bathrooms at Benson. At this point I will thank everyone for being here, thanking our people, IT, the video people, and the Boards here for being present and making this meeting happen. I'll now entertain a voice vote for adjournment. Anyone wish to do a motion to adjourn? Motion by Mr. Martin, second by Mr. Bernard.

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY NORMAND MARTIN, SECONDED BY LEO BERNARD, TO ADJOURN

All in favor of adjournment please see Aye. Those opposed? The ayes have it, we are adjourned. The meeting is adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

MOTION CARRIES

A True copy attest:

Patti Barry, Town Clerk/Tax Collector