

HUDSON, NH BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Minutes of the August 27, 2013 Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER - by Chairman Maddox the meeting of August 27, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the Selectmen's Meeting Room at Town Hall.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - led by Recreation Director Dave Yates.

3. ATTENDANCE

Board of Selectmen: Rick Maddox, Nancy Brucker, Roger Coutu, Ted Luszey, Ben Nadeau

Staff/Others: Stephen Malizia, Town Administrator; Donna Graham, Executive Assistant; Michael O'Keefe; Patrick Colburn, Town Engineer; Fire Chief Shawn Murray

4. PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Maddox asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board on any issue which the Board has control of at this time. There was nobody wishing to speak.

5. NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS - NONE

6. CONSENT ITEMS

Chairman Maddox asked if any Board member wished to remove any item for separate consideration.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to approve consent items A, B, C, D and E, as noted or appropriate, carried 5-0.

A. Assessing Items

- 1) 2012 Tax Abatement, Map 143, Lot's 12 thru 19, w/recommendation to deny
- 2) 2012 Tax Abatement, Map 152, Lot's 14 and 16 thru 24, w/recommendation to deny

B. Water/Sewer Items - NONE

C. Licenses & Permits

- 1) Raffle Permit - Knights of Columbus Council 5162
- 2) Request to Solicit Funds - Cub Scout Pack 21

D. Acceptance of Minutes

- 1) Minutes of the August 6, 2013 Meeting

E. Calendar

8/28 7:00 Planning Brd - Buxton CD Meeting Room
8/29 2:30 Trustees of Trust Funds - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/03 7:00 Board of Selectmen Workshop - BOS Meeting Room
9/05 6:30 Recreation Cte - BOS meeting Room
9/05 7:00 Benson Park Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/09 7:00 Conservation Cmsn - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/10 7:00 Board of Selectmen - BOS Meeting Room
9/11 6:30 9/11 Observance at Benson Park
9/11 7:00 Planning Board - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/11 7:00 Benson Landscape Cte - BOS Meeting Room
9/12 7:00 Zoning Brd of Adjustment - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/17 7:00 Cable Utility Cte - BOS Meeting Room
9/18 5:00 Municipal Utility Cte - BOS Meeting Room
9/18 7:00 Senior Affairs Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/19 7:00 Benson Park Cte - BOS Meeting Room
9/19 7:00 Budget Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/23 7:00 Recycling & Energy Ctes - BOS Meeting Room
9/24 7:00 Board of Selectmen - BOS Meeting Room
9/25 7:00 Planning Brd - Buxton CD Meeting Room
9/26 2:30 Trustees of Trust Funds - Buxton CD Meeting Room

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Votes taken after the meeting of August 13, 2013

- 1) *Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to authorize Chief Lavoie to hire Michelle Barrow, Cynthia Vienneau, Jessica Rose Dejackome and John Bernard Sowerbutts as part-time School Crossing Guards effective August 20, 2013 with starting salaries of \$13.50 per hour, carried 5-0.*
- 2) *Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to hire Andrea Lavery, Elizabeth Abbott, and Jan Horvath as Regular Special Shift Employees effective August 14, 2013 with starting salaries of \$11.00 per hour, carried 5-0.*
- 3) *Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to hire Lori Bowen as the Senior Services Coordinator effective September 3, 2013 with a starting salary of \$15.00 per hour and her hours not to exceed 29.5 hours per week, carried 4-0-1. Selectman Luszey abstained.*
- 4) *Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to terminate Michael Lamoreux effective August 13, 2013, carried 5-0.*
- 5) *Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to hire Leo Bernard as a part-time maintenance person at the Recreation Department effective August 14, 2013 with a starting salary of \$13.50 per hour, carried 5-0.*
- 6) *Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to hire Lori Bowen as the 2013 Soccer Coordinator for the fee of \$1,275 and Sherri Lavoie as the Assistant Soccer Coordinator for the fee of \$775 effective August 14, 2013, carried 4-1. Selectman Maddox in opposition.*
- 7) *Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to have the Town Administrator, the Fire Chief, the Police Chief, and the IT Director prepare a plan within a month's time to create a combined dispatch, carried 5-0.*
- 8) *Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to adjourn at 11:15 p.m., carried 5-0.*

B. Skate Park Update

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia.

Steve Malizia stated at the last meeting the Board of Selectmen talked about the skateboard park which has been closed. The Board asked for a quote or to get some idea of what it would cost to put security cameras on the property. Mr. Burns went out the next day on his initiative and took the initiative to get a quote to get an idea of what it would cost. Mr. Burns is here to explain this quote if this is the direction the Board wishes to go.

Kevin Burns hoped not to take up a lot of your time on this. I went and got a quote from Mason Electric for almost \$5,000. It does not include the work that we would have to do and get an internet connection into the park. Before we get too much into that, I got a call from the IT Director today saying that she would recommend we go a different way with this. We would be using our network. She said the equipment costs would be more than \$5,000 but there would be no long term costs. Before we talk about too much on the \$5,000 - \$6,000 for surveillance equipment, I also got call from Dave Yates today. The company that manufactured our equipment is no longer in business so we cannot get parts to repair the ramps. I checked them this week. Every ramp out there that has a leg, the legs are broken. The feet are missing from the people dragging the ramps around since they've been unbolted from the ground. All the transition joints are either broken off, missing, or just worn right out. So parts are not available. His suggestion that Dave told me today was to basically the only way out would be to replace the ramps which was an expensive endeavor on the first go around. So basically we've had a park that we've built at a sum of around \$50,000, which has been abused since creation. I'm looking for guidance. Do we wish to rebuild it and put in surveillance or do we wish to go a different direction?

Selectman Coutu asked if there would be no objection from the Board, a woman that had communicated with me has come here this evening and would like an opportunity to speak to the Board about the skate park. This is not an endorsement of anything that she says. I believe she was involved if I'm not mistaken in the original group to help set up the park which included you, and the Recreation Director, and a few other people who we know. If there would be no objection Mr. Chairman, give her an opportunity to speak. Chairman Maddox turned to the Board and asked if there was any objection. Seeing none.

Meghan Costro and I live right here on Chase Street. I was involved because my oldest son was involved in the building of the Rec. Center. It was many, many people that took a lot of hours to put it together. Regardless of where the money came from or who took the hours to do it, the children that are doing the damage - and I really use children loosely because I believe its older children - they're not the majority in this Town. They're definitely not. I work with these kids in the school system. I know the kids that are enjoying this park. I think that we're more or less telling them you win if we take this park apart. I really believe that. I've given this a lot of thoughts since this first started coming up and this is the second or third time this park is

closed. With Benson's growing the way it is, I really somewhere in the budget, somewhere in somebody's good heart maybe with donations, I don't understand why there's not a slab poured and that park moved to Benson's. There would be a lot more eyes on it. There'd be a lot more young children taking advantage of the park. The park is in a tough place for young kids to use. A very tough place. It was great when it was built, sure, and it has been abused. It's a major disappointment in my household that it has been abused. It really is. It's all the kids have if you really look at it. There's so much over at Benson's. If there was an area somewhere that it could be moved and people are willing to put in the time and effort again, that is my suggestion.

Chairman Maddox asked if there were questions from Board members. Thank you very much.

Selectman Coutu thought he's sent Mr. Burns and e-mail relative to that suggestion. I took to heart what you reply was. Would you care - I don't mind if you share it with the Board.

Kevin Burns indicated his concern is the skateboard people would not limit their skateboarding to the park. All of a sudden we'd have skateboard problems spreading to the \$100,000 playground we just put in, the various buildings, and the paved ways that are in there. I hate to sound negative but I've had really - which I think you acted the same way - I've had nothing but bad come out of the skate park for everything we build, everything is destroyed. I would hate to see that also transferred up to Benson's. Benson's right now it really is a family park. People go in there with picnic baskets, and their little kids are in the playground. Unfortunately the language and the type of kids that do the skateboards, maybe I'm stereo typing and I'm sorry if I am, but I don't think it would fit well next to the playground at Benson's in my humble opinion.

Selectman Coutu asked if you remember, and if you don't the Recreation Director is here, Mr. Burns do you remember what the original cost was to erect this skateboard park. Kevin Burns said the entire cost was \$50,000. The equipment was \$25,000. Selectman Coutu stated you're saying now that the equipment that we have is damaged, would need replacement parts that are no longer available because the company is out of business. For us to start over, we'd have to spend another \$25,000 for those ramps. Mr. Burns said that was \$25,000 12 years ago. It's like a 3-legged coffee table most of those pieces out there now. The legs are gone. You get too many kids on it, it topples over. There's a liability problem with the equipment we have now because the transition is gone. There's a one inch lip at the bottom of every piece which I suppose is probably okay if you're coming down hill. Going uphill, you're going to face plant. It's unfortunate but it's just a dangerous situation right now.

Selectman Luszey said if we go through the Rec. budget line items, we see line items for repair to ball fields and things like that. Did we ever budget ongoing maintenance to this equipment once it was put in place because that should have been a consideration.

Dave Yates said they do have a maintenance budget of \$500 per year for the skate park which is going to miscellaneous items. We repainted and resurfaced the ramps 4 or 5 years ago and some of the items that have been broken, we've used that money for that. It's \$500. While I'm up here and Kevin was half right. The company is still in business, however, that product is obsolete. He is correct. We would have to totally replace it if we were to redo it.

So that there's a clear picture, Selectman Coutu said you were involved with the initial construction, fundraising, and the activities involved in erecting the skate park with the best of intentions. Could you, and if you can't, then I'm sure Mr. Burns can because he's done it before, enumerate all of the amenities that were available in that park that were eventually destroyed. There were several. Dave Yates said first we started with a couple of Pepsi machines that Pepsi donated along with a fence around the machines. They totally destroyed the machines. I actually went across the street to the business across the street one day to just witness and watch it. As they'd come, kids would just kicking the machine, punching the machine, and reaching up inside and pulling out sodas. That eventually went away. The fence around it was trashed. The water bubble there's only a piece of cement now. The lights for the flagpole have been removed. They recently stole a flag. All the benches have been removed. The ones that are there now have two slats on them. I also asked for a price of them. That would be a replacement item. It goes on and on not to mention the ramps. Again when we put it in, we thought we were doing it in good faith and it was a family park. It's turned into kids with their stereos pulling up, blasting their stereos. It's older kids and if it is what it was, then I'd be supporting it. It's really turned into a tough place.

Selectman Coutu had one last thing. I agree with Meghan Costro almost 100 percent. I truly believe that the bulk of the damage is being done after hours. But realizing that 3 or 4 years ago - I don't remember anybody disagreeing with me - we said that if we were going to have any further vandalism, we would shutter the park. We took that action on a temporary basis waiting to hear from the Recreation Director and the Road Agent relative to what their recommendation would be. Aside from all the other things that were damaged, they damaged the camera and were able to climb up on top of a telephone pole and remove the camera. Unless we're willing to commit right now monies that we don't have an additional probably anywhere from - it wouldn't be a minimum of 25, it would probably be a minimum of \$25,000 to \$40,000 to do what needs to be done to restore the park not in its original format which would have been the bubbler, the benches, and whatever amenities were there. Just a skateboard park, we're talking with proper surveillance, unless we were willing to pay also to assign a duty officer at that park all night to make sure that no one is there vandalizing it which would cost us in excess - that's a full shift, 52 weeks a year. We're talking an awful lot of money. I truly believe that if we were to restore the park, the kids the use the park on a regular basis would take care of it, they would pick up their trash. I know my grandson still lobbying me tells me that that's what they do. I have no reason not to doubt him because I know him to be a very neat kid. We've taken him to events and he always puts his rubbish in his pocket and on the way out, he dumps it. That's the way he is.

Unfortunately because of a few people who skulk the night and vandalize other properties that don't belong to them, Selectman Coutu said some of the kids who don't abuse the park are going to be punished for it. The town neither has the funds nor can commit the manpower to safeguard the equipment that we put in there. I don't care how big a fence we build, I don't care if we build it with a roof on it, they're going to find a way in and they're going to destroy it. It's sad day for Hudson that we have to come to a point where I think it's time that we shudder the park because it's become a nightmare. Thank you.

Selectman Luszey said if we shudder this park, then I would like to make a motion that we start tracking the vandalism at all parks and all recreational places in town and start shuddering those as those occur. We have vandalism at Musquash. We have vandalism at Benson. We had vandalism at the elephant barn. We had vandalism at the A-frame. We had vandalism recently at the Old Lady in the Shoe. We're not talking about shuddering those. We take care of those issues and we go after and we find the folks that do the damage and we take care of them. I don't think it is right for us to honestly punish the few or punish the good because of the few bad. We are just throwing our hands up. We did not in good conscience and in good faith take care of this park over time. We just let it go. \$500 a year for maintenance for that type of equipment is unrealistic. It is a very extreme sport. It has a lot of physical abuse to it. Yes, it will get damaged. Skateboarding is going to become an Olympic sport. It is growing that fast and yet we're talking about scuttling it. Well than maybe we should scuttle some baseball fields and apply the money there because we just spent a ton of money over on Greeley Street. Chairman Maddox indicated that it wasn't the taxpayers. It was a private group that stepped up and did that. Different pool of money unfortunately.

Selectman Luszey said let's muddy it up. We spend a lot of money taking care of fields in this town yet we don't spend the appropriate amount of money to take care of that and nor did we. Enough said.

Selectman Brucker knows she's heard from a resident recently about organizing a committee of interested people in the skate park to do some fundraising and other things that would contribute to refurbishing the park. I would only be interested in going anywhere if there is a group out there who wants to put some effort and money into this park. It's a lot of money and I think that if they have a vested interest in it that it will be better kept and that we would have to do the surveillance cameras on our part to make sure that if there is vandalism, we can catch the people. I'd like to see some interest from the community.

Selectman Nadeau said we had an original committee that did the fundraising and they did get some community grants to open the skate park. I would hope like you had just said that we get together to have a committee and work on reopening the skate park within the near future to see if there's any grants available out there. Again, we need to be a little bit more proactive with the skate park if we do reopen it with some much better surveillance equipment, which I think we're going to be doing at more places around town because the vandalism is getting higher rates. I think that putting \$500 a year into the budget for the maintenance of the park, back then when it first opened \$500 might have been a reasonable number. Like I've said with anything else if we're going to maintain a skate park or any type of park that we need to start putting some capital reserve funds together and make a capital reserve fund once we open up the park. If we know the equipment is \$25,000 and the life expectancy is 10 years, then we need to start putting away \$5,000 a year towards the new equipment so that when that time comes, we're not in this predicament that we are today. Thank you.

Chairman Maddox asked if there was a motion here. The Chair is split right down the middle. I think that at this point I'm looking to see if we just close the park as we have it. We might as well scrap the equipment that is broken beyond repair. There was a plan to make this into something else. I think we ought to hold off and see if those people step up. See if people come forward who want to do something. It can stay as a fenced in area and maybe that's half way to where we need to go. I'm having a tough time spending \$30,000.

Selectman Nadeau said the other thing that we can do is maybe contact some of the local businesses that do stuff like angle iron and some welding and see if they can make us some transition pieces for this park. It's no different than a plow blade bottom. If there's a local vendor in town that's willing to give us a price on fixing those pieces of equipment, it might be a \$5,000 fix to reopen the park. Maybe that's something that we should be looking at and thinking about.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to keep the skateboard park closed until we get a committee together or a group of citizens that are interested in reopening the park and have them work on the project.

Chairman Maddox asked Selectman Nadeau if he had a time frame for this committee to come forward. Selectman Nadeau said no. I'm going to leave it open ended for now and see if it goes anywhere. Come January or February if it hasn't gone anywhere, we'll see what we're going to do with it in the spring.

Chairman Maddox had a question of Mr. Yates. I know it's great to say we can weld on a transition piece but if the legs are all broken - Selectman Nadeau said well you weld on the new leg too. Chairman Maddox asked how does that hold up into whole liability and all of that interest. That's a great idea but I'm just trying to see if that's practical.

Dave Yates indicted that he and Kevin talked about that today too. We can look into it and see. I think liability wise as long as we have good transitions and it's as sturdy as it was, I don't see an issue. Selectman Nadeau it is a lot less than buying new ramps. That was the second option that we did talk about.

Selectman Luszey asked a question of the Recreation Director. If we weren't having this discussion, what would you be doing with that equipment right now? Dave Yates said he'd be looking into like I sent an e-mail out looking to get a price on the transition ramps. Selectman Luszey said that was a very recent item. Mr. Yates said yes. They've worn down over the years.

Chairman Maddox indicated that we have this plan to just basically just shudder it and wait for somebody to knock on the door and say we're going to take this challenge on. I'm just trying to get a time frame here.

Dave Yates stated that the park is slated to close for the season November 1st. It would be my suggestion to let it close for the season and hopefully we can get this group - if this is the way you choose to go, we would work on this over the winter and hopefully have an answer for the spring.

Chairman Maddox asked where do you store the ramps off season. Mr. Yates said they leave them right there and lock the gates like they are now. Meghan Costro said they'll climb the fence. Mr. Yates said they do climb the fence but I haven't seen anybody in there. I don't know if the Police Chief has but I've been watching and haven't seen anybody. I think when Kevin put the barrier up, I think that got their attention that it is definitely closed. I haven't seen anybody climbing over the fence.

Kevin Burns wanted to add one thing. In my many years here, I have occasionally proposed some items that have got people here publicly talking against some of my ideas. For example the trash when we first went to the automated trash pickup. People came and they told you how upset they were with our new trash system. I don't see the outcry for this right now and I'm surprised. I don't see an outcry from the day we chained it up. Just a personal observation.

Selectman Nadeau noted he said it at the last three times that we've talked about this. If anybody was interested to please e-mail, contact me. My information is on the town website. I received two e-mails. When I replied back to them asking them if they'd like to be on the committee, that was the end of the e-mails. Hopefully there's some interest out there and hopefully somebody steps forward, and hopefully they can find some grant money for this and get this done by the spring. I do think it is a place for the teenagers and the younger kids that want to learn how to skateboard to be there. Right now with the price tag that's on this and what we have available, I don't see it happening so I'm hoping the committee will step forward.

Chairman Maddox said he was going to vote no. I don't want to kick this down the road any further. We either close it or we spend some money. I see Mr. Burns' issue and you've not seen a lot of people clammering to come forward. I think we're just delaying probably the evitable.

Vote: Motion carried 3-2. Selectman Coutu and Selectman Maddox in opposition.

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. HCTV Carriage House Bidding

Chairman Maddox recognized Mike O'Keefe, Chairman of Cable Utility Committee, and Patrick Colburn, Town Engineer.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. Patrick Colburn gave a quick progress update for the senior/cable access center. I don't know if you folks have drive by recently but much progress has been made and construction is well underway. A better part of the rough site work is complete. The building footings are installed, wall reinforcing is in, and forming and pouring of concrete is underway and continuing this week. You'll recall from several months back Mike and I appeared before you folks to request some additional design service money. The purpose of that was multi-purpose. Part of that design fee was for the construction of a carriage house or a garage facility for the cable access center. They have equipment and a vehicle that they would like to have a garage to support. We are in receipt of those plans at this time. Patrick said now we're here tonight to discuss the competitive bidding for the award of that additional construction. I'll turn it over to Mike so he can run through that with you.

Mike O'Keefe noted as the Town Engineer said, the next step in this process is to get quotes on the cost to construct this facility. Pat met with Brookstone Builders the current contract who's building the main facility. They suggested one option which would keep them as the general contractor. They would then solicit quotes from three vendors of each subcontractor. So each trade they would solicit three quotes. One of them would be the existing contractor on the current project. Once they compiled all of that information, they provide it back to the Town, we would be able to pick any of the subcontractors from that list. Presumably we'd pick the lowest bids of each of them and come up with a final cost. Brookstone would then add 10 percent as their fee and potentially 15 percent mark up on any equipment that they buy. I think that would be minimal in this case. The only other cost associated with that particular option is that they will charge a \$3,000 fee to manage the process basically to administer the contract, collect all the bids, and make sure the bids meet the spec. that we provide. If we choose that option, the construction would happen, assuming the Board approved the project ultimately and funding was available, it would occur as the other building work is going on. It would be going on simultaneously with the current project which means potentially it could all end up done at the same time.

Mike O'Keefe indicated the other option to the Board is basically treat this as a complete separate project and go out to complete separate bid where we would likely get other general contracts bidding on it. One of the negatives of that is that we can't really allow any other construction to go on that site until Brookstone is done and they turn the site back over to the Town.

We actually inquired whether that was the case and they said yes. They wouldn't be open to having other contractors on the site. That would mean the construction for this facility couldn't begin until the other one was complete, which would probably be at this point we're looking at maybe March of 2014. In theory, utilizing the current contractor and potentially some of the current subcontractors, we could get some pretty competitive pricing since they're already on site. A lot of their expenses are already covered. They already have a site supervisor, trailers, and what not and everything in place. That wouldn't have to be duplicated by another contractor. Basically those are I think the two options to move forward in terms of getting a quote for this construction. It's both Patrick's and my opinion that we should take Brookstone on up its option to solicit the quotes and then come back to the Board with that information.

Selectman Luszey said he's talked with both Patrick and Mike about this. I agree with their approach. I also think that the \$3,000 that we would be charged in administration fees to do this would be offset. We would actually have to hire another clerk of the works to oversee this as a separate project if we were to do it. Lumping it in with the senior center and cable utility building, we have a clerk of the works and they can oversee that.

Selectman Coutu stated he didn't have a problem with that. What I have a problem with is which gives me cause for concern is a statement that Mr. O'Keefe made. It was "if funding is available". I'd like to know if funding is available to do this and if so, if you've ascertained this funding available, then there must be a number out there. If there's a number out there, at some point somebody must have tried to ascertain a cost to build this carriage house to come up with this number. Is there funding available or am I taking you out of...Mike O'Keefe said no. I'm happy to talk to that subject. As you know, the current facility contract is roughly \$1.6 million. The warrant article approved \$1.8 million. So there was about a \$200,000 excess amount available for contingency. Patrick and I have gone over all the additional expenses that have been incurred and potential or estimated expenses that are upcoming still. To be perfectly honest, we don't think there's going to be a lot of additional money available in that \$200,000 when it's all said and done. Given that, it was going to be my recommendation that the construction of this facility come from the cable utility's operating budget of 2014 and not the current year's operating budget. I did run numbers and although we don't have a final quote obviously on what this facility is going to cost, I think given rough estimates there's sufficient funding. There was some money that was going to go into capital reserve, which isn't going to have to go in now. I think there's sufficient funding. We don't have a firm estimate. We've heard anywhere from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Selectman Coutu said there is reason for concern. It's still if the funds are available. Considering your 2014 budget, aren't there monies allocated for the move of the facility from Old Derry Road to the new facility and are we sure that there's sufficient money to cover that. Not looking at the budget in total but looking at the amount that was allocated in that line item. Mr. O'Keefe said there is a line item in this year's budget associated with the transition. It wasn't specifically for the move. It was primarily to retrofit the current facility back to its pre-existing condition when we terminate the lease. That's I believe \$20,000. I don't think we're going to actually have to spend all that money. I understand speaking with the HCTV Facilitator that there's already a tenant looking to occupy that space. It's actually the one who owns the two spaces adjacent to it. They're going to knock all the walls down. It doesn't look like we're going to have to pay to put the wall back. I think we may get out without really having to incur any expenses to put in that. I don't have that in writing but that's where it's looking. So there will be most of that money as well as significant other funds because of the way we carried some money over from last year, I'm confident there's at least \$100,000 to cover this building. The worst case if you move forward and there isn't funding, you've essentially the biggest lost is the \$3,000 that we'd have to pay Brookstone to do the whole bid process. There's nothing binding you at this point to move forward beyond soliciting the quotes. We're going to come back with the numbers and then the Board would authorize spending funds to actually build it.

Selectman Nadeau said his concern is we think it might be \$50,000 to \$100,000. We're building a garage, a shed. We should have some numbers from what we've talked about in the past. Before we move forward and spend \$3,000 for their administrative fees, I want to know how much this is going to be and where the money is coming from. I don't want to spend \$3,000 and get these bids and a building proposal and then not use it. What we're going to do is we're going to pay them \$3,000 to do this. We can go out and do an RFP ourselves and find out how much it's going to cost us and then let them decide whether they want to administer it for us, or we wait until it's done and we might get it done cheaper. We might not. Before I go spending \$3,000 to have them do this, I want to know roughly what we have in the cable monies.

Selectman Luszey believed the reason we're doing the bidding process is because we're required to based on the amount of money we're going to spend. Otherwise if we didn't have to do that, we could just do a change order to the current project for the cost of the building with the current contractor. Is that a true statement? Mr. Malizia said if you categorize it as a change order because it's on the site plan if it's something in theory, yes. That's if the Board approved that. It's yours to approve or disapprove the change order.

Selectman Brucker said she hadn't thought about this for a while but are we talking about money that is strictly HCTV money? Selectman Luszey said yes. Mike O'Keefe responded by saying there was discussion that if there were money remaining in the warrant article fund, some of that could be utilized for the construction. As I indicated earlier, we don't have final numbers but I don't think there's going to be significant funds there. My anticipation is the vast majority of the money is going to have to come from the cable budget itself - the current operating budget. Selectman Brucker asked if the carriage house is going to be used strictly by the cable. Mike O'Keefe said yes.

Selectman Coutu said he was where Selectman Nadeau and I understand the process now where the money is going to come from and having familiarity with the cable budget obviously, I know what's available for funds. I want to go back to you Mr. Malizia relative to the change order. We can't do a change order for this carriage house if the majority of the Board wanted to

do it? Couldn't we authorize Brookstone to come in with a bid for it and we just do a change order and they do it themselves. Obviously they're going to do it with a subcontractor. Steve Malizia indicated that if you feel that this is a change order to the project, you could do that. Change orders traditionally that we looked at the past have been maybe an HVAC issue or some other structural issue with the main structure. Given that this is a separate structure, it's the Board's prerogative I believe to do what you'd like to do. I'm not saying you can't do it. I haven't spoken to the attorney about it but you are constructing a senior center and HCTV facility. If you believe this is an integral part of the HCTV facility, i.e. their equipment storage, their mobile unit storage - it's part of the project. It could be categorized possibly as a change order because it's part of that bigger project. It was articulated on the original site plan. So it's not something you just dropped in. It's something that you had contemplated. It's really up to this Board. We were just trying to look at it from the perspective of you start getting into the estimated \$50,000 to \$100,000 - we were trying to be reasonable looking at bids to assure that we got the lowest bid or the best price for this project. That's what we were trying to do I think. That's what we were trying to accomplish here. Hence at least 3 bids you could pick this electrical bid, this foundation, this framing bid because you put them all together you would assure that you get the lowest price. If you'd like to go the change order route, you probably wouldn't be doing that. You'd be dependent on Brookstone to put together the number and say that change order is - pick a number \$75,000. If you're comfortable with that, it is part of the project. It's articulated on the site plan and its part of the facility. It's a separate stand alone building.

Selectman Coutu said he knew it was always contemplated that we were going to do this and I know that we had if I'm not mistaken a footprint specifically for that. So it is part of the project as far as I'm concerned. I have another question that more aligns with what Selectman Nadeau said. I know that it's a gamble one way or another. My question will be directed to you Patrick. I know it's a gamble one way or another whether Brookstone can get the better bid or we go out and we solicit bids whether we will get a better bid. We did well with Brookstone. They came with a great reputation and I guess you're working well with him. I think Selectman Luszey is our representative on the project. You're very satisfied what we'll be doing. Certainly was impressed with the aerial overview that was done by HCTV, the time lapse photography that was done on that whole project. I was very impressed with that. Selectman Nadeau alluded to the fact, and I think what he was saying was that there was really no rush where we obviously want to move HCTV and we're not going to be able to move the equipment until the building is done, and we want to open the building the upstairs and have it available to the seniors and we won't be able to do that until the construction is done and we get it furnished. In light of that, I would think that building a carriage house of this size, and we're not talking anything more than 2 - 2 ½ car garage with a loft is what it appears to me to be with oversized doors that's why the width would be about 2 ½ car garage width with a loft to be able to store some of the sets and things of that nature. I know that construction costs increase but I think when you go for bid in the winter time you always get better prices if you think you can start this project in the spring. Don't you think it might be best for us to wait, go out to bid later when we know we've secured the funds, we know we've identified the funds, we saved the \$3,000 compared to the total cost of the project may seem insignificant but like Selectman Nadeau, we need to pinch pennies here on everything that we do in this town right now because we're limited to our budgets. I don't see the rush in doing it but I don't see anything averse to putting it off to the spring and having a different company come in and do it and we can still keep Mr. Manor on to oversee that project until it's complete. What I'm looking at I'm sure it's going to have the same kind of fascia as the building probably like barn type structure and shouldn't take more than a month or two to build at best. It's not a great big building. It's just a building on top of slab. Can you counter that argument and convince me that going with Brookstone is the right way to go.

Patrick Colburn told Selectman Coutu he was absolutely right. It is somewhat of a gamble. You could almost go either way with it. One would think that the economies of keeping the same general contractor on that site would prove valuable. I just don't know. I know Selectman Nadeau would like to see costs but I can't get costs until I put it out on the street. Right now, the group of us are about the only folks that have it. The building is 30 X 30 like you say, a 2 ½ car garage, but it is clear span and does include structural steel. There is a second story loft. There will be roof trusses and what I would hate to see is a brand new parking lot ruined by construction next spring. Without doubt, you're going to have lulls hauling sheetrock to the building, deliver trucks, construction workers, everybody is going to be tracking, turning their tires, plus you have to excavate for the footings for the frost wall, the slab, that's all going to be done over brand new work. There certainly is a risk that you will ruin what you just did with the finish coat of pavement.

Mr. Colburn stated that the other thing that happens is that we're getting a warranty out of Brookstone. That was our discussion with Brookstone is what happens if we bring in another contractor. If we bring in another contractor, then we will void our warranty with Brookstone. If Brookstone should happen to roll off a piece of granite curb with a delivery vehicle or something between now and the end of their warrant period, they own it. If a new contractor comes in and is building a garage and does the same thing, we own it. So that would be the concern. In my opinion, the change order route is somewhat risky because you don't have the checks and balances of us getting a look at what the subs are getting for numbers. All you're doing is relying on Paula, the owner of Brookstone and her folks to give us a good number. Yes it does cost \$3,000 but at least in the route that we're looking to take, you do get that last look. You get to see the numbers. They're going to present us with the sub's quotes. So we will have the benefit of seeing those numbers. If we put it out on the street ourselves, we're either going to have to pay someone to put the RFP together or I'll be tasked with doing it which means we have to have a set of contract documents to go along with it. It's not as easy as what we're proposing to do now is utilize the pieces and parts from our current contract and the front end the insurance liability and everything that we have established. I see benefit of going in the direction we're asking to go in.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to direct Brookstone Builders to solicit bids and provide the town with construction costs for the HCTV carriage house to be located at Benson Park.

Selectman Coutu said he's heard the presentation made by Mr. O'Keefe relative to the funding. I heard the presentation made by our Town Engineer who we've entrusted with this and other types of projects. What sold it to me is I don't want to task him with any more work. Seriously, I think that having familiarity with HCTV budgeting and Mr. O'Keefe's management of that budget as well as the trust that we have in our Town Engineer, I'm convinced by what was presented that this is the right way to go. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Maddox said he is going to vote in opposition. I'm having a tough time talking about a two car garage for \$100,000. I would like to see what the specs are that drives a price that I believe Selectman Luszey got at one point we were looking at a two car garage of \$15,000 to get into the six figure range. I can't make that leap. I don't disagree with your thought process Selectman Coutu; I'm just having a difficult time getting to a six figure number.

Selectman Nadeau indicated what I just heard the Town Engineer tell me is what we're looking for a building. I have no problem taking what he just said what we're looking for a building and float it out there and see we have plenty of local contractors and just him hey what do you think this will cost so we have something to judge against what we're going to get back from Brookstone. Everything you just said - the trusses, the steel, the concrete work - it's a 30 X 30 garage with the trusses which are available we know that. We know that there's local people here doing the steel work. I do not feel comfortable asking Brookstone Builders for \$3,000 to go out and get me a quote on a 2 ½ car garage until I know roughly what it's going to cost out there. I don't think that it's going to cost more than \$50,000 or \$60,000 to build something like this. To give someone \$3,000 to go look at finding it for me, I think there might be a cost savings using Brookstone Builders but before I vote to say yeah go ahead and do this, I'd like to know what it's really going to be. I'm going to have to vote in opposition of it even though I am in favor of having a carriage house at Benson's for the HCTV.

Selectman Luszey had a couple of things. One is the \$15,000 was a kit of a T111 structure that did not include the assembly, or the concrete work, or site work. You can probably easily double that to get to about 30. The other point is there are drawings of this building and it's not a two car garage. It was designed to fit the setting - to blend in with the architectural design of the current building. It's not a square box. It's got the same look and feel as the building that we're building. It's designed to fit into the landscape and all that goes along with that. It's not just a two car garage, a box - Mike and Pat have done a lot of work putting together a package that extremely well defines what it is we're asking for. Selectman Nadeau said that's a wonderful RFP. Selectman Luszey said it wasn't an RFP. You'd need to put an RFP together to do that and that is a lot of work. If we're going to task the Town Engineer to do that then we can do that. We'd spend a lot more than \$3,000 of his time and energy to go and do that.

Vote: Motion carried 3-2. Selectmen Nadeau and Maddox in opposition.

B. Derry Road Water System Extension Agreement

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Engineer Patrick Colburn and John Boisvert, Chief Engineer for Pennichuck Water Works.

Patrick Colburn thanked the Board. What we're here to discuss tonight back in 2011 this Board entered into an agreement with Pennichuck East Utility to extend water up 102 to the Londonderry town line and further to a development that a proponent came in that is situated in the Town of Londonderry that he requested this Board authorize serving with Town of Hudson water. You entered into that agreement. The proponent and Town Engineer at that time and Pennichuck worked together. That design requires a water booster station. That has been designed and the extension was designed, the booster station was designed, and since has been approved both by the Town of Hudson, the Engineering Department, the Fire Department, etc. The problem came when I was approving the design plans. The current design plans don't necessarily match the agreement from 2011 in that the 2011 agreement as I said runs water up 102 to the Londonderry town line. The current design plans take an alternate route along West Road to the entrance drive - the proposed development in Londonderry has an entrance drive off of West Road in Londonderry and also off of 102 in Londonderry. The current plan proposes to run the water up West Road through the development and stop at the 102 and drive intersection. I brought this to the Board's attention and I asked Mr. Boisvert to come in tonight to describe why that change occurred and ask that this Board sign a revised agreement so that this can move forward.

John Boisvert said one of the things I remember we were working on this well before the agreement was signed. It was one of those where okay now we have to get from point A to point B. We wrote the agreement, said okay 102 is the shortest distance between two points. The agreement is signed, we go back, we start looking now we're starting to really do the design engineering, got our surveys out there looking where the other utilities are in the ground, reviewing DOT plans, a whole bunch of other things that we looked at and also looked at the potential customer base. Where were the best customers so that if people wanted to tie on how can we get as many and capture as many of them as we can. Also to meet the needs of the fire department where they wanted their hydrants in Hudson and the like. As we started looking at it with all of the DOT drainage, guardrails, steep slopes, ledge, and everything going up that hill on 102 - you have Eastern Propane if you're heading out on the left and then you have pretty much just a slope. There's really not much on that side. It's a steep slope that comes down to the road, levels off, and then there's a guard rail and then it steeps off, and whole bunch of ditch work and DOT drainage up through that whole thing. It's not going to be fun not only to put in but not really fun to work on in the future when the time comes. If somebody wants to tap it, you have to deal with the DOT right of way and the guard rails, slopes, and drainage.

Mr. Boisvert noted that they we looked at the other alternative was that there were two entrances to that proposed development in Londonderry. One is on West Road, one's on 102. We looked at running down West Road. Pretty much an equal number of customers but also potentially for Hudson considerably more when you looked at the amount of vacant land and open space that was there, ease of construction. We have a lot more room on West Road. DOT would require us to be in this case at least even behind the guard rail or we'd be way up on a slope because DOT does not want our pipeline or your pipeline within their pavement limits. The alternative route is about the same length of pipe, same everything, and it was just a better design. Shame on me probably because when this was done, okay we're going to the Londonderry town line but we really hadn't given a lot of thought at that point in time to the exact route and best route for the water main. If the development project never got approved in Londonderry, we wouldn't be here today. At that point when this was signed, there was still a lot of uncertainty of whether this would have moved forward at all. We're here today and it's the simple language that says not only are we on 102 but we're going down West Road with this main extension. It would reflect what the preferred and best design route is at this time and that's what we're asking you to approve tonight. It's just a change in that.

Chairman Maddox said he always envisioned when we had the first original plan is this went up 102 which would benefit existing businesses in Hudson on Tracy Lane and the one that's across from it. We've basically now made them an island with the water going around them rather than by them.

John Boisvert said (inaudible) on the left that goes in there's a couple of businesses. Is that the one before the sheds? We looked at that and when you look, you've got those and then the ones that you're bypassing here you also have water customers on West Road as well too. Again, it's one of those where like you say the number of customers is no different. Whatever you lose over there you're gaining over here as well too.

Chairman Maddox said he was going to have to disagree with you. There was going to be a stub at West Road that those people could have gone down. This effectively with the gates being able to utilize this water line to benefit those two streets that are in Hudson. I'm having a tough time saying that we're not going to water this area whereas if we had gone up 102 as it was originally designed, those Hudson businesses would receive the benefit of the water going by. Yes this does have some Hudson businesses on West Road but that stub was going to be there but it was continuing up the hill. I'm a little concerned that I am isolating those businesses without giving just to change this because it's easier for whoever to go down West Road and go in the back way. I would hope that we could find some mutual ground of coming back towards Hudson on 102 a couple of hundred feet to maybe make it more palatable for those people to be able to tie in in the future.

A couple of points Mr. Chairman. Patrick Colburn indicated that I went over this with Gary Webster in my office when I sort of discovered the issue. He pulled out two drawings that I guess he presented to you folks back in 2011. They were the two options. There were always two options proposed and basically as I understand it this Board left the decision to the developer because remember the developer for the Hickory Woods Development is covering the full cost of the construction of the booster station and the construction of the main extension. As I understand it, it basically has boiled down to his chosen route. As Mr. Webster identified, neither option was discounted and basically they have chosen the preferred route now that they have the additional data.

John Boisvert said it's a little bit more pipe for them initially up front because they hadn't planned on starting that part of their development closer to West Road. So they are actually putting in more pipe a lot sooner than they would have in selecting this option because of constructability perspective going up 102.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to approve the Derry Road Water System Extension between Pennichuck East Utility, Inc. and the Town of Hudson.

Selectman Coutu said he wanted to be involved in the discussion. I just wanted to get it on the table. I don't disagree with Selectman Maddox. Mr. Boisvert when I look at the proposed plan, and I want to make sure I have it correct, this is the proposed plan coming up West coming all the way up through the development coming back out and ending on 102. Mr. Boisvert indicated that was correct. Selectman Coutu asked if there was going to be a stub on 102 coming out in Londonderry from what is proposed to be Tavern Hill Road. Mr. Boisvert said yes and actually in the agreement we're taking from there Pennichuck we have a small isolated community water system. We're going to be running from that stub down into Londonderry to tie that system in and get it off its wells that have poor water quality or at least difficult to treat water quality. That was one of the things that we'll be working on. The other thing is it will have a T and a stub that could head back towards Hudson so at some point we can actually close the gap if we find there is a demand on Route 102 for water service. As it comes out there, the plan is to have it would actually be a T and most likely there will be a hydrant as well. Albeit that's in Londonderry but we already do something similar to that down at Cutler Road where it comes out where it goes in, it essentially goes through Litchfield through our pipes, and then what we would do is feed off our system and we do a deduct. You take your retail records and we've worked that out in the past.

Selectman Coutu reiterated what Mr. Boisvert said is that you're maintaining that there will be a stub available for interested parties coming south on 102 back into Hudson. If there were two or three businesses along Route 102, which is where what Selectman Maddox was concerned about the availability would be there for them to take. Mr. Boisvert said yes that's correct. Selectman Coutu said when you enter into from I would assume is an existing line on 102 up to West Road is there an existing line there. Mr. Boisvert said there's an existing line...Mr. Colburn said in front of the med. park. Selectman Coutu said he gave the right of way to be able to go across for the rec. center. So you're coming off that stub and you're going to continue up 102, turn onto West. At that juncture would it be possible to put a T there? John Boisvert said what we'll have there is a hydrant

and actually we've made it so what will happen is there will be a T there on that will be a hydrant to start. So when somebody wanted to tie in or move on, all they have to remove the hydrant, run their water main, and relocate the hydrant. All of that will be set up ready to go in that direction either there or cross over into Robinson Road too. So the stub will be right there. Selectman Coutu asked would you then say that there is a possibility then rather than going from Londonderry south you could go from the intersection of 102 west north up 102. John Boisvert said you could at that time yes.

Selectman Luszey stated given what Selectman Coutu just said, isn't that the problem area? Aren't we just prolonging the issue? John Boisvert said it's a good point because you can come from both direction but when you look at the costs and really more of the difficulty of running up 102 from West Road up that hill where like I said you've got guard rails, you've got ditches, swales, and everything you may find to catch those businesses coming back down from the other way so you don't have to go down through that stuff, you may find it to be what would be the preferred alternative at some point if you had to choose one way or the other. Let's say someone was half way between that Hickory Woods entrance onto 102 and West Road, they may elect to come back from the other way I think which would cross through some Londonderry stuff and then it would cross it back into Hudson.

Chairman Maddox asked Selectman Luszey if it answered his question. Selectman Luszey said it answers my question but we're just pushing off the cost of getting water along that line to some future unknown developer.

Selectman Brucker was curious who would then pay for the new water. John Boisvert said whoever is developing. Mr. Malizia said which has been the practice of the Board of Selectmen since we've owned the water utility. If you'd like water extended and you're a developer you pay for that extension. There may be a clause that if someone else hooks up from your extension that they might get a reimbursement. The policy of the town has been if you'd like to have the water extended, you'll pay the cost of doing so subject to reimbursement. I think one of the reasons the previous water company got in trouble is they made expansions without customers. We're not in that practice. We are serving the customers we have and if someone wants to add on as a customer/developer providing the engineering works, they pay the fee, we're good with that.

Selectman Nadeau stated the other thing he was looking at going up West Road, a lot of the businesses that could have gotten the water off of 102 might be able to get work easements and stuff to go through the back to get it up to say Eastern Propane wanted to bring it up to the back side of where Fuller is, they might allow an easement to go through there. That's the shorter distance if you look at it on the paper which we've done in the past is allowed it to go through other people's property, which we did on 102 to get it to Christine Drive. Steve Malizia said there's a cross country path. Selectman Nadeau said that's an option too that could be opened to those businesses. That could be a shorter distance and less money.

Chairman Maddox indicated that his whole dilemma is we were going to get it up 102 to those businesses at the get go. Now we're saying that if you want it, you've got to go into Londonderry and retrieve it. Selectman Nadeau said or it's in Hudson. The potential is still there for them if they're interested.

Vote: Motion carried 4-1. Selectman Maddox in opposition.

C. Pelham Road Bridge Project - Additional Design Services

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Engineer Patrick Colburn and John Byatt, CLD Consulting Engineers

Patrick Colburn stated again this is the Pelham Road Bridge project where Second Brook crosses under Pelham Road. You'll recall from years back that this project has evolved. There was a warrant article and appropriation that dates back some years now. We're still working under that appropriated sum of money. Considerable progress has been made in recent months and I can report that the preliminary plans have been reviewed and approved for this bridge through the DOT along with a cost estimate that fits into our appropriated sum of money also has been reviewed and approved by the DOT. During the preliminary design phase of the project, a couple of items presented themselves that we now need to deal with prior to moving on to final design. One of the things that we did during preliminary design is we sort of lengthened the scope of work and the limits of work along Pelham Road to correct the approaches. Right now there's a horrible sage curve at the bridge so we've lengthened the limits of work in order to help the approaches and make some improvements to that sag curve. One of the things that that did is negate the previous easements that we had acquired from adjacent homeowners because now we need additional easements. We've expanded the limits of work.

Patrick mentioned that the other thing that we have tossed around for some time is our own research with FEMA. Basically what you have out there today is a 60 inch diameter culvert. During heavy storm events, there's a large flush of water that is impounded on the upstream side of the crossing and makes that crossing a high hazard dam. What we need to do because we're going to host a public meeting as required by the DOT, what we need to do is apply our hydraulics to a FEMA flood model and confirm if properties downstream of this bridge will be impacted one foot or more in the 100 year flood than they are today. If I can say that a different way, today there are properties downstream of this crossing that are impacted by the 100 year flood plan and therefore would require flood insurance. There's a chance that once we install this bridge that the limits of that 100 year flood line may change. Looking at it vertically if those limits grow by more than one foot, than an amendment is required to the FEMA flood map. We need to investigate whether that's the case or not. For that, I brought John Byatt in to discuss with you folks a proposed scope and fee change to their existing contract with the town. What I would like to report before I turn it over to John is that I just received notification from the DOT that they will cover 80 percent of CLDs amendment leaving us with a scope creep and fee change of just \$2,714.

John Byatt indicated that Mr. Colburn pretty much covered most of it. Last time we met I think a year or so maybe a little more ago we discussed whether we wanted to build a dam or open it up and make a bridge. Now building a dam had impacts upstream, building a bridge had some impacts downstream. As Patrick said, we need to have a public meeting now and one of the things we need to do is discuss the effects of what happens when we open up the bridge. One of the big questions we see coming is well how is that going to affect my flood insurance. Do I need to get flood insurance now? In order to answer that question, we have to run the analysis Patrick discussed. What we have to do is we have to actually get FEMA's hydraulic model and run it with the new bridge opening and see what happens. If it does increase a foot beyond their base elevations, then we have to get a letter of macro vision of LOMR. What we're looking forward to doing now is just run the analysis to see if we need that LOMR or not mainly so that we can tell people at the meeting what the affects are going to be when we do this.

The other item was the easements. Mr. Byatt indicated that we did some right of way research originally back when this was a dam project and not even a bridge. We went to the Registry and we actually asked the town for information on all of the right of way easements and all the right of way material there so we could establish the right of way. I think we established it was about a 3 rod right of way typically. Almost a 50 foot swath centered on the road. Now recently when we were looking into the age of the bridge as part of the historic review, they wanted to know how old the bridge was. The town looked into some information on how old the bridge was and we found some new right of way material which showed the right of way instead of being sort of 25 foot offset from the center, actually goes through the middle of the road. In order to construct the bridge and even if you don't construct the bridge, we're going to need to re-establish the town's right of way through there. Not only did the project length increase because of the roadway work we're doing, so we'll need a couple more easement from different people on that, we're going to have to do some new easements differently from what we did before. We got some easements originally when it was a dam kind of just in the upstream and downstream areas but now it's spread more and we have the right of way issues so we need to redo those easements.

Chairman Maddox asked if the one foot elevation though cuz we all agreed when this came before us a year ago that the real problem is at Lowell Road. It's not transmitting enough water underneath Lowell Road and through that stove pipe that's underneath there. I think that we all understand that at some point that is going to be an area that has to be addressed. I guess this one foot elevation could be temporary if we showed that we do have an intent to rectify the undersized drain underneath Lowell Road. John Byatt said he wasn't sure how that would work with FEMA. We could try but I'm not sure they would say - they may want to know when is it going to be opened up. When are these things going to happen? Chairman Maddox said he was just asking the question before we...John said once they do open it up if we did open up the stove pipe, LOMR could be done again and maybe what was upstream now reduces and less people upstream would need flood insurance. Otherwise, I think we have stuff to do.

Selectman Coutu told John Byatt in the communication that's before us dated August 15th, Nancy Mayville asked specifically about the acronym is "ROW" right of way further easements that we might need to take and alluded to the fact that there's \$5,000 left and she wanted to know if we would have a problem with taking additional right of ways. The reply that she got I guess from you was that you didn't foresee that. Of course this is her letter dated August 15th. So she communicated with you prior to that. Are you now stating that there may be some takings that are going to require some funding? John indicated that they didn't know yet. The first easement we got - Gary Webster got - from the people free of charge. They did not ask for any compensation for those easements. Our intent is to do the same thing to ask for no compensation for those easements. It's pretty typical on projects like this. That doesn't mean somebody might say no I want some compensation. What I told Nancy was we're planning on buying a lot of property for this. That was the current intent is to just ask for a no fee easement for those properties. I don't know until we talk to the property owners again how they feel about that. There are two new property owners. Five thousand dollars was just kind of thrown in just in case. That's kind of a lot. Most of these municipal type jobs we don't really pay a lot that most maybe sometimes it's \$5,000 or so. The intent isn't to purchase the right of way. It's to get an easement and we'll see what happens from there I guess until we speak to the property owners.

Assuming we approve this this evening, Selectman Coutu said you need to have one or two public hearings. John Byatt indicated the plan was to have one. Typically it's one. Sometimes if there's complicated decisions to make in regards to the bridge, maybe they want us to see the options and what's going to happen after we'd two but right now our current plan is to have one unless someone thinks more is necessary. Selectman Coutu said prior to this evening our reference to this project was the "damn bridge". Assuming that all goes well, it's a broad assumption but assuming that all goes well even we get through the public hearing process, when do you think we'll get a shovel in the ground? John said the plan is to have a shovel in the ground next summer during school closure. Selectman Coutu thanked John. I appreciate the time you've given us on this project.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to approve proposed Amendment No. 2 to the original Agreement between the Town of Hudson and CLD Consulting Engineers dated October 2012 to add an additional design services in an amount not to exceed \$13,571, which 80 percent or \$10,856.80 will be reimbursed by the State Aid Bridge Program and the Town's contribution will be \$2,714.20. Said funds will be from the March 2008 appropriations, carried 5-0.

D. Application for Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund Grant - Zach Field

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Engineer Patrick Colburn and Len Lathrop.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Patrick Colburn said an update for Zach's Field. The removal and relocation of the asbestos waste is well under way out there. I would say 80 percent complete to date. The relocation cell is completely excavated and about 80 percent full at this time. We have a great contractor out there, Jaymore Enterprises, and we're working very closely with the EPA and DES as well as the oversight contractor. We've got a good team out there. What has happened as construction has gone on is we've discovered a volume of waste that was unanticipated. So what we would like to do is because again working with the EPA, we realize that additional funds are available through another alphabet soup. As you know, right now we're funded through the REDC, Regional Economic Development Committee. Now we would like to visit the CRDC, Capital Regional Development Coalition, for a similar grant. This Board requires that grant applications be approved prior to submittal. I wanted to get here as soon as possible to present it to you folks.

Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to approve the Town Engineer to apply for additional Brownfields Grant money for the Zachary Tompkins memorial field site, carried 5-0.

Chairman Maddox asked if they had any idea what the turnaround time is on that Sir. Patrick Colburn indicated they were working on that. We received notification from CRDC that it could be into October before we see a grant. There's a board that needs to approve the application and it's a 20 person board that receives the application for review via e-mail. EPA has committed to shortening that timeframe and we'll see how she does. Chairman Maddox said great. I look forward to seeing you coming back to accept the grant.

Len Lathrop was happy to work with Patrick on this project. It's going well. This was an unfortunate finding of a lot more asbestos. I think with some plan modifications that we've got it well underhand. We've met with the Bears. They're happy with the new site plans and I think we'll still have quite a very nice facility for our town when it's finished. Selectman Coutu said for the public record, you're doing well health wise. Mr. Lathrop said he's doing much better health wise. I thank you for making this quick and easy tonight.

E. Acceptance of Sewer and Water Main Extensions - Sparkling River

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Engineer Patrick Colburn.

Patrick Colburn said basically this is another construction phase out at Sparkling River. The street is called "Cricket Field Lane". If you drive by you'll see all sorts of houses being framed up along that road. This summer the roadway was constructed along with the utilities under it - sewer and water, all under the supervision of Gary Webster and my summer interns. Since construction was completed, we received the notice of acceptance for both sewer and water mains. In addition, we received the required as-built plan for the sewer utility and we received copies of all of the test results for both utilities be it vacuum testing, pressure testing, bacteria, and so forth. All are in accordance with local standard. Your approval tonight will approve the private sewer to discharge into our public sewer main and then we'll make the water mains in that development public. We've been provided through the proponents counsel a water utility easement deed affording us 20 feet in width over the as-built water main for maintenance. This is customary for projects of this sort - residential developments. I recommend approval.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to accept the sewer and water main construction at Sparkling River as recommended by the Municipal Utility Committee, Town Engineer, and Road Agent, carried 5-0.

F. Updated Ambulance Agreement

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia.

As you are well aware, Steve Malizia indicated that we the Town of Hudson provides ambulance service to the Town of Litchfield. We've done so under agreement for quite a few years, probably longer than my memory. Certainly before my tenure. We took it upon ourselves or the Fire Chief took it upon himself to look at the agreement and determine that we need to make some changes to the language. The primary thing was to get the benefit rate for the firefighters up. Previous to this agreement, I believe we're at a 25 percent fringe benefit rate. Reality dictates that our fringe benefits are 45 percent of compensation. Why that's important is because we bill Litchfield based on an estimate of our budget. Our budget estimate was low. We're looking to get the number to a more realistic number of what our actual expenses is.

Mr. Malizia said the other thing was updated on this, or two other things that were updated, one was the insurance liability language that our insurance provide LGC reviewed and recommended just to make sure it was current. The other item was for Litchfield customers. In other words if it's a pickup in Litchfield for a Litchfield patient, Litchfield would pay if the patient does not pay. For example after three billing attempts, Litchfield makes the payment. The payment that Litchfield would make to us would be based on the Medicare rate. As you're well aware, we set our rates at Medicare plus 30. We don't have to chase them. So we would go for a Medicare rate, which is basically what we get for most of the patients in Hudson. So just wanted to articulate that, make sure the agreement was updated, given that there's been some vacation schedules, we've been working on this for a while. As I understand it, the Litchfield Town Administrator and Litchfield Fire Chief recommend this as I do as the Fire Chief here does. It needs to go to both Boards as you are the contracting parties.

Selectman Luszey said paragraph H on page 2 why did we change the definition of the indemnity for both towns. Mr. Malizia said the language came from the LGC who insures both towns. So that gave that. That was their recommended language.

They had a pass at this agreement. Why they changed it, I'm not an expert on insurance language. We relied on their verbiage.

Chairman Maddox asked Selectman Luszey if that answered his question. Selectman Luszey said no. Selectman Coutu asked have you read it all the way through including the old paragraph. I thought it was self explanatory. On the old H, it appears that they're talking about both parties agreeing - what they're doing is they're just bunching it into one paragraph where here they define each town in the indemnity clause as what each of their responsibilities are. We're not going to sue each other and things of that nature. It's making it clear as opposed to having an ambiguous statement like both parties agree that the Hudson Fire Department shall not be liable to the Town of Litchfield. It's just making it more clearly defined. Selectman Luszey said when I read the old one, it is the Town of Hudson shall not be held liable for anything that we do in Litchfield only. The new one - each is holding each other harmless regardless of any negligence on each other's part. That's the way I'm reading that. The old one there was liability on Litchfield's part. Selectman Coutu said that LGC insures both communities. Steve Malizia said correct. They're the property liability insurer for both. Selectman Coutu thought that's one of the reasons why they're...it's an LGC policy, a language that they're applying for service from one community to another.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to approve the updated Ambulance Agreement between the Town of Hudson and the Town of Litchfield as recommended by the Fire Chief and Town Administrator, carried 5-0.

Selectman Nadeau indicated now that we've just updated this, when was the last time we updated our communications, our dispatching with Litchfield. Chairman Maddox indicated the Chief is coming up for the next item so maybe he can address it.

Selectman Luszey asked to make a motion to swap H and G. I would like to have a discussion about the job description prior to posting the position. Selectman Coutu said he had no objection.

Chief Murray said it was updated I'm thinking 5 or 6 years ago. I'll double check it and get you the exact answer. If that's the case, Selectman Nadeau asked do you think we should update that also seeing that we just updated this one. Chief Murray said the dispatch agreement really talked about increasing our charge per call. So over a 3 or 4 year period, our dispatch rate was brought up to a more reasonable rate. I can look at it and if I think it's out of sync, then we'll come back to the Board.

Selectman Coutu said I don't know if you remember Selectman Maddox but in our discussion of combined dispatch, that was a topic of discussion that we would review our agreement with Litchfield and we would incorporate it at that time. I think that's where that was left off it. I imagine based on our directive they're working on that now - combined dispatch. Chairman Maddox said he was sure that the Town Administrator has that tucked away somewhere.

Chairman Maddox indicated that we're going to take up H.

H. Adopting the new Firefighter/AEMT job description

Chairman Maddox recognized Fire Chief Shawn Murray.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board, Chief Murray said we're before you to ask you to approve a change in the firefighter EMT-I job description. It's really a housekeeping item. As you know, we've talked to the Board about the National Registry of EMTs is changing the title from EMT Intermediate to Advanced EMT. In 2016, the change will be coming into effect. So we're really just trying to get ahead of this to rename the EMT-I to Advanced EMT position. There are no other changes made to the job description.

Selectman Luszey asked if there are any salary implications to the change. Chief Murray said not at this time no. Selectman Luszey indicated that the scale is identical. Chief Murray said yes.

Chairman Maddox asked what is the difference in an overview between what we have now as an EMT-I to the new AEMT. Chief Murray stated an EMT Intermediate actually the last time the curriculum was updated was 1985. That's why the National Registry decided to do this. From my perspective, the only difference is through our research and when you compare it, they're going to get more of depth of education. They're going to go further into advanced life skills here providing more information than they did with the old curriculum. There's an addition of one additional skill which is a pediatric advanced life support skill where they put an intraosseous needle into an infant in cardiac arrest to get medications into it quicker.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to adopt Fire Department Job Description JOBD-11 Firefighter/AEMT as submitted effective immediately.

Chairman Maddox inquired as when this becomes effective. Chief Murray stated this would become effective immediately. The National Registry title change takes effect in 2016. So simply all that happens is up until that time, we continue to use EMT Intermediate title but there is a provision in the job description which allows the waiver of the title if you will.

Selectman Coutu said to Chief Murray if you remember, we were involved in discussions about this last year. There was still a lot hanging in the air. When would it impact their advance training? Would it be in the 2015 budget going into 2016 or can they start taking the training immediately - the advanced training that would match the job title requirements. Chief Murray stated the advanced training is ongoing now. They've opened up a two year window for them to get it completed.

Selectman Luszey asked what happens if someone doesn't complete the training by the two years. Chief Murray said they are required by their job description to meet a certain level of certification in their job description. If they don't meet it, potentially they don't meet their job descriptions and the consequences of that. Selectman Luszey asked up to and including termination. Chief Murray said it could be. Selectman Luszey said it's either you meet your job or you don't. Is there wiggle room in two years not meeting this job code? Chief Murray said not according to the National Registry of EMTs no. Selectman Luszey said that's not the question. Is there wiggle room? I don't know who the National Registry is, is there wiggle room here? Chairman Maddox said if we pass this, you're saying that is the minimum that is required. If you don't have the minimum...Selectman Luszey indicated that's what I'm asking. Is that a hard date? Chairman Maddox said this is proposed to go in 2016. So that date is as hard as anything can be 2 ½ years in advance. For clarification Selectman Luszey said he heard two things. One is if we pass this, this goes into effect immediately which means all the current job codes that are the I become this. Chief Murray said no. The job description goes into effect. Selectman Luszey noted that is this which means they now have two years to meet these requirements. That's a hard date in my mind.

Selectman Coutu indicated he disagreed and he can correct me if I'm wrong. I understand that the two years kicks in from 2016. They have until 2018 but you're giving them an opportunity to get it in advance. If I'm wrong, then please correct me. Chief Murray said you're wrong. The change will take effect on January 1, 2016. Selectman Coutu said it means they have up until then to be certified. Chief Murray indicated that was correct. So they essentially have 2 ½ years right now to get the training which is out there being offered and they are in training for it. Selectman Coutu said he'd go back to where Selectman Luszey was. Are you saying now on the basis of this job description, I know they're going to keep the same job title they have now and in 2016 you're going to change it Firefighter Advanced EMT because we're giving you authorization to do that, can you say for certain that what will apply to those who cannot meet the requirements of the job do not pass these additional courses that are required to achieve this degree, this certification, or this level within their job responsibilities will be terminated? Chief Murray said he can't because this Board of Selectmen is the policy making board. We have to have some discussions. There is a lower level that they can go to but if we do that, we're lowering the level of service we provide to the citizens.

Chairman Maddox said you still have a waiver request on the last page. So I don't think a hard and fast rule to your question is on 1/1/16 will people be terminated for not having this. There is a waiver provision. So that's probably going to come into play. Chief Murray said it can also be some potential collective bargaining negotiations related to this too.

Selectman Brucker asked is there's money in the training budget to train for this. Chief Murray said there is and the State is supplementing some of that by providing vouchers. They have to take a computerized test so the State of New Hampshire has subsidized some of that for the testing fee.

Selectman Luszey asked Chief Murray why the change now. Why not wait until 2016 to make the title change if there is no hard cut off and there's waivers? What's the need to change it now? Chief Murray said because we're being proactive knowing it's coming forward in two years. Selectman Luszey indicated you can be proactive in the training but I don't see any need to change any job description at this point until such time as your standards require us to because there's no benefit to do that. All the benefits that training can take place and on 2016 January 1, the Board can then make the change. If there's no benefits for us to be doing this at this time. I don't see that.

Steve Malizia said what about future hirings. For example if we're looking to get folks now, I'm assuming they can get this certification now. Is that a correct statement? Chief Murray said yes. Mr. Malizia stated as folks are now coming on board with us, those folks that we would be recruiting and hopefully bringing onto the department to replace other folks would already have this certificate. That maybe a benefit to us. Selectman Luszey asked does that stop you from hiring them at the I. Mr. Malizia said they wouldn't have an I, they'd have an AEMT. Could you hire them at an I? Selectman Luszey said we're talking about a title here. Mr. Malizia indicated with the required certification. Selectman Luszey said and the requirements of this job. You can hire a more experienced person into a lower job description because that's what this is apparently. At the 2016 date is when the requirements take affect and everyone is supposed to be at that. I don't understand why we're pushing it 2 years out or 26 months out to change a job description now when it's not really beneficial for us at this point. Mr. Malizia said that was just one possible benefit. Selectman Luszey said he didn't see it as a benefit. I can hire a PhD or someone that needs a Bachelor's Degree. A job description is a job description.

Steve Malizia said the counterpoint maybe if it's a paramedic certification which we hire, I don't know if we could actually hire them as an EMT-I. I don't know that. Your certifications I don't exist in your world but for example we have a paramedic certification. We hire those specifically and there's a job description and everything else. If one of those folks say I just want to be an EMT-I, they're at least an EMT-I because they're a paramedic if you know what I'm saying. I don't know if you could actually hire that certification as an EMT-I level. I don't know. I'm not an expert. That's why I'm looking at them saying I don't know how it works with the AEMT. Are these folks going to come out of the academy now as an AEMT and not an EMT-I and how does that impact us? I don't know.

Chairman Maddox said we're always trying to play catch up. Here's a chance for us to say in advance this is what we're looking to put into place. Yeah maybe 2 ½ years is a little early but again I don't know how long this is going to take to get the department through the process. We're telling people this is what we are going to expect as a minimum. Selectman Luszey said that's actually my whole point. We're not saying that because you have a waiver and I did not hear that come 2016 this is the requirements for this job. Chairman Maddox thought if we pass this, that is the requirement. Selectman Luszey stated

that's not what I'm hearing. Chairman Maddox said you're always going to have waivers for any number of reasons. We can't say hard and fast you can't be employed. If you don't have this what it says in the job description that you have the ability to waiver. Again, I'm not going to even guess what that could be but you're saying remove the waivers. What you really want. Selectman Luszey said to remove the waiver.

Selectman Coutu withdrew. I'll stir up another can of worms had a proceeded. I'm fine.

Vote: Motion carried 3-2. Selectman Coutu and Selectman Luszey in opposition.

G. Posting of a Full-time Firefighter Position

Chairman Maddox recognized Fire Chief Shawn Murray.

Chief Murray indicated that we had a Firefighter Paramedic resign this past week and I'm asking the Board for permission to advertise to fill the position.

Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to allow the Fire Chief to advertise for the vacant firefighter position, carried 5-0.

Selectman Coutu asked this position like all other positions that we're presently advertising it would go through our office. We're using that expanded media coverage - the Lowell Sun, Manchester Union Leader, and not just the two local newspapers - the Telegraph. Mr. Malizia believed we use the other media as the Chief understands.

I. Part-time Temporary Electrical Inspector Funding and Reclassification

Chairman Maddox recognized Deputy Fire Chief Rob Buxton.

Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. In March of last year you made a change to the Electrical Inspectors position and you made him a temporary employee. It was brought to our attention coming into this meeting that September 5th that position runs out. You were funded until September 5th because you hit the sixth month period. It's my understanding from discussing with Steve Malizia that that is a six month appointment. That is the max they can work as a temporary hire within a 12 month period. Tonight we are currently asking you to create a Part-Time Inspector for the same time period that you've created currently - 16 hours a week, 2 eight hour days, and move forward from there. I've provided you with a little bit of data that reviews kind of where we are to date in inspectional services and what our comparison has been between 2012 and 2013. We certainly have done a lot of work in this over the last couple of months but this is just a six week snapshot of where we're at activity wise. If you look at the numbers, we certainly have seen an increase. If you look at Dave Hebert who's the Inspector, he handled 162 inspections within that 6 week period compared to last year. There were 90 inspections done by the Zoning Administrator who's splitting duties. He was splitting duties between Zoning duties and the Building Department covering those jobs. That extrapolates out to approximately in 2012 there was 3.1 inspections per inspector during the day. As you recognize our fire prevention division is also included in that, so we rolled their activity in there and we continue to move forward on that.

If you look at our permit activity, Deputy Chief Buxton said we're up some 40 permits. The 2013 numbers are still trending towards renovation of existing space and not necessarily new construction, although some of that has changed in recent months with things that are landing on the Planning Board's plate. Those projects alone take a lot more labor time for review to make sure that existing structures meet the needs of the new change.

Revenue comparison, Deputy Chief Buxton indicated you can see we certainly have made a jump from 26,000 in the 6 week period to 41,000. So we're seeing an uptick in what we're receiving for revenues and how we're bringing those types of things in. If you look at the project values, we go from 3 million to 5 million within the same period. I'd like to point out, we ask and all the permits are based off of value of projects. We ask and that's how that number is brought in. I'm not sure if you recognize that or not but we ask what a project value is when they do apply for their permit. Basically when you look at work volume, what we're looking at is we have the Oakridge Subdivision which is currently under way. That is a 100 unit subdivision. We have the Fairview Nursing Home which is already at the footing stage and foundation stage, which is a daily visit for the Inspector every day at 12:30 where he spends pretty much an hour to an hour and a half on that site today and that will increase. We have the daily visit that will be starting out to the senior's facility for footings and foundation work and then obviously you have Sparkling River, Brady Drive, Vectron - which is being redeveloped, and the Jarry Subdivision which is Moose Hill - which is an 18 unit subdivision.

Basically Deputy Chief Buxton said what we're asking you to do tonight is re-title position as a part time inspector. It's the same person who will be filling that position. It's not a change which brings us kind of in line with what we did with the merge last year entitling our inspectional folks as Inspectors and not titling them specific to one task. The Electrical Inspector has been utilized for building inspections in 2012. He's been trained to do those types of things. So cross training has already taken place with him. We're asking him to continue that. We would spur conversation during our workshop, our budgetary presentation for the 2015 budget to see where we're at to see if we're seeing an economic bubble or if this is truly a trend that we're seeing construction continuing to take place in town.

Selectman Luszey's comment is I think given the number of plans that are on the table that the Planning Board is looking at and the size and scope, I think we should continue with this. I think we're going to be busy with another at least 24 months.

Motion by Selectman Nadeau, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to reclassify the Temporary Part-Time Electrical Inspector as a Part-Time Inspector at \$28.00 per hour for 16 hours per week, carried 5-0.

Chairman Maddox indicated the man's expertise is going to be sorely needed if something comes to fruition on one of our next items. You're not going to find anybody better to do that job.

Selectman Coutu said he couldn't agree more Mr. Chairman. He reached out and spoke with me maybe better than a week ago. I understand Selectman Nadeau had an opportunity to talk to him yesterday. We're well aware of his commitment to the job that he does and his local knowledge of our community. He certainly knows everything there is to know about electrical work. The man I think got 20 years younger since we folded in and reorganized that whole department. He is cheery. He's spry. He loves the atmosphere. He loves the people he's working with. He loves the setup and he looks forward to coming in and going to work. That's a different Joe than I knew a couple of years ago. This has been like you guys gave him a shot in the arm. I don't know what you put in it but he's come to life and he absolutely loves the atmosphere. Of course we're very busy and the onset of additional projects which will keep the inspectors - there are other projects that are not on that list. Deputy Chief Buxton indicated he just took a snapshot. Selectman Coutu said he's got a construction site going next door to me. He's spent a lot of time in there and there are other smaller sites like that that they have to go out and inspect. That's besides all of the permits that are taken out for homes and things of that nature. I'm going to support this wholeheartedly and thank you for all of the work that you did in putting this altogether. It's showing in the atmosphere that's been generated in that office. I think a lot of it is due to the work that you put into it and support that you had from the Chief. So thank you for that.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

J. 161 Lowell Road - Request to Town Boards and Committees

Chairman Maddox recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia.

At your request, Steve Malizia indicated I put this item on the agenda and you had asked that an item be placed on to discussion possibly sending correspondence to the various boards and committees in town that are involved in land development and land use to ask them to work with the Board of Selectman and other town officials so that they remain flexible in their schedules. I think that is the intent if I understood you correctly. If a fairly significant project does come to fruition that we afford them the opportunity to go through our review process in an efficient manner. We're not looking to cut corners. We're not looking to relax rules, or change ordinances or requirements. Instead I think it's a sincere effort to make sure that they get a reasonable time frame by which the development is reviewed. So for example the ZBA had a meeting scheduled for the fourth Thursday of the month and these folks missed that, that perhaps consideration be given to put them on a second Thursday of the month so that they would not have to wait an additional month just to keep the process moving. To that affect, I've prepared a sample letter. I think that articulates what I just said but it's the intent of the Board that we ask all the land use boards and all the others involved in this development to work with this Board and other town officials so that we remain flexible when we're dealing with this important economic development of a parcel of land in town.

For those who are sitting at home wondering what we're talking about because they missed the Planning Board meeting, Chairman Maddox said there is a potential and a very strong potential, it came into the Planning Board as conceptual, but the parcel that sits off of Lowell Road across from Granite State Glass is to have a 600,000 square foot building constructed upon it. The nice thing about it is it will not come onto Lowell Road. They are going to go back through Friars Drive and through the industrial park to make this happen. The gentleman that made the presentation said based on the value, there's going to be \$10 million I think Selectman Brucker worth of conveyors he said. Great potential for 200 jobs and tremendous tax revenue to the town. So we are not asking our land use boards to do anything more than be more flexible I think with the schedules. I know like the Planning Board is cancelled for tomorrow night to help us move this along. Again, they want to start construction January of next year. The schedule they have to go through because they do have some wetlands on the property and they're going to have some wetlands buffer impacts, no wetland impacts, they're going to need to go to the Planning Board, Conservation, then ZBA multiple times. Again, I'm hoping that this is just meant to say the Town of Hudson Board of Selectmen support this project and would ask our town boards to be flexible. The only change I would ask is it does not come from me it comes from the Town Administrator. I think that would be more fitting since I sit on at least of these and I thought it would be more...

Steve Malizia said it was certainly the Chairman's prerogative. I did it as you're the head of government.

Selectman Luszey said he had a comment. I find it interesting that we're doing it for this yet we don't do it for all economic development opportunities.

Chairman Maddox said point taken.

Selectman Coutu said he didn't disagree at what you're saying Selectman Luszey. However, these people have indicated that there's a tremendous amount of competition in this State right now to get these people to not consider Hudson but consider their communities. They are under a time constraint because they want to get this build as quickly as possible. I think that the

Planning Board and our representative to the Planning Board who happens to be the Chairman of this Board at this time didn't want to lose that opportunity. However in the future should any developer of considerable size - it doesn't necessarily have to meet certain criteria. Should request the same things I would think that we would extend the same opportunities to them in the future. I think that we need to grab every opportunity for development. It's been so long since we've seen anybody come into town. As a matter of fact, we've lost a couple of industries and here we now have Vectron re-rented and the building is going to be redone to accommodate the new tenants. So that's going to fill that void. Here we have a vacant parcel of land that we could have bought cheaply a long, long time ago but didn't. We have a great tax potential and I believe that's only the first of potentially two phases on that parcel. I think that you're right. In the future we need to look at expediting or handling every single one in the same fashion that would assure us the opportunity of getting them to come into our community.

To that end, Chairman Maddox thought Selectman Brucker there was another item on the Planning Board's agenda that same night and that was approved in one night because they know our regulations, and they met them, and they came in, and they were approved. Again, I think all the land use boards are trying to do their best. Again because of scheduling and whatever, they won't like up right. So this was just meant to ask to be able to be flexible so that they can be heard in a manner in which they can meet their time schedule to hopefully bring this business to Hudson. I think that the Board supports this project and the letter will be sent out to the land use boards. Is that a consensus? The Board indicated yes. Steve Malizia asked with his signature. The Board said yes.

K. Action Item List

Chairman Maddox said there's a number of items on here that anybody wished to bring up. They have some numbers. I put 12-02 on there just as a sample. You can pull that one off because until the State changes the laws, that's not going anywhere. I just put it on there as a sample.

Steve Malizia indicated you just did 13-09 too. Selectman Coutu said that's correct.

Selectman Luszey thought 12-04 was done on a temporary trial basis. Chairman Maddox indicated they're coming back. That's combining Energy and Recycling. Some of these action items that we have asked to have put on here as probationary periods so that we do not miss those dates. So some of those are on there. You have some comments that are on there.

Selectman Luszey question 13-19. Are we going to reschedule that one because the IT Director had a family issue that she couldn't show up for the original? Chairman Maddox asked if she was scheduled for a workshop yet. Selectman Luszey said he didn't think she's been notified to come in for August but we need to reschedule that. Ms. Graham said she was coming in September. Selectman Coutu asked if that was about the IT road map. Selectman Luszey indicated yes.

Chairman Maddox indicated some of them are our alleyways and Stop and Shop monies that we want to see a plan.

Steve Malizia asked to update the Board on the Stop and Shop money. There was an action or there was a request to get some information. I've attached it to the back of this package. So if you go to page 2, I don't mean to - I'm just trying to give you some information I believe you asked for it. The Board discussed the impact fees and I just wanted to let you know that the funds in the amount of \$50,000 originally were receipted and deposited September 7, 2004. The agreement states what the funds may be used for and that they are to be returned if not used within 10 years as they were receipted in September 2004. Ten years would be September of 2014. So I know that that was a piece of information that the Board asked for. I've given you that along with I believe a couple of pages down the salient piece of the pages of the agreement just so you could see that. Again, a copy from the Finance Department when it was receipted. What I'm telling you is on that item that you asked, the monies must be used or returned by September of 2014. Chairman Maddox said plenty of time to get a plan before the board. Selectman Coutu said he hoped we see a plan.

Selectman Luszey asked about the alleyway one 13-20. You have August or September. Steve Malizia indicated that he's given it to the Town Attorney and I've stated what the Board asked for either a quote from him or another legal firm that specializes in land to tell us or make recommendation to us. I sent him the entire package, which was pretty voluminous, he was reviewing the package and I believe he had some questions with Patti trying to find some information. Attorney Hodes who is part of Hage Hodes, in my opinion, has a required expertise but I'm still waiting to tell me if he doesn't think he can do it. If not, he will give us someone who can.

Selectman Luszey asked we're only going to get an answer in August or September as to whether he can do it. Steve Malizia said no. I would expect if he can do it, he's going to give us a solution of what we should do. He has the entire packet of information. What I asked him was please review the information and let me know if you think you can do it, i.e. if you can propose a solution or a legal solution, tell what your recommendation is. If you can't, I need you to get me someone who can. Chairman Maddox indicated he could probably give us that information by our next meeting at the workshop. Mr. Malizia said he didn't want to speak for him. I don't know. He is working on it right now. Selectman Coutu indicated that the request has been made. Mr. Malizia said he will not have time. I will be in Concord on Thursday testifying at a hearing so I won't even have time to look at something if he sends it. I'd rather wait until at least the 10th when he has that. Chairman Maddox was asking why can't he tell us for our next meeting, next Tuesday, if he is going to be able to do it. Mr. Malizia said that was a different question. Mr. Malizia said that was a different question. I'm sorry. I thought you wanted the whole solution. Chairman Maddox said no. I just wanted to know whether he's going to be able to do it or he's going to have to farm it out. Is that a reasonable request? Mr. Malizia said he would get that information.

Steve Malizia said the speedway anticipate coming back sometime in September just because if you wished to change the ordinance, you have to do a required public hearing. If that's still on the Board's radar.

9. OTHER BUSINESS/REMARKS BY THE SELECTMEN

Selectman Nadeau - A couple of things. One thing that's very important is this Thursday night Chase Street out here will be milled during the evening. They're going to be working through the night to mill the road just so people are aware on this section. Steve Malizia said along with School Street in front of Town Hall. Selectman Nadeau said it's been posted. It's only going to be one night according to the Road Agent. Robinson Road reconstruction is 100 percent complete and the new driveway at the Robinson Road fire station is complete. Wall Street - the construction and paving is complete and we're recommending acceptance to the Town Engineer. That's been sent to Mr. Colburn. The drainage has been replaced on Buswell Street off of Ferry Street and they did some work on some of the sewer catch basins in the last couple of days. That will be repaved next year. They'll put a binder coat this year and they they'll be repaving it in the spring next year. That's been a common practice to let the road settle for a year before you put your final pavement on.

Another thing - not last weekend but the weekend before, Selectman Nadeau said he took the time to go down to the speedway. Like anything else, there's always one bad apple in the crowd. We seemed to have found that problem. They're addressing the problem so that the noise will be back to where it should be. While I was there, I also got to see the fire department in action. We did have a couple Call Firefighters there that came back because there was multiple calls at the same time, which was great to see. As usually, the fire department did a great job in the extrication of one of the drivers.

The other thing Selectman Nadeau said he wanted to mention is we had the passing of a Call Firefighter from the department from quite a few years ago. I'd like to pass my condolences onto the family of Firefighter Ed Bisbing who passed away.

Selectman Coutu - Thank you Mr. Chairman. The first thing I want to do is bring to everyone's attention that the summer program for the Recreation Department has concluded. It was a very successful program this year, especially under the direction of the new Coordinator that we hired, Frank Girginis, and his staff.

The soccer program is under way. The coaches are going to have a meeting and team selections have been completed. Practices begin this week with games beginning on Saturday, September 7th, at Alivrne.

The Recreation Director had a chance to meet with Lori Bowen yesterday. She's very excited about the seniors program and coordinating all of the activities there. This is something that I think that she's got to take a great deal of pride in and I think she's going to pull this all together for us and make this work.

The other thing Mr. Chairman as you know based on a conversation that we had that I was seething this weekend about a visit that I had from a member of the public. Selectman Coutu indicated he's had conversation with the Chairman and he's had a conversation with Selectman Nadeau and it relates to the race track. You suggested to me Mr. Chairman that I should read the Code of the Town of Hudson, New Hampshire, as what is required or what may be required of the Board of Selectmen is identified in this ordinance that covers Chapter 264, race track motor vehicles. Under Article 264 VI, Inspections, "The Hudson Board of Selectmen Building Inspector and Health Officer are authorized to make announced or unannounced inspections of the property to ensure compliance with the requirements of this article and any license issue hereunder." I think it clearly states what we may consider to be our responsibility but as a segway as to what I want to say is you all know that I own a business in this town.

There are times that we are very busy and there are times that we're not very busy. If there was a requirement written within this Code book that the Board of Selectmen have a right to inspect convenience stores as well as the Building Inspector and the Health Officer, which I know they can, but the Board of Selectmen was included because there was a special warrant article for that. One was to walk into my business at the busiest time of my day and start talking about my business in front of other employees and customers, I would tell that Selectman where to go in no uncertain terms. A person who witnessed the event, we know that Selectman Nadeau went there. He went there not necessarily for a specific purpose but to look around. He explained to me what he noticed and what was done and he happened to be there on the day that the fire department had an extrication. There was no problems. The owner of the property had no problem with Selectman Nadeau being there. For the record so that there's no misunderstanding about my relationship with the owner of this racetrack, I wouldn't know him if he came in here right now I wouldn't know that he owns the race track. I don't know the man. Have I ever spoken with him? Yes. I've spoken to him I believe on two occasions on the telephone and the last time would be approximately three years ago. Have I been to the track, yes I've gone. I've brought my grandchildren. I've paid when I go in even though he has said anytime you want to come in feel free to announce who you are. I wouldn't do that. I know that Ben goes with his son and his Dad. I know he pays when he goes in. He doesn't seek any special favors. This isn't as a result of a friendship that I have. It's a matter of what is right and how to treat business people in our community.

Selectman Coutu said as a segway to getting into this conversation that if a Selectman came in and started speaking to me about my business in front of customers and my employees at a busy time, I would tell that Selectman where to go on no uncertain terms. In this particular case Mr. Chairman, you went to the race track, you may or may not have been announced by the wife. You said you were and I have no reason to doubt you. You probably were. Went up into the booth in the middle of probably one of the busiest weekends he had, and you started discussing his business, and his method of operation, or

whatever conversation you had, he obviously took exception to it, there were several other people around who witnessed it who felt that it was improper and inappropriate. I think it's time that we define what our role is and specifically I don't see why the Board of Selectmen should even be included in this. We are not inspectors. Your perception of what loud noises is going to be different than what Selectman Nadeau's perception is, is going to be different than mine, and so on, and so on. You might not think a muffler is really loud. I may think it's overbearing. It's a race track. You have 10 cars out there racing. It's going to be loud. You have 30; it's going to be a lot louder. So for me to go in there and inspect and tell the guy well you need to quiet the noise down, you need to worry about parking. You asked me Mr. Chairman if I would communicate with the Police Chief, as I'm the liaison to the Police Department, relative to any phone calls I guess you said that you heard that there were calls made about parking. We know that there's a parking problem both on Robinson Road on both ends and Old Derry Road when it comes to people coming to Hudson to enjoy the races of the Hudson Speedway. I told you that on their record, and I don't believe that anybody who's working in the dispatch center is not going to record calls that come in that they did indeed have one call and it was non race track related even though it was on Robinson Road. It was a private business who had a person parked inside his parking lot and had been there and wanted the police to know what they could do. The police went and issued a 24 hour ticket.

However last weekend the police department was very busy. If all of you recall, we had a triple stabbing, we had the arrest of somebody who did two robberies at gun point in town, we had a couple of domestics - one more serious than the other. That's besides accidents that were going on, assisting fire department on calls. They were very busy so the Sheriff's department took the special duty to do the race track. According to the Chief, we had a young - probably one of the newer recruits, that was his section of town to patrol and I reported to you that in the process of his patrol, and he doesn't just patrol up and down Old Derry and Robinson, he does that whole sector. He did dedicate some time to monitoring traffic and he found 7 distinct violations and issued tickets on all 7 vehicles. We talked about people parking on those roads, and trying to have a method of prohibitive parking. When you go to court and you park your car and you take a picture of the area front and rear of your vehicle and there's no sign that says no parking, the court is going to throw the ticket out. I explained to you that I don't think that if we start issuing all these tickets and we start getting challenged, the courts are going to start laughing at us. Unless you're parked directly under a no parking sign, we're not going to be able to enforce the no parking. We need to sit down with our Chief and the public safety committee and see what they can come up with.

Mr. Chairman, Selectman Coutu said he expressed to you how I felt and that I was going to bring it up. At your suggestion I should bring it up that I don't feel the Board of Selectmen has the right to interfere with the operation of a business when the owner of the business in this particular case was busy attending to running the races on a Sunday afternoon or whatever day you went. I think that that's something you could have said that is there an opportunity we can speak after the race? Can you pull yourself away so we can have a talk? That's one thing and if he says yes or no I'm too busy, then that's the end of it. To sit there and start talking about the business in front of other people is just uncalled for. It's very unprofessional and I think it leaves a black mark on the Board of Selectmen. That's all I have to say on that subject and that's all I have to say for the evening. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Selectman Luszey - The Town Engineer took all my thunder on the senior center except that Fairview Nursing Home is going to be doing a fundraiser on November 9th. They've selected the senior center to receive the proceeds from that. We're beginning to get, I think, a lot of community support. We've had individuals donate some furnishings to it already. We see a business outreaching to us already. The Hudson Council on Aging will be coming here shortly with an additional donation for the kitchen. I did see a note in my e-mail. The letter that described it was missing so I don't know the details but I know that's forthcoming. There's some also some great pictures. I'll pass this around. This is the concrete in the ground. Take a ride up there and drive by. The sewer is connected today. We are beginning to make visible progress and I think within the next few weeks people will really begin to see the changes up there. With the type of information that we're starting to get content, the videos, the pictures, I'd like to have the consent of this Board to talk with the IT Director to put up a dedicated Hudson Seniors website under the Town website. We really don't have one and I think it's time we start now that we've got a coordinator, we can start doing that type of stuff. If you're okay with all that, I'll begin that activity.

Selectman Luszey said he met with the Library Trustees. I think it was in the paper today the digital e-book mobile is coming to Hudson. I believe we're one of three stops in New Hampshire which is great. I have mixed emotions about it because I think most people know that my personal long-term outlook on libraries is what we're going to see stopped in the parking lot and that is we don't need a huge facility anymore, or we're not going to. I do want to say, the Library Trustees they're making some great progress in terms of strategic planning and programming for the future. Hopefully they'll have that plan done for our budget pass so we can see where they're headed given the challenges that they are facing in the future with the whole e-revolution.

My last topic is the alleyways. I received a number of e-mails. I will be anxiously awaiting the answer as to when the Attorney thinks they can have a solution for us or a proposed solution. Given we're coming up very rapidly to the no parking zone if we're talking September/October for the discussions around what we can and can't do, I did commit to a couple of folks that I would ask this Board as to whether or not because I don't know the answer if we can waive the no parking ban that goes into effect November 1st I think it is until we get this problem solved. I don't necessarily need an answer tonight but I would like something for the next time we meet because it may require a brief discussion with the Town Administrator with our Attorney on whether or not we actually can do something like that and not open up a can of worms that we don't want to open.

Steve Malizia said his gut reaction if I could is just let them do what they've been doing for the last 50 years and park off the street and don't enforce the prohibition on town property. That might be a reasonable solution if we have not attained a

solution by then only because that's been the practice of everyone. The situation if they park on the street and the problem is when they plow. Those are narrow streets. They'll never be able to plow them. I think it would be difficult. Selectman Luszey said his only response to that is we actually have enforced the no parking on town property. I have copies of registered letters that were hand delivered by our police force as agents of the office of the court to enforce that. I'm not sure what that means now. Mr. Malizia stated there was a very specific I think situation or some specificity...Selectman Luszey mentioned, again, because we enforced the by-laws or the code of no parking on town property, I think we have a situation we need answered by legal counsel as whether or not we can go forward.

Steve Malizia said he didn't want to belabor but if I could if you recall, there was an ordinance proposed to prohibit parking on those by-ways or alleyways that did not go anywhere. In essence, there is nothing in our ordinance book. What we were trying to do was assert probably more likely our property rights as opposed to actually enforcing an ordinance. The ordinance now prohibits parking on town streets, accepted roads, after a certain time in the evening so that when the plowing operation maybe going on at two in the morning, we're not knocking on your door. We're not plowing you in and we're able to get your neighborhood out. All I'm stating is there was an ordinance proposed not passed. We weren't enforcing that ordinance. It doesn't exist. What we were doing was asserting our property right to don't park on our property. I'm not sure that's articulated as such on our Town Code book. Selectman Luszey said no but it's articulated in the deeds of those properties and we enforce that. I don't know what it means not to enforce it any more given that we already did. The precedent has been set. Mr. Malizia stated he was trying to articulate that maybe in the end if we're not solved, the lesser of the two evils. That's all I'm trying to point out.

Selectman Coutu stated he touched upon it. Selectman Nadeau does it every year. He talks about the parking ban. The reason why we have a parking ban in town is we don't want to have any grievance with plows going up and down the street, and having blockages, and having to stack the snow around the cars. That's the reason why we have it. They don't plow those alleyways. I don't think they could get a plow down those alleyways anyway at least the one that's open. I'd say that on the basis of inaction on the ordinance that we tried to pass and we're waiting to try to reach a solution. Quite frankly which I think that regardless of what the opinion is going to be from our attorney whether he does it or a land attorney does it, it isn't going to get done over night. It's going to take several months to look at all this property, and the deeds, and whatever. He has a huge packet. It can't be any smaller than mine. I would say status quo. Whatever they did last year, they're going to do this year until we get this resolved. It's not like we're not working on it. We're making an effort to cure the problem. Those alleyways are not going to be plowed. They shovel themselves or snow blow parking spots for themselves. We're talking about one of the two alleyways that is being used in that in manner. I'd say that I don't want to hear somebody come in here and say hey I got a ticket because I did what I did last year. I'd be a little upset and I think the message is now out there.

Chairman Maddox said they had some time before November. Hopefully we'll have made a decision.

Selectman Brucker - I was very sorry to miss Old Home Days. I was really looking forward to enjoying it. I had a happy event. My granddaughter was born so I went to New York City. I enjoyed it for one day until I realized I had food poisoning. Then I was trapped there because I did not want to go to New York City hospital emergency room. I waited a couple of days until I could travel in the car and came back up here to our wonderful hospitals up here and went. That is one of the advantages we have here. We have great hospitals. Next time though I might call the ambulance because it took 3 hours to finally get seen. It just happened to be a very busy time. It's all fine now.

Selectman Brucker stated she was hopeful for the skate park that we'll get an answer from the community. If there's no interest out there then we have our message. I am excited about all the things that are happening in town, especially some of the commercial things that seem to be coming along. Just very encouraged and happy that we have this great community.

Chairman Maddox asked Selectman Luszey if the coloring was his. Selectman Luszey indicated that I asked Donna to go through and find the answer to my question. That is the reference to when we asked Mr. Yates to attend the senior stuff. That's what this is. Chairman Maddox asked if he had any input. Selectman Luszey said no. Selectman Coutu thought there was going to be input. Selectman Luszey said he got his question on the coffee and donuts. I guess I should say a little more about that. We talked about coffee and donuts that was being provided by the Rec. Department at the rec. center back on 7/23. Then in October we approved \$2,000 to go from a line account that was collected from impact fees to be used for the seniors at the senior community center at the time. What wasn't clear, we alluded to it in the July 23rd meeting that we asked the Rec. Director to start pulling together all the different senior groups. For me what was implied in that is when we did the things with the donuts that we would stop the donuts at the rec. center and we'd provide the donuts at the community center and begin to integrate all the different senior groups if you will that we have within the town so that when we get to a senior center, we have a program that is being provided by the town for the seniors. There was no formal to that. I guess now is the time to actually make that a formal motion is that we stop the coffee hour at the rec. center and have that activity take place where our seniors are meeting today. They're not meeting at the community center now. I think it's the Legion. Mr. Malizia indicated that they're back.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Luszey, to stop coffee hour at the Recreation Center and have it take place at the Community Center.

Selectman Luszey indicated that he's stated his reason and part of what it's all about is the message I think that we need to send to all the residents in town and the senior population and that is we are putting together a integrated and comprehensive senior programming under one umbrella and that those types of activities will be managed out of the Rec. Department.

Selectman Coutu agreed with Selectman Luszey. I think that one of the stated goals of building the senior center was that our hope was that we take all of these fractured groups for lack of a better term and we pull them altogether and have one seniors community working under the umbrella of the Senior Affairs Committee. We've given Mr. Yates some charge and responsibility relative to that goal. I've got a very positive nod from the Recreation Director that he will accommodate that at the community center. He might have to buy more coffee and more donuts and I'm sure you can accommodate that. I think it would be great that in the spirit of unifying all of the senior groups that you might even want to have one more coffee club and tell people on Tuesdays that they're more than welcome to come down there. That we're trying to pull the group together so it's our responsibility. This is what we'd like to if this passes this evening. I think you can accommodate them and you can do that. Your presence at the community center with the seniors is going to open a lot of doors for you too in terms of communicating with them. Hopefully at some point we can have seniors interacting with some of our kids in this community showing kids how to knit and doing different things, especially where they're going to be co-located at Benson Park. There's so much interaction that can take place. I'm looking forward to seeing that. That's the reason why I'm going to support the motion.

Vote: Motion carried 5-0.

Selectman Maddox - I guess the only thing I had this evening is I know we've gotten a water report today and various reports. They just don't seem to be in a timely manner all of a sudden. I'm just wondering if there's an issue with scheduling or whatever. I think we just got the Police Department's January and February reports. Is this something we need to take a look at? Steve Malizia said nobody has not made that aware to me. I realized the police ones were late. I'm not aware that the other ones were. I haven't noted any untimely zoning, untimely fire. I thought they were coming in on a regular basis. I wasn't aware that they weren't. The only one I noted as you all did was the police. Either myself or the liaison can speak to them whichever you prefer and say the data isn't any good if you give it to us six months later. Other than that one, I'm not aware that I've seen any others that are...Chairman Maddox didn't think he saw the ones for Community Development - Zoning and Building permits. Selectman Coutu asked if they were up in read upstairs. Mr. Malizia said they're electronic copy. It comes via e-mail now a days. Selectman Coutu thought they had it in read upstairs too. Mr. Malizia didn't think so. Selectman Nadeau said those are just the letters. Mr. Malizia said there's a log. You will see correspondence and there's a log. I believe he submits it electronically. I wasn't aware that that one was deficient. We all are aware of the place.

Selectman Luszey asked if there was a requirement to have them out in a certain period after the end of the month or the quarter. Has that ever been stated? Chairman Maddox said no. That's why I was wondering if there was a schedule. Is this one supposed to be at a certain time for that exact reason? How do you know if you're missing it if you don't know when it's coming. Just something to talk about tomorrow at the department head meetings.

Selectman Coutu asked if Mr. Malizia was having a department head meeting tomorrow. Steve Malizia indicated he was not. I have an NRPC meeting for two purposes. One is an enhanced GIS and the other is a potential discussion on next year's electricity bid. I will communicate via e-mail and bring it up at a future meeting. I will not not put it on my list.

Selectman Luszey had a question of the Board. When do we want to see it? I understand the Town Administrator making the department heads aware but do we have a need or a requirement to have those reports so many days after the end of the month, or the quarter, or however so that the information is timely. That's the real question. Selectman Coutu said he didn't even see the need for the reports frankly. Chairman Maddox said the two of you on that side of that room were like we're not kept aware of what's going on. These reports are some of the ways that do that. Selectman Coutu stated if somebody is having their water shut off, I need to know that? As far as the police reports, I see what's going on in the paper every day. All that detail is of no value to me. Chairman Maddox thought it's a discussion we need to have at some point. Why don't ask the department heads if there's a schedule and maybe we need to take a look at all of them and see which ones we want to get and not.

Selectman Brucker asked if it was fair to just ask some and not...Chairman Maddox thought the one you get from Engineering is what I'm looking for. It's like two pages. It's concise as to what they are doing, issues that they may have or whatever, and it's there. The police are don't I think because of their requirements for CALEA. The Fire Department is because they are trying to do the same basic thing. Again, just trying to make sure we're getting all the information or if we don't want it, we don't want it. I guess if you could ferret out some information and we'll take it from there.

10. NONPUBLIC SESSION

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to enter Nonpublic Session pursuant to: RSA 91-A:2 Strategy or negotiations with respect to collective bargaining; RSA 91-A:3 II (b) The hiring of any person as a public employee; and (e) Consideration or negotiation of pending claims or litigation which has been threatened in writing or filed against the public body or any subdivision thereof, or against any member thereof because of his or her membership in such public body, until the claim or litigation has been fully adjudicated or otherwise settled. Any application filed for tax abatement, pursuant to law, with any body or board shall not constitute a threatened or filed litigation against any public body for the purposes of this subparagraph, carried 5-0 by roll call.

Chairman Maddox indicated that Nonpublic Session is being entered at 9:50 p.m., thus ending the televised portion of the meeting. Any votes taken upon entering open session will be listed on the Board's next agenda. The public is asked to leave the room.

Chairman Maddox stated that open session is being entered at 10:30 p.m.

Motion by Selectman Coutu, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to authorize Recreation Director Dave Yates to hire Christina Peterson as the Part-Time Office Assistant with a starting salary of \$15.00 per hour effective September 3, 2013 and not to exceed 29 hours per week, carried 5-0.

Selectman Luszey discussed the truck and trailer in the parking lot at the Burns Hill Fire Station which advertised a landscaping business.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Coutu, to put no parking in the boxed in area at the Burns Hill Fire Station. After discussion, Selectman Coutu withdrew his motion.

Consensus of the Board of Selectmen to have the Fire Chief notice his employee that he's not allowed to bring his trailer to work at the Burns Hill Fire Station.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 11:00 p.m. by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, carried 5-0.

Recorded by HGTV and transcribed by Donna Graham, Recorder.

HUDSON BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Richard J. Maddox, Chairman

Nancy Brucker, Selectman

Roger E. Coutu, Selectman

Benjamin Nadeau, Selectman

Ted Luszey, Selectman