

HUDSON, NH BOARD OF SELECTMEN  
Minutes of the October 9, 2012 Meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER - by Chairman Nadeau the meeting of October 9, 2012 at 7:40 p.m. in the BOS Meeting Room at Town Hall.
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - led by Selectman Maddox.

3. ATTENDANCE

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

Absent: Roger Coutu

Staff/Others: Steve Malizia, Town Administrator; Donna Graham, Executive Assistant; Jim Michaud, Assistant Assessor; Chief Jason Lavoie; Michael Linehan, HLN Reporter

4. PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Nadeau asked if anyone in the audience wished to address the Board on any issue at this time. Seeing none.

5. NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS - NONE

6. CONSENT ITEMS

Chairman Nadeau asked if any Board member wished to remove any item for separate consideration. Seeing none. I do have one that came in under "Licenses and Permits" for the Friends of Music. Does anybody wish to do this separately? It came in today when they realized they didn't have one. We can either suspend the rules and add it on or we can just add it on under "Licenses and Permits" #4. Friends of Music. Is that the pleasure of the Board we'll just add it on under "Licenses and Permits"? It's a permit for a fundraiser that's happening this weekend at the VFW. Selectman Luszey indicated he was fine with that.

*Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to approve consent items A, B, C, C. 4, D and E, as noted or appropriate, carried 4-0.*

A. Assessing Items - NONE

B. Water/Sewer Items - NONE

C. Licenses & Permits

- 1) Raffle Permit - Stitchery Group
- 2) Request to Solicit Funds - Boy Scouts Troop 83 - Dracut
- 3) Request to Solicit Funds - Teen Challenge
- 4) Raffle Permit - AHS Friends of Music

D. Acceptance of Minutes

- 1) Minutes of the September 25, 2012 meeting

E. Calendar

- 10/10 7:00 Benson Park - Landscape Cte - BOS Meeting Room
- 10/10 7:00 Planning Board - Buxton CD Meeting Room - CANCELLED
- 10/11 5:00 Sewer Utility Committee - BOS Meeting Room
- 10/11 7:30 Zoning Board of Adjustment - Buxton CD Meeting Room - CANCELLED
- 10/15 7:00 Conservation Commission - Buxton CD Meeting Room
- 10/15 7:00 Energy Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room
- 10/16 7:00 Board of Selectmen - Budget Review - BOS Meeting Room

10/16 7:00 Cable Utility Cte - HCTV studio  
10/17 5:00 Water Utility Cte - BOS Meeting Room  
10/17 7:00 Senior Affairs Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room  
10/18 7:00 Benson Park Cte - Ann Seabury Meeting Room - Police Dept.  
10/18 7:30 Budget Cte - Buxton CD Meeting Room  
10/18 7:00 Board of Selectmen - Budget Review - BOS Meeting Room  
10/22 7:00 Recycling Cte - BOS Meeting Room  
10/23 7:00 Board of Selectmen - BOS Meeting Room  
10/24 7:00 Planning Board - Buxton CD Meeting Room - CANCELLED  
10/25 7:00 Board of Selectmen - Budget Review - BOS Meeting Room  
10/25 7:30 Zoning Board of Adjustment - Buxton CD Meeting Room

7. OLD BUSINESS

A. Votes taken after Nonpublic Session on September 25, 2012

- 1) Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to authorize the Fire Chief to hire Jennifer Riel to the position of Executive Secretary within the Fire Department beginning on September 30, 2012. This assignment will be a non-exempt position and in accordance with the Hudson Police, Fire and Town Supervisors Association Contract with an hourly rate of \$19.37 per hour and then to Step 3 at the completion of probation, as recommended by the Fire Chief, carried 5-0.
- 2) Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Nadeau, to authorize the Finance Director to post and advertise the Senior Accounting Clerk position, carried 5-0.
- 3) Motion to adjourn at 9:48 p.m. by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, carried 5-0.

B. Tax Deeded Property Checklist

Chairman Nadeau recognized Selectman Maddox.

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Selectman Maddox indicated that if you take a look I put on two pages all of the information that was in the 7 pages by doing a couple of questions and jumping to different boxes. It was passed around and Donna I saw the e-mail from Patti Barry. Anybody else?

Mr. Malizia said the only thing he had was "cost tracking" on the very bottom. I think it's important to keep track of costs but I'm not sure it's part of the process as we were trying to articulate which was the decision tree whether to take property in the steps appropriate to take that property. I recognize that we should keep "Cost Tracking". My concern is when it starts to become an end all be all document for absolutely everything that might be involved even post taking, that was one concern I had. You did check all the other boxes. In other words when I looked at the legal opinion and the sheet that was originally presented, you have captured the processes for eviction, for example, for notification and all of that.

Selectman Maddox said they got a little hairy in a couple of points.

Mr. Malizia's concern was sometimes we do too much on one document. The only suggestion I would have was I thought "Cost Tracking" was while it's important, it's more relevant when we go to dispose of if we go to dispose of the property and can be tracked separately. That was a concern I had just to try to separate this from this. The only other thing I would just raise, and again I don't know if anybody wants to change it, on the "Site Information" on the first page, one of the things we just need to be cognizant of is we cannot appear to be prejudicial on property. In other words, there are decisions we make on property that you're taking a property for tax deeding purposes. While conditioned or some sort of liability is there, I just want to be careful that we're not giving the impression that we're taking certain property because they're wetlands or because they're not wetlands. Again, I'm not saying that that's a critical decision point but I thought it we needed to be very careful when we're taking a property or considering taking a property for taxes that we're being consistent. Again, that's the phrase we use a lot here - "fair and consistent". I'm not saying this does do that but it could possibly give the impression that if you're using this as criteria or somebody is interpreting this as criteria, it may be an issue if somebody says well you took that because it had wetland, or it abutter this. To some degree, we should be sort of blind to that. We should just be looking at it from the perspective of they're not paying their taxes is there some reason we shouldn't take it, i.e. it's an asbestos dump. It's a toxic waste dump. It has some environmental challenge to it. Beyond that, I was just concerned that that may, again I stress may, give the impression that we may be making other judgments that are subjective and as not as objective.

That was the only thing I had. Other than that, I think you checked all of the boxes. There's a lot going on on these forms. They may require supplemental sheets to go with them because someone may not be able to write all their comments. As long as we understand that and there may be occasions where something is not applicable if not applicable is acceptable, we could certainly mark that as appropriate here. My only thing was I thought the post taking while it's important, the cost tracking is kind of a different decision tree that we certainly want to do. I'm not sure it's part of the processes we were trying to articulate here. That's kind of all I had.

Selectman Maddox indicated that we've seen in the past with the library houses when we started to add up the costs stuff was forgotten. I thought by putting it here it gives a place for people to start tracking it. That's why I put the cost tracking because, again, I understand that in 7 months, 10 months, a year and half, no one is going to think about X. This gave you a place to think about it. You may not fill that out until the very end when everything is done, but it gives you a place to put it all so that we're not leaving dollars on the table for the lack of a better term.

The other thing on the "Site Information", Selectman Maddox said it was just to give some information about what the site was. As I understand it, we're going to start taking all properties so we're not going to have unless there's a specific reason outlined in question #5 if people that we have sent out to do the inspections have a reason why it should not be taken, that would be the only reason we're not going to. I think that was just there. If you want to take it out, it's just me deleting something. I just thought it gave the Board some information that if it's abutting conservation land, we might want to let the Conservation Committee know that this is going to happen. I didn't see it as being arbitrary. I thought we were going to be pretty much once we get this in place; it's going to be automatic. If you hit the deadlines, you're going to go through the process. It's something that we have all tried to avoid but it's to the point where we need to do something. This form was meant to document...I have on here done by, date done, and comments so that we have some information in front of us rather than...again, yes and no is great but without any real detail of who did what, Mr. One gets to be involved. Again, I can delete either of those items. I just thought again it gave us more information when it goes through the process.

Chairman Nadeau wanted to give his two cents on this while we're going through this. I think the cost tracking on here is just a good place to keep track of it. If we put that on page 3 and just make it its own separate page and widen out everything else so there's more room for comments, that's fine for me too. The percentage of the wetlands and that stuff on here if we got rid of "abutting conservation land" and just put "percentage of wetlands", at least we'd know on that in here. "Abutting conservation land" really doesn't make a difference on this one. We're still taking it one way or the other like we said. So if just got rid of the conservation land question I would be okay with that one. The percentage of the wetlands. That's just a legitimate question. Is it 20 percent swamp land or is it 80 percent?

One of the things Chairman Nadeau can see if they just put under reason "please see attached". At least it says on here "please see attached" and we'd have a place to go look for it on the back page or something. This is a heck of a lot better than what we have to work with now. Again, this is documented and we can change it in the future if we need to. It's definitely a lot better than what we've been working with. Any other comments, questions from Board members?

Selectman Brucker thought it was really well done and covered anything that I could think of in a very concise way. Chairman Nadeau liked the form just for that fact. It's all there in front of you. You're not looking for it when you look at the data information sheets that we had in the past didn't have a lot of the information on it.

Selectman Luszey asked if we adopted this, does this mean we're going to have to buy more filing cabinets to start filing these forms or can this be an electronic document? Mr. Malizia I indicated he didn't have it electronically. I'm sure we could get it. Selectman Maddox said he did it. It's just a matter of he didn't want to give it electronically away. Selectman Luszey was wondering if we should adopt it. I know you have it electronically. Can it stay in an electronic form or are we going to have to print it and file it with the paperwork when we do something like this?

Chairman Nadeau said it would be just like any other meeting that we have. We have the document in front of us. Selectman Luszey said when they fill this out and it goes with the paperwork for that piece of property, it goes into a file somewhere. Are we now going to have to start tracking these documents in a paper form and are they going to have to be kept for 25, or 30, or 100 years? Can it be kept electronically so that we're not filling up another filing cabinet?

Selectman Maddox thought this was one of those things you're going to have to put in a filing cabinet. If you have a big folder of all of the tax deed information, all kinds of things that's going to be attached to this...Chairman Nadeau said 3 more pieces of paper in that file isn't going to make a difference. Selectman Maddox thought this is going to be one of the things we're going to have to track all of that because of the legal requirements of when it can be bought back, and when it can be sold, and all of those details.

Selectman Maddox said the next question they're going to have to deal with then is how we're going to deal with a management company if we do take an occupied structure? Mr. Malizia said when you say management company I'm assuming you might be talking about someone who manages the condo fees for example. Is that what you're talking about? Selectman Luszey said no. We'd go out and get a property management company. If it should come to that, we'd put out the bid or request for a property management company to take care of the property just like we did on the buildings over here. Mr. Malizia indicates we had done that on Ferry Street. The Board at the last minute chose not to go that route but we did put out a solicitation, got bids, had narrowed it down I believe to one, and then because of some issues we stopped the process and ended up reselling it. There isn't a reason you couldn't do the same thing if the Board wanted to keep say a structure and do something with the structure i.e., rent it out I'm assuming your talking. Selectman Maddox said no. I'm talking about once we take this, and again this is a difficult subject. You're talking about taking people's homes; the day we take it we're responsible for it. If there are maintenance issues, if they don't leave, if there is winterization, sealing up the house and all of those things, we need to have a company in place to do that. Banks are doing it all the time unfortunately. I don't think there's going to be a problem finding someone. That's the next step we need to go to.

Selectman Luszey's thinking on that is if we're filling this form out, we would go to bid for a management company. Conversely, Mr. Malizia said wouldn't we also maybe go to bid to auction the thing off because why do we want to own these in the first place. I'll throw that out there for the conversation. Selectman Luszey said you can't go to auction if it's occupied. Mr. Malizia agreed with Selectman Luszey. Selectman Luszey stated in order to get it unoccupied, it's about a 2 ½ to 3 month process. So you'd have to have a management company to...Mr. Malizia said you don't own it until you kick them out though as I understand the process. Selectman Luszey said you own it and then you have to go under 540 to become a landlord and you go through the eviction process. We have our attorney start that. You would want your management company on board at that time so that once that property is vacant, they can go in and do...Mr. Malizia said the key word "vacant". When somebody is in there you're probably not go to say hey I'm Joe from maintenance. See you later Joe.

Selectman Luszey asked if you want to know the process, I'll fill you in on it. Mr. Malizia said at some point I would also assume that if we're taking these properties, our ultimate goal is to get our taxes paid. I would assume that we would do something from an auction perspective unless somebody shows otherwise that it benefits the Town to carry these properties. Again, we're not landlords. It's not our business.

If that's the next thing we need to research Mr. Chairman, Selectman Maddox said we need to know exactly when it gets to this point. Once we have gone through this process and we say take that property and there's people living there, we have to deal with we are now landlords. Good, bad or indifferent, that is our responsibility. We need to be prepared to deal with that. Mr. Malizia said that was an interesting question. I would hazard to guess if we're trying to evict somebody, we're probably not going to fix the plumbing for them. Selectman Maddox said yes you'd have to because you're the landlord. Mr. Malizia said he wasn't an expert on this matter. I would defer to a legal opinion because I don't know that. Why would I help them stay? Can I cut the grass for you? I'm not sure that's what we want to be doing. That's my concern. From a legal perspective, we would probably have to determine while somebody is occupying it, we're actively working to evict them how we would...even when we take it; Selectman Maddox said you can't sell it the next week. There's still a whole bunch of items to be done. You want somebody to be cutting the grass if it's empty so it looks good when you're trying to sell this thing.

Selectman Luszey said everything you're talking about is like on an individual case by case basis. It depends on the property. This gets us to that point. Like I said the day we're filling this out if there's a structure on the property and there's a need to have someone actively manage it, we would be out to bid getting a management company manage it as well as engaging our attorney's to fill out the appropriate forms that need to be filed to make sure things are done according to 540A.

Mr. Malizia said it would be a pre-requisite that you work hand in hand with your attorney. It's critical I think on anything like this. Obviously all through the process. Selectman Luszey said if it's a wooded lot, that's a whole different subject. It's a case by case.

*Motion by Selectman Brucker, seconded by Selectman Maddox, to approve the Selectmen's process for the tax deeding of property for unpaid taxes as outlined in the Tax Deeded Property Checklists as amended.*

Mrs. Graham asked the Chairman if they were taking out the "Cost Tracking" as a separate page, leaving it on the first page. Chairman Nadeau was okay with leaving it where it is. Mrs. Graham asked if we were taking out under "Site Information" "Abutting Conservation Land"? Selectman Maddox said he was taking that whole bottom line off. I'll make the spacing better above it.

*Vote: Motion carried 4-0.*

8. NEW BUSINESS

A. Revenue Enhancement Options

Chairman Nadeau recognized Assistant Assessor Jim Michaud.

Good evening. Jim Michaud put forward a Memo with some ideas for the Board of Selectmen to consider. It's probably a beyond tonight kind of consideration. The first one is I read in the paper from this past spring the City of Manchester had gone out to bid to see if there was any advertisers interested in putting an insert in with the automobile registration renewal notices that the City of Manchester sends out. It turns out they did find a successful bidder. Autofair of Manchester bid a 3 year contract, \$25,000 a year and they include an advertising insert with the City of Manchester's automobile renewal registration process. That more than paid for the cost of that mailing. So as a way of offsetting property taxes. The two people in city government that had that idea, the Mayor imposed a program where employees could share in the savings. I'm not actually suggesting that here. It was part of the article. That is something the Town of Hudson would consider going out to bid to see if people are interested in piggybacking an advertising insert on our Town of Hudson automobile registration renewals.

Further, Mr. Michaud said they also went out to bid to see if there were companies interested in putting an insert with the water bill mailings, the sewer bill mailings, and the dog license renewal mailings. Apparently they didn't get any takers on those. However, they were successful with the offer to advertise in an open bid process for automobile companies or really for anyone who wanted to advertise. It didn't have to be an automobile company. I know \$25,000 here is a penny on the rate. That's pretty valuable.

Second idea and it may be late for this cycle obviously, Mr. Michaud said recycling cart advertising. The City of Manchester went out to bid before their carts had gone out to see if anyone was interested in putting advertising on the recycling carts. The recycling carts that we have here in Hudson I recognize it's probably too late for Hudson for this junction, but when that contract comes up again whether we own the carts, or someone else owns the carts, that's a subject of detail negotiations that can be done at that point in time. This is also another opportunity for the Town to offset property taxes by looking at revenue enhancement options.

The third idea Mr. Michaud said was under RSA 261:153, communities can establish and municipal transportation enhancement fund. What this is when someone registers their car, this would be subject to Town Meeting approval if the Board was to put this warrant article on, when I register my car I will pay up to a \$5 fee. The Town of Amherst does it and the Town of Derry does it. That \$5 fee goes into a dedicated fund. It's different than property taxes. It goes into a dedicated fund for municipal transportation. Paving. We have 31,000 vehicles or so. At \$5, that would be about \$150,000 a year. That's 6 pennies on the rate. Right now I'm up to 7 pennies so far, 7. A fee is a tax. It's a three letter word. It means the same as a tax. In some ways having a fee for this purpose would allow those that are non direct property taxpayers. In other words, people that rent. They don't directly have a property tax line in with their rent. The non direct property taxpayers would contribute to the maintenance of the Town's roadways where as right now on a direct basis; it's only the property taxpayers that are paying for that especially when we've had a slashing of the gas tax revenue coming in town from the State. That's the Highway Block Grant money that's fund for that is the gas tax. I'm not sure how much was cut but it was in the tens of thousands of dollars that was cut as far as that revenue from the State. This is probably the most unpopular proposal here because how do I know my taxes will go down if I'm paying \$5 to register a vehicle. It's a designated fund and it only goes to paving. If we reduce property taxes or allow those taxes to go to some other function, the voters would vote for support. It gives the Board a couple more options.

The fourth idea, which is not new, Jim Michaud said this is looking at town owned property and I assume not this building and see what we should sell. Auction it off. Do whatever we're allowed to do by...Chairman Nadeau indicated he's said that for years. Mr. Michaud said there's lots of little slivers around. I cited a big number of \$46 million. Obviously it's much less than that because we're not talking about selling a highway facility, police facility, or this facility. If I had a 20' x 100' strip of land next to my house and I couldn't build a garage before because I didn't have the setback and now this piece of town owned land is going to come up and face it between me and my neighbor, we're the only ones who probably would be interested in it. Now they can buy it for not a lot of money probably and now I have a setback. I can put a garage on my property. So what have we done? We've sold property. We've raised one time revenue. We've put property on the tax rolls so in that sense it expands the tax base a little bit. If they put improvements, this enables people to put improvements on their property. Now we've expanded the property base again. The Town of Merrimack did it. They really did have hundreds of thousands of dollars that they raised from this. I don't have a handle on how much money it would be. Obviously this would be on a case by case basis or we're researched 30 of them and people have vetted them - department heads and what not, legal, whatever needs to be done, and then how we sell them. We hire an auctioneer or we do it ourselves. That's a detail. This is another avenue the Town could look at in terms of both dispelling with property that we haven't made use of and also at the same time allowing some revenue to come into the coffers which would offset property taxes. It's not that Mr.

Michaud is either endorsing or recommending these, but I am bringing this forward to the Board. I have done some memos in the past. I thought that it would be fruitful to the Board to consider them at this time.

Chairman Nadeau would like to thank you for bringing some of these up for us again. It seems that we keep rehashing selling of the Town owned properties. I just wish we could get to doing it but something always comes up. We had that property in the south end of town that we are hot to sell. We didn't sell that one yet. We have a lot of lots that we've gained through developers as pieces that we were supposed to get little playgrounds on and certain developments. Like you said, it would be good if two neighbors went in and wanted to split it or something. There is a list of the property that the Town does own in the Annual Report. One of the ways that people if they are interested in a piece of property next to them, they could ask us in writing if they're interested in that property through the Selectmen's office to purchase it. Over the years, I've had inquiries of people asking and I've told them the process to use. It's never gone forward with any of the ones that I've suggested. That's one of the ways we definitely could, like Jim Michaud suggested, enhance our revenues. It is a one-time thing but again if we could get somebody to build a house or an addition to a lot that they had, I think that's a great idea. We just have to find a way to start getting that on our "things to do list". We can forward the other one to the Town Clerk. It's something she's interested in putting out there with the inserts. Does any other members have any questions/comments?

Selectman Brucker thought they were really interesting ideas. I just wonder they put it out to bid for the insert for the car registration. Thinking about it would it always be only one advertiser or could you have...I look at the dog license renewal mailers. I could think of veterinarians being interested. We have a lot of pet stores in town - 3 or 4, who might be interested. I wonder why they chose to limit it to one.

Jim Michaud thought he could speak to that. I talked to the Deputy Tax Collector for the City of Manchester and scarcity drives value. If I know I'm the only one, and I think that's the going reason why you would have one, if you have to split the bill with your competitor, I'm not going to advertise my competitor I want them to come to me. It goes to the highest bidder. Autofair said we'll pay the freight and the other dealerships said all right we lost out. They were willing - open bid process to pay what they were willing to pay and commit to a - this is a debated topic obviously but just do it one year, and then switch to another guy the next year, and someone else the next year. Still a 3 year commitment. They're committed to it. Its committed advertising. It's a contract. That was my idea. Scarcity drives value.

Selectman Luszey came at it from a little different perspective. I wouldn't want to see another piece of paper in my bills. It's trash mail. For me, there's no added value. However where I think we could have the same affect is if we could get automatic bill payment implemented where I could sign up and have my water bill, sewer bill, dog license, car registration automatically set up in my checking account just like I do all my other bills, so when they come due it hits it and it pays and I get it. We reduce the mailing cost to zero. We'd save the same amount of money. That's where I think we need to be going not adding more weight to our postage costs and more paper in the recycling bins but eliminating it. The folks we need to start creating services for are not us. It's our children. They're looking for the apps. on their mobile phone. The internet generation we were kind it. We're on the wayside now. It's all mobile apps. now. We should be looking at how do we start implementing those types of technologies to allow people to start doing transactions with the Town electronically and not having to come here. That's where I think we'll see our biggest savings. That's my two cents.

Selectman Maddox split the baby here. I think the first thing we should do is find out what it costs to add a piece of paper into our mailing. Selectman Luszey said it won't.

Jim Michaud said he could speak to that because he's been working on the tax bill - \$442. That's the cost from NH Print Mail Services to add a piece of paper to a tax bill. I don't think we send out our automobile registrations to NH Print. Do we do that in house? Do we send out...Mr. Malizia didn't know. Our water and sewer bills go out as far as I know through the mailing. Mr. Michaud said with automobile being sensitive their numbers and stuff, maybe we're doing it in house. NH Print Mail would have cost us \$442 for the tax bill. Then there's the cost of the paper, ink. There's no additional postage costs. A piece of paper doesn't add anything to the cost. One piece of paper does not increase the cost. We verified that. We're talking less than \$1,000 in costs for potential gain. To Selectman Luszey's point, he's right. In the coming decades as we get in the coming years if not decades as we get to more electronic billing and payment, there will always be people that still want the paper. However, we can merge there but it's going to take some time to get there. This is a way to actually raise the funds necessary to get that software to do that. In other words, it actually supports what you're talking about Selectman Luszey.

Selectman Brucker was thinking that you really would need to do both. First of all we are graying in New Hampshire and that most of the people are older. I believe that's true so that most of us are used to getting paper in the mail. I also think that with the economy - I'm always looking for a deal, a coupon, and I won't mind getting that extra piece of paper. Mr. Malizia thought it was an ad and not a coupon. I don't know maybe it would be a coupon. Chairman Nadeau thought it depends on what the person doing - and I'll use the dog one for example...Selectman Luszey said

why don't we just sell our mailing list. Chairman Nadeau said that was an option too. Mr. Malizia indicated that you could probably buy all of our customer lists if you want to electronically. I'm assuming you can buy the voter list. Selectman Luszey said that's kind of what we're doing. Mr. Michaud didn't believe you can sell your motor vehicle registration renewal list. I don't think the DMV...Selectman Luszey said including the letter in it is kind of what you're doing. Mr. Michaud would have to ask Patti Barry the Town Clerk or DMV he would have to ask if it is legal to sell. I don't think DMV records are available...what Selectman Luszey was saying is by us inserting mailers in those things, we are invading the privacy of the people receiving those with junk mail. In essence, we've sold the mailing list to the user of that particular mailing. We may not have sold them the list but we enabled them the use of it. We enable them the use of it exclusively.

Mr. Michaud said Selectman Luszey was right. In an indirect fashion you're right. If you were also to tell them that it would save a penny on the rate, I don't think anybody would be against saying that. Mr. Malizia said the only problem is Manchester has probably 5 times the vehicles we have just given the size. Mr. Michaud said it was a good point. We wouldn't get \$25,000. We might not get anybody to bid. This is that we're going to get somebody. We may not get anyone today. We have one say flagship dealer in the community with a national name on it. Then that means somebody in Nashua wouldn't want to advertise over here either. Do it before Nashua does it. Is there anything the Board would like me to come back on any of this?

Selectman Luszey had a question on the automobile registration. When I filled out my renewal form last month, I made one check out but it was for two parts - the Town and the State. What's the Town portion now if it's not for covering roads? What's that money go to? Mr. Malizia said the general fund. Selectman Luszey said isn't that for the purpose of...Mr. Malizia said not specifically. Selectman Luszey said it may not be specifically but the whole intent of it at one time was for the maintenance of the roads. Mr. Malizia didn't know if that was the intent. One could infer that but I don't know only because that's probably one that was put in place. Like the Highway Block Grant, we use an equal amount in our budget to pave. It's not a requirement of getting the Highway Block Grant. It's just something that the Board, this Town has practiced for many years. Not necessarily required. You don't have to require it. What's he's articulating on one component of this is if you were to institute a \$5 fee, that would have to be dedicated to a specific fund for the maintenance of your roadways. Other than that..

Selectman Luszey asked couldn't we do that with the piece of money we're already collecting through registration to say that money is specifically set aside for maintenance of our roads. Mr. Malizia supposed they could. Selectman Luszey said instead of raising the taxes. Mr. Malizia said let's say you take that away from all the other general fund that you're funding with that money. Now all of a sudden you have a \$3.7 million hole in your revenue. That's a lot of money for paving because \$3.7 million is what we budget for that money coming in as you'll see when we talk about...Selectman Luszey said that's the dilemma of government. You set up appropriations for one thing and over the years they kind of get convoluted then they're setting up another fund for the purpose to the same point. We could set that up but there's nothing that says that will go to that all the time. Mr. Malizia indicated that what he's saying is if you look at the municipal permits for registration, that is articulated by Statute. I don't know if there's a Statute, I don't know it was ever a Town Meeting for the general motor vehicle registration fee. Specifically on this he cited an RSA which says if you do this fund, if your voters vote for this fund, this is the purpose and this is how it has to be accounted for. Can that change? Of course it can. Laws can change all the time. Amounts can go up; it can go to \$10. I don't know the evolution of the general fund, motor vehicles. You could suppose it was that. I truly don't know. It was probably invented when they invented the car.

Selectman Maddox said since he did the last form, maybe you can do the next one for selling property. Again, I think we need to be fair and consistent how that's going to happen giving first dibs to the abutters is a wonderful idea but how are you going to decide if 3 of them that about that property...

Mr. Malizia asked to go to the short version. You have two kinds of property. You have property that's been tax deeded and you have property that hasn't been tax deeded. The Board has the right, the ability to sell tax deeded properties. Obviously there are restrictions if it's less than 3 years there's a sum of money after you make your proceeds and your expenses it would go back to the original owner. Let's take the example of a property that we've held for 10 years that was tax deeded. You go out and sell it. You actually have 3 ways to dispose of that property - sealed bid, i.e. you put out a notice in the paper that says we're accepting sealed bids; whatever the criteria that you want to take, which I'm assuming would be the highest bidder but maybe not always, but let's assume that's your criteria; 2) you can have a public auction. Auction is this date, show up, give your money, we're going to have an auction. We've done that with other properties. High bidder again would rule. 3) the third way is charitable disposition. If for some reason the Board thought it was in the best interests of the Town to charitably dispose of that property. I'm not aware of anything off the top of my head that would trigger that. It is articulated in our Town Code. Our Town Code dictates that tax deeded property can be disposed of by sealed bid, public auction, or a charitable donation. So it's fairly articulated. I'm assuming the only interested parties would be neighbors but somebody else could swoop in and buy it. It does not preclude somebody else from coming in and making a higher bid. Again, you

also have the right to reject bids if you write that in the language when you're conducting the sealed bid or the town auction.

If it's not a tax deeded property, it's my understanding you have to put it on the warrant to ask the voters for permission to sell it. So all these little scrubby pieces of land we've picked up from developers, I don't think they fall under the tax deed category. They fall under the - hey can we sell this. Maybe I'm wrong with those but if they're not tax deeded, you have to ask for permission. Mr. Michaud said Mr. Malizia was right about that. Land that's been acquired from a developer in many cases, there was a Planning Board purpose for that land as opposed to left over land that got taxed and then they let it go. A lot of property. I'm not saying you're going to get \$46 million in that but you could say give me the top 20 properties you think or whatever it is whatever direction the Board wants. The rest of Fox Run, the rest of Barretts Hill on the other side of the not built not to be built circumferential highway. There's scores of (inaudible) acres there at the end of Rangers Drive. That's probably one of the Marquis properties that we have that was tax deeded. Mostly what we have is these little bits of properties. It doesn't automatically go. We can't automatically just sell it to the abutters.

Chairman Nadeau asked if there were any other questions from Board members. Anything that we'd like to have done with this?

Selectman Maddox asked what they did. It was a nice discussion and we haven't done anything.

Chairman Nadeau said he asked if there was anything you wanted. Do you want Mr. Michaud to give us a list of the properties that we can sell off next week? Do you want to...

Selectman Maddox indicated that if Chairman Nadeau was asking him, I would like to get together with the water/sewer or whoever does the mailings for those - the dogs, auto registrations and have them come back and say that they think this is a worthwhile project and see if we can put it out to bid. Somebody has to take this and go from this is a nice idea to it's an implementable idea. Chairman Nadeau was sure that tomorrow they could ask the department heads at the department head meeting. Mr. Malizia indicated there would be no meeting. He had to go to a hearing for something else at the Unemployment Office. Chairman Nadeau indicated at the following meeting if it's something they want to bring up and see if it's worth for them to do.

Chairman Nadeau asked if it was possible to put all our properties that we have - like a warrant article together to say that these are all the pieces of property that we want to sell - the ones that we got from the developers and the different things like that. If it's something that we could lump all together and put it on the warrant article that we want to dispose of these. We said the ones that we got from...Mr. Malizia said if they're not tax deeded, you need to have permission of the Town - legislative or the body to dispose of those. I would probably defer to a legal opinion only because I'm not entirely sure if they would have to be articulated separately because maybe I like these 3 and maybe I don't like those 4. I would have to ask them just because I don't know. I don't want to give an answer that's wrong.

Selectman Maddox referred back to a former member of this Board. Land values are so low, we don't want to sell everything at fire sale prices. Why don't we pick 4 or 5 properties and see where this takes us. I don't want to do every property that we have. The other thing we need to check is to see if it has consequences say conservation or any other number of groups that may say this makes sense. There are 188 properties that might fall under this category.

Jim Michaud wanted to come up with a count for tonight but I didn't because there's two different lists and even within each list. There's scores of properties. I don't know what the exact count is. Selectman Maddox said some of them are very small and some of them are good size. I'm just saying Mr. Chairman why don't we test the waters rather than leaping in full belly flop and see what 4 or 5 properties gets us as far as value, how much it was to do, put it through the voters, and all of those types of things. A couple of larger ones and a couple of smaller ones and see what this brings us. If it brings us \$10,000 for 150 acres of land, does that make sense either? Mr. Michaud indicated you have the right to reject bids. Selectman Maddox was saying do we really want to do all 100 or whatever.

Selectman Brucker was wondering if in looking at this Mr. Michaud if any come to mind that you would right away say - of the tax deeded property, that you would say would be good choices. Mr. Michaud said at one point I might have been at that point. That was a couple of years ago when I thought it might happen. I can't sit here tonight and tell you I have. I don't have that. How much work am I going to invest in this before and if I know what the Board is going to do with a finite amount of time? That's why I'm sorry I didn't have any numbers for you tonight.

Selectman Luszey was not thrilled about asking all the department heads that might have something here to go up and see if it's worthwhile. I'm not sure how they would do that unless they actually go out and start soliciting perspective buyers of ad space. Each list is going to be a different quantity. Therefore, it would have a specific value. If we're going to ask to see if this is worthwhile, it should only be one person spending some small amount of time to

try to figure out if it would be worthwhile and do it all encompassing for all but water, sewer, dog, tax bill, registration or whatever instead of having everybody working on it. I think that would be a waste of time.

Chairman Nadeau wouldn't say everybody working on it. If you ask the Finance Director who's in charge of the water and those bills and see what her input was when they're at the department head meeting, I don't think its...Selectman Luszey said you're asking, again, in order to have valid input, she would have to go off and find out based on the number of water bills what she might be able to get for an ad if somebody was interested, which is going to be different than a registration, which would be different from a tax bill because the mailings are so different. You know what I'm saying? Chairman Nadeau guessed not. Selectman Luszey indicated if you wanted to advertise your business would you place more value on putting an ad in the tax bill or a sewer bill. The number of people you're going to be putting your file in front of them is a lot more with a tax bill than a sewer bill. Therefore, the value of that piece of paper is very different. Why would we ask each department head to go and try to figure that out? Is it a worthwhile project to do and we really should only task one person to go off and figure that out? What would the projected revenue be if we were to go and do this? Chairman Nadeau indicated the only person in here that I would see would probably be the Town Clerk. Other than water, Mr. Malizia said the rest of them seem to come under her purview. Selectman Luszey said then they'll have her do the water too. You can get that number from the Water Clerk on how many bills goes out. Mr. Malizia said 6,000. I already know the number.

Selectman Maddox said on the last page of your handout, there's a breakdown of the annual volume. If this is Manchester, we should just ask that same question of how many are of all of these types of things. I think we should unfortunately say we need to give this to the Town Administrator because the Town Clerk/Tax Collector is in the throws of the election cycle. She does answer the question on line form today because she's just trying to stay ahead of the stuff that's going on with elections. So either wait until after that or just task the Town Administrator to find out how much volume we're talking about in all of these various items. I do think we do alarm billing. Mr. Malizia said the main bills are your auto registration, your tax bills, sewer bills, water bills, and I'm assuming your dog licenses. If I had to think of the 5 major categories, things that have significant billing those are them. Sewer is quarterly; water is monthly; taxes are twice a year; registrations are once a year for registering. Selectman Maddox indicated that Mr. Malizia already knew most of this so you can just put it on a piece of paper. I can see if you have a 10 percent coupon, you're sending it out vehicle registrations, and you also have to get an inspection. Somebody might be interested in that. Residential wastewater bills - I'm not so sure there's going to be anybody really interested.

Selectman Luszey asked if they wanted to have somebody spend their time put a program around what it would mean to implement something like this. That's what we're asking. Selectman Maddox said yes. That's why I'm saying that the Town Administrator could at least tell us what the volumes are, what the procedure would be, and estimated revenue. Mr. Malizia said he had no way to estimate revenue. If somebody is willing to bid on this, how would I possibly know that? Mr. Michaud volunteered to work with Steve on this in terms of making a couple of phone calls literally. I'll do it unless the Board says different. (inaudible)...the Nashua dealerships as well but concentrate on Hudson first. Then water - well that's going to be a water softener company. That's going to be somebody that sells products that take the water that's coming in their house and make it cleaner. Who are natural people that would want to...who's going to advertise on the sewer? It's not going to be a septic company. Dog licenses - that one is easy - veterinarians and what not. Let me just brainstorm with Steve. I'll come back and say I've made a couple of calls. This is my survey and then the Board can decide. Then it has more information to make a decision. Do we actually want to pull the trigger on this? One at a time.

Selectman Maddox said these are too good of an idea to just go harrumph and let it die. I think that good or bad we need to get some more information and see where it takes us. Mr. Michaud took the time and put some information before us that nobody wants to see their tax bill go up. Is there another way to bring in revenue? I think this is something that we need to take a look at. If the two of them can pull this off and get us some more information Sir, I think we need to just not say that was nice, nod our heads, and it goes nowhere. Chairman Nadeau agreed as well. Selectman Brucker agreed also. Mr. Michaud said he could ad hoc in number 4 to the Board saying here's a list of 20 properties. The good, the bad, and the ugly - 20 properties. Chairman Nadeau thanked Mr. Michaud. Wonderful item.

- B. Request to apply for a State of NH Highway Safety Agency grant in the amount of \$4,500 - "Operation Safe Commute"

Chairman Nadeau recognized Chief Lavoie.

Good evening. Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is the Highway Operation Safe Commute Grant. We're asking to be able to go ahead and apply for this grant. You've already stated the amount. The objective of this grant is for us to be able to go out there and do added patrols when officers are off duty to target specific areas regarding distracted driving and things of that nature - impaired driving, people that may be putting on makeup while driving, etc.

Selectman Luszey said this was for overtime. What I didn't see when I read through this is that this would also cover because my assumption is that we're paying for the overtime than we are adding to the officers retirement benefits, earned time, and all of that right? Mr. Malizia said it would not add earned time. It would add pension.

Selectman Luszey's next question was there was a list of about 15 dates and it's for the hours of 6 to 9 a.m. to 4 to 7 p.m. Those are somewhat normal working hours. Why would we need to have added overtime to those to cover this? Why wouldn't it be part of the officers shift duty to do this? Chief Lavoie said it is. However, the officers on duty will still have to answer calls for service. These officers do not. These here are some of our peak times when motorists are out driving, coming to and from work. This allows us to get more patrols out there. Often times in the morning on some of these dates that are in here it could be school days we're focusing on school bus routes, crossing guard areas. This allows us to saturate more patrols out there.

Selectman Luszey asked the significance of the dates. He didn't see anything that said these dates had more percentage of accidents on these dates. How did these dates come about? Chief Lavoie said there are no dates. There's no dates that cause more accidents to occur. They happen due to circumstances whether people are out there more at that time. Selectman Luszey's question is why these dates? Just out of random? Chief Lavoie said those were just the dates that they chose. If he's hearing Selectman Luszey correctly, if you could help me understand this, there is no date that says December 25<sup>th</sup> is the most accident prone motor vehicle day. We don't have that. Mr. Malizia asked if they focused on days of the week like a Saturday, Friday, or a Tuesday or anything. Chief Lavoie said there are random dates that have had a wide variety during commuting times. I don't have these dates as to what days they have to...Chairman Nadeau indicated that October 26<sup>th</sup> is a Friday.

Selectman Luszey asked what the significance of these dates were. It says it would be conducted on these following dates. There's a table that talks about percentages, and what leads to all of these crashes, and the why the times. Mr. Malizia asked if it was the requirement to do at least a day a month. Chief Lavoie said no within a time period of I believe from October until September of next year. In lieu of doing 12 dates in one month, Mr. Malizia indicated you've spread them out through the year. You get a random sampling of what you're trying to do and what you're trying to accomplish.

Selectman Brucker asked if it was a grant - we'd be getting the money? Chief Lavoie said yes.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to accept the recommendation to authorize the Hudson Police Department to apply for the Hudson "Operation Safe Commute" Patrols with the New Hampshire Highway Safety Agency in the amount of \$4,500

Selectman Maddox indicated if you go through the schedule they're all Tuesdays and Fridays.

Vote: Motion carried 4-0.

C. Request to use the Hudson Community Center - District 13 Alkathon Committee

Chairman Nadeau recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia.

Mr. Malizia believed this was the fifth request. The District 13 Alkathon Committee of Alcoholics Anonymous has been using the Community Center in Hudson for the last 4 years to provide a sober and safe place for folks that have alcohol issues to celebrate the holiday and have a place to go. They've done a great job keeping this place clean. As a matter of fact, it's cleaner than when they get it. It does provide a much needed resource for folks that struggle with these issues. As I understand it, this is a worthwhile purpose. The Board has approved this every year. All I've ever gotten back was no incidents, place was cleaner than when they got it, so it's recommended that you approve their request to use the Community Center on December 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> for the fee of \$400.

Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to authorize the District 13 Alkathon Committee of Alcoholics Anonymous to use the Hudson Community Center on December 24 and 25, 2012 for a fee of \$400.00.

Chairman Nadeau said it was definitely a worthwhile cause. I've stopped in quite a few years in a row at different hours just because I was out at different events. Like we said, it's definitely a good cause and they do a great job.

Vote: Motion carried 4-0.

D. Budget to Actual

Chairman Nadeau recognized Town Administrator Steve Malizia.

If you take the year and divide it, Mr. Malizia said we are through the first quarter. That's 25 percent of the year if we were spending money in a linear fashion, which we don't. Obviously we make commitments earlier in the year for things like our trash contract and other items. Whoever this is, the expenditures through September 30, 2012. At this point, it's early in the year so nothing pops out as being a major issue. Obviously things we look at are legal, town poor, accounts like that. Right now, everything looks to be in reasonable shape as far as our expenditures go. Our motor vehicles are pretty darn close at 24.2 percent. Interest again continues to lag. We had a couple positive months which is always a good thing. That environment just isn't there right now based on the constraints that the Town Treasurer has to work with from an investment perspective. That's interest on the general fund account. That's separate from the other accounts.

Selectman Luszey asked where town-wide paving was located. Mr. Malizia said it was part of the Highway Streets Account, which is on page 2, 5552. Where you see we spent 37 percent on the second page, it's in there. So you would have greater than 25 percent expenditure predominately because you pave your roads basically in the summer months. According to the detail that I have which is up in your office, it appears that we've expended \$262,463 on street overlay, which is the paving account with another \$33,000 encumbered. That's through September. That is part of the number you see on 5552. 5552 is the summary of the labor and all the other pieces that go there. The detail is up in your office.

Selectman Luszey asked for the next one in November that we have a breakdown of what you not only did but what he projects to do in the spring against this number. He'll probably be stopping this next month right? Mr. Malizia said at some point the plants shut down and you can no longer get...Selectman Luszey said they'll stop sometime in November and he'll only be spending probably around 47 percent or maybe a little over 50 percent. Then he'll pick up again in April or may or as soon as the snow or weather allows him. Mr. Malizia wanted to correct himself too. We go to the 4<sup>th</sup> page, the warrant article that raised \$45,000, he spent against that article. He did not put it in his regular budget. So he's committed and spent that \$500,000. Add that to the \$200...Selectman Luszey said he's got \$700,000 something and that's what I'm asking. We're seeing what he's spent up to now which is about 100...Mr. Malizia said he's spent \$262,463 under his regular paving. He spent \$500,000. He's committed \$33,000 which puts him slightly over his budget at \$5,675 over budget. So he's a little bit over. I'm assuming he's paid nothing in the spring because he doesn't have any money. He'd done. Unless he somehow manages to save money through the process, he will not spend any more money. He is at his limit. I think that answers the question. Selectman Luszey said he'll send him an e-mail. Looking at the numbers, Mr. Malizia said he knows that he was chomping at the bit to get Robinson Road and all that done, which he has accomplished with that \$500,000.

Selectman Maddox said maybe a better question was how many road miles did he pave and all of those issues. I think that's probably what we're looking for is the entire paving budget...Selectman Luszey thought there was culvert work that was a part of that too. I'll take a look at that and share that with the rest of you.

Selectman Maddox asked about insurance reimbursement - that's probably FEMA on page 8. Mr. Malizia said no. It's actually a refund of our worker's comp. premium this year. Selectman Maddox said that was even better. As you're well aware, Mr. Malizia said there's been some chatter out in the big world regarding some of the insurance trusts. You've heard about the Local Government Center. There's been cases and judgments against the Local Government Center for possibly having too high of a reserve for their expenses or their projected actuarial expenditures. In other words, they will reserve monies in advance of potential claims. This particular year, Primex has given us a rate holiday and eventually refunded that money to us. That's what that reimbursement is against our expense. In essence, you're getting a break this year on worker's comp. insurance which is carried through Primex. So it's not FEMA money. Selectman Maddox said that was great. That's even better news Sir. Mr. Malizia thought FEMA was all recognized last fiscal year. Good question.

#### 9. OTHER BUSINESS/REMARKS BY THE SELECTMEN

Selectman Brucker - The Budget Committee at the last meeting had set a tentative calendar for the budget reviews. They have set the calendar and you all should have received a copy of it or will receive a copy of it. That will be for reviewing the school and the town budgets.

Conservation Commission cleaned up the Musquash Conservation trails on September 29<sup>th</sup>. Sandra Rumbaugh was very instrumental in organizing that and leading it. They did an incredible job and in fact found such things as a sofa and a few other items out there that you would not expect to find.

The Planning Board met. They were most interested in seeing some way to reasonably enforce illuminated sign codes. They have noticed that some of these codes are not being followed. They are concerned about it. There was a lot of discussion about it. There was even a suggestion that we might hire a consultant who has the expertise to go out and measure lumens and nits, whatever those are to be able to know whether or not they're exceeding the

required limits of what the illumination could be. They asked me to share with you some of the discussion and consider if there's an interest in this code enforcement. They also thought that there could be a warrant to drop the whole issue of the lighted signs. Their concern is that they don't want to see the town commercial areas covered with these illuminated flashing moving signs. So they'd like to see some kind of enforcement. We discussed how it could be done and to me I think it's pretty involved. No one came up with a really reasonable plan. The only suggestion was that for new people who are applying for a new sign, that they pay an impact fee for their sign that would pay for a consultant to measure their sign. They're concerned also about the number of hours that these signs are on. It says in the Code that they should only be on during business hours. They're concerned that they go beyond the business hours. I said that I would bring that information to you.

Selectman Luszey said we had a Code Enforcement Officer. Wouldn't that fall under that purview and unfair consequences for not following? I know at the time of initial law the Code Enforcement letters that go out that says if you don't you're going to be fined. Are we following through with that? I believe the mechanism for following through is there. I'm wondering why we have all of this signage issue. Don't we have permitting requirements for signs to go up? Aren't they supposed to be signed off and all that neat stuff? Chairman Nadeau was sure we do but I'll yield to Selectman Maddox.

Selectman Maddox's question is the applicant and the installer signed that they have read our requirements. I'm agreeing with you that a letter to the owner of the sign or the installer saying please show us that it meets the Code whether it's the 8,000 mits during the day and reduction of whatever it is or give us a chart that changes for candles to mits. I think you're right. There's something in place. It's just a matter of the liaison to Community Development conveying that that should be happening.

Selectman Brucker suggested that we should send out letters reminding businesses that they should be adhering to the Codes. Selectman Luszey said it was more than a letter. There are fines associated with not meeting the Code if you violate the Code. Selectman Brucker asked if the fines were already in place. Chairman Nadeau said yes it's in our Ordinance. Selectman Maddox said fines are done by the Court. Selectman Luszey said there's penalties if you don't meet because I initialed something that says if you don't meet or something like that. Selectman Maddox said that was a Statute. It's not a Town Code that tells you how much the fine is. Selectman Luszey said there's a mechanism in place to penalize the offenders. So why we're not doing it I don't know.

Selectman Brucker thought the question comes down to who would be responsible for knowing what time a business's hours are, and when the lights should be off...Selectman Luszey said the Code Enforcement Officer. Selectman Maddox said why would we hire a consultant to tell us that. Selectman Brucker asked if that person would be responsible for observing whether or not they've turned their light off. Selectman Luszey said if that's what it takes. Selectman Brucker said at 10 or 12 at night. Chairman Nadeau said businesses that have those signs are not open that late at night I don't think. You only have 5 signs and most of those businesses close around 8 p.m. It's not that hard to tell the Code Enforcement Officer this week that he's checking in at 5:45 and checking these signs. It's something that we need to...Selectman Brucker said that can be done. I know they're short handed down there at the moment. Chairman Nadeau said they are and I know that we're working on some of that.

Selectman Brucker also thought that it covered all lighted signs. It only covers...Selectman Maddox said electronic changing. Selectman Brucker said those are the only businesses that have to turn their lights off when they're not in business. I heard complaints that some businesses will say that they're open. They'll have a lighted sign saying they're open and the person drives in and they're not open. So these are the kinds of complaints that I heard. The only ones that we're concerned with are illuminated signs. Is that correct?

Selectman Maddox thought this is a case of no good deed goes unpunished. I think that the Planning Board worked with the sign companies and the business community through the Chamber to craft an ordinance that made nobody thrilled and nobody terribly angry. It was trying to find that midpoint of being able to utilize electronic changing signs to advertise the price of gas or whatever their item was but not be flashing signs. There were compromises on both sides. I think that people are trying to stretch that in some cases. There's no enforcement on our part so things go on. I can tell you that some of those signs are brighter than they probably should be at night because I'm guessing like everything else, it's all software driven and somebody clicks a key and all of a sudden the brightness goes to a level that they didn't intend it to be. The letter should be the first step and follow up by Code Enforcement. I don't think we should be getting involved in electronic changing signs until it becomes unmanageable by Code Enforcement.

Selectman Brucker said that was fine. I just want to know that the Board would like to do that.

Selectman Maddox - After coming back from San Francisco, Hudson was a welcome ride home. It is amazing how you forget a lot of different things. Gas at almost touching \$5.00 a gallon. Filling up the car here wasn't as bad. Different world on that side of the continent. I do have a comment Mr. Chairman in regards to a Thumbs today as I

caught up with all my 400 e-mails and regular snail mail. I was reading the Thumbs about an issue with the Police Department. As their liaison, I am disappointed that someone continues to write half stuff that nobody can understand. There's a procedure in place if there's a complaint about our officers or the Police Department. Contact the Chief. There's an investigation process. What they're trying to write I don't understand and it's not going to help them or us to simply write things to the Thumbs anonymously and not get the problem taken care of. If they feel that they can't contact the Police Department, the Town Administrator, or me as their liaison but I think just putting stuff in the paper that disparages the entire Police Department for an issue or an officer is counterproductive. We have great people working for us. Going through the training that they're going through, through the continuing education that they go through, CALEA accreditation. It would be nice to know what the issue is so that we can correct it rather than just see Thumbs about our Police Department. Thank you Sir.

Selectman Luszey - Thank you Selectman/Chairperson. If you go up by Benson Park and take a look if you're heading towards Pelham on Kimball Hill, take a look off to your right. You will see a clearing. That is where the senior center is proposed to be built. I did not get a note from Gary yet but hopefully the boring machine was there this week or it will be in there this week. We will have our answer to the ledge problem. Next time we meet, I'll have that answer. I also put forward a proposed cost center. You folks saw a rough draft of that the last time we met. I sent the final draft into the Finance Director Friday to have it included in our budget book. You will see that as a new cost center for half a year next year.

Question to that end, Selectman Maddox said one of the items on that cost center was a part time person, which we need to make a warrant article for. Selectman Luszey said no. Only if we have to add a number of heads to the total town. There are a number of vacancies in the town which we could designate for that person. Selectman Maddox said it sounded a little too creative for this Selectman. Again, we've always gone and we've said to the voters this is what we're going to do. You're saying now we're not going to fill a secretary in Community Development and make it a part time person at the counter. Selectman Luszey said that's not what he said. I said there are a number of positions open in the town that there's a possibility that we could use one of those positions as a part time without increasing the approved head count for the town, which we would not need voter approval for. We are not increasing the head count. We'll have that debate I guess somewhere around the 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup>.

Selectman Luszey's last comment - as most of you know, I'm very involved with MooreMart. In a couple of weeks, we're going to be doing a major packing by November 10<sup>th</sup>. We will be shipping a 50,000 package. We're quite involved right now collecting goodies to send to our troops. A unit from New Hampshire was just redeployed. The 169<sup>th</sup>. Selectman Brucker asked if he was looking for volunteers to help. Selectman Luszey said to talk to him off line. We've got more volunteers than we're going to be able to handle because of the significance of this particular packing. Thank you. Thanks Mr. Nadeau for your contribution already. They've already been packed. Chairman Nadeau said all right, that's what I like to hear.

Selectman Nadeau - I will follow up with a list of stuff here. The first thing is last meeting I said that the blood drive and then I corrected myself because it was that day. The total pints collected was 248 roughly. Great job! I'd like to thank the Police Department and also all the community members that helped with the blood drive and also the businesses that provided the food for the blood drive.

The next item, for all of those who haven't read the Hudson/Litchfield News yet or are looking at it this week from last week such as myself, I did catch the article on the fire truck that came to Hudson on the 1<sup>st</sup> for the pink fire truck for breast cancer awareness. You will see some of the firefighters driving around for the month of October wearing pink shirts in support of this. It was a really nice article that was in the HLN. It was really interesting to know that the truck started here its life in Hudson, New Hampshire, in 1974 and is still going strong. I don't understand why we trade those nice trucks in though.

There's a lot of fun things going on in Hudson this weekend. We have Pumpkinfest at the Hills House. That's Friday, Saturday and Sunday put on by the Kiwanis Club. On Saturday we also have the Friends of Music. They're doing a Comedy Night at the VFW.

In closing, Chairman Nadeau said one of his favorite subjects, Benson, was in a great spotlight today for those who haven't seen the Telegraph's Best Of. It was under the free things. Mine Falls beat us out this year in Nashua. I'm hoping next year with the dog park, we might be in contention for first place for best free things to do. There was also a lot of Hudson businesses that were mentioned by the Telegraph. I think it was definitely a nice thing to read today of some of the good things that are happening in Hudson and some of the Hudson businesses. That is all I have this evening.

10. NONPUBLIC SESSION

*Motion by Selectman Luszey, seconded by Selectman Brucker, to enter Nonpublic Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3 II (c) Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of the public body itself, unless such person requests an open meeting. This exemption shall extend to any application for assistance or tax abatement or waiver of a fee, fine, or other levy, if based on inability to pay or poverty of the applicant; 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 4-0.*

Chairman Nadeau entered Nonpublic Session at 9:10 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 Nadeau opened the regular session at 9:28 p.m.

A discussion was held relative to a Memo from John Cashell to the Board that the Selectmen received in their mailboxes relative to hiring a secretary.

11. ADJOURNMENT

*Motion to adjourn at 9:38 p.m. by Selectman Maddox, seconded by Selectman Luszey, carried 4-0.*

Recorded by HGTV and transcribed by Donna Graham, Recorder.

HUDSON BOARD OF SELECTMEN

\_\_\_\_\_  
Benjamin Nadeau, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard J. Maddox, Selectman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ted Luszey, Selectman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nancy Brucker, Selectman