



## HUDSON, NEW HAMPSHIRE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

### Minutes of the November 25, 2025 Budget Review Meeting

#### 7:00 PM

Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, Town Hall

**\*Non-Public Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, (a) & (b) beginning at 6:00 p.m.**

Regular meeting will begin immediately after Non-Public Session

---

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – by Chairman Dumont the meeting of November 25, 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the Selectmen Meeting Room at Town Hall.

Chairman Dumont: I'll call the order of the meeting of November 25th, 2025 in the Board of Selectmen Meeting Room at Town Hall at 7:00 p.m. All motions made this evening prior to the public meeting that was in the non-public will be read into the record later after the normally scheduled meeting.

2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Selectman Guessferd.

3. **ATTENDANCE**

**Board of Selectmen:** Dillon Dumont, Bob Guessferd, Xen Vurgaropulos and Heidi Jakoby. Dave Morin is excused.

**Staff/Others:** Town Administrator – Roy Sorenson; Police Chief – David Cayot; Fire Chief – Scott Tice; Director of Development Services – Elvis Dhima; Director of Public Works – Jay Twardosky; Chief Assessor – Jim Michaud; Town Accountant – Dan Thibeault; School Liaison – Stephen Meyer; Alvirne High School Student – Zone Burt; Executive Assistant – Lorrie Weissgarber.

4. **PUBLIC INPUT**

Chairman Dumont: We will roll it right into public input. Does anyone in the audience wish to address the Board on any issue which the Board has control of at this time? If you do, please come on up, state your name and address for the record. I don't know how many people will be having speak time, but I'll just remind everybody we try to keep it to about a three-minute limit so that way everybody can get their turn. Thank you very much.

Craig Putnam: Good evening. Craig and Deborah Putnam, 59 Rangers Drive. We installed a solar array on our property in 2015 and have been receiving the solar tax exemption since it was instituted in December of that year. As recipients of that exemption, we of course were very interested to see that the Board of Selectmen is considering possibly modifying it. We are here tonight to provide you with our perspective on the matter. Our array was installed and went live in the fall of 2015. Would we have made the investment had we thought the exemption was unlikely to happen? Maybe, maybe not. It's hard to say now. But it certainly would have made it less likely that we would proceed with the project. We understand the issues with continuing with the 100% exemption, particularly given the possibility of rooftop installations on enormous corporate-owned buildings. But eliminating the exemption entirely would be overcompensating. Most of the 250-ish solar installations in town are on residential properties. I'm sure most of those property owners would not be at all happy to have the exemption eliminated. I think it's likely that many of those residential property owners might not have proceeded with investing in a solar installation knowing their property taxes would go up. So, our suggestion to the BOS is as follows. If you feel the town must move away from the 100% exemption, then thread the needle by capping the exemption amount at a value that will cover the typical residential array. I'm sure Mr. Michaud can advise on a proper value for a cap, one that won't harm residents who likely made financial decisions based at least in part on the existence of the exemption. But that cap value would be likely very low enough that a large corporation wouldn't be bothered to file for the exemption. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to provide input on this matter. Please feel free to ask if you have any questions.

Rebecca Odierna: Becky Odierna at 152 Dracut Road. I am also here about the tax exemption for solar panels. I want to echo everything that Mr. and Mrs. Putnam just put forward. And I totally agree with his solution. I think that there should be a cap. I understand that 100% exemption is not financially feasible for the town long term

and that businesses who are installing major solar panel arrays should absolutely be taxed on that. It's for the benefit of all the people. But as a homeowner, I invested in 2017. I have still not seen complete returns on my investment yet. I invested under the security of knowing that this was put in place in 2015 and that we would be exempted from taxes. I don't feel that middle class homeowners should be penalized for trying to make their homes more energy efficient. I think it benefits the entire town when homeowners do that. Raises property values, which helps the town, helps local education, helps local jobs. The more installations that are happening, the more people have jobs for these installations, increases energy independence in the town, helps provide stability to the grid. There are so many reasons why investing in solar panels is a good thing, but we need to make it an incentive for homeowners to do it. And I think in order to do that, we need to keep this tax exemption in place, at least at a cap, so that local people like me, who are just hardworking individuals trying to do the right thing, are not penalized.

Doug McKenzie: My wife couldn't make it tonight, but 25 St. Laurent Drive. We put in solar panels in 2021, and frankly, it was a financial decision for us. The electric rates in New Hampshire are some of the highest in the country, and they're going up rapidly. So, for us, it was a hedge against potential energy cost increases. And when looking at the numbers, knowing that there was an exemption in place was a huge factor in that decision. What's the solution there, whether or not we keep the exemption in place or put a cap there, I really don't know. But I'm obviously strongly in favor of not reversing that decision. I just think that it's not right, knowing that a lot of people made decisions based on that. And again, that would certainly change the economics of how that investment pays off for itself. So that's it. Thank you.

Susan Chouinard: I wasn't planning on speaking tonight, but I wanted to be here in support of what's going on. Sue Chouinard, 118 Dracut Road. I put solar in probably 2015. I'm still paying for it. When I put it in, I contacted the town to make sure that there was an exemption to the tax bill, because I didn't want to see my taxes going up anymore. And that's why I'm a little upset with hearing about this, because I thought that that was the way it was going to be. I'm retired, my husband's retired. Going up that much more in taxes would be a burden. It really would. And so, I just wanted to say that much.

Chairman Dumont: Anybody else like to come on up and speak?

Tristan Dion: Good evening, everybody. Tristan Dion, 15 Glen Drive. It's a pleasure to speak to all of you guys. I'm here for the same thing, for the solar exemption. I don't think I could really put the arguments any better than the individuals that have come before me. I will fully admit that I was not privy to the solar tax exemption when I first put my system in in 2023. But after I'd done so, learned about it, applied for it, I think it's a great incentive for any local homeowner to want to be able to join the program, get on board with it. The fact of the matter is, is New Hampshire has very expensive electricity bills, as it is. I think we are all living it. Everybody on this Board can probably attest to that fact. And it does help offset that. The other thing that we have to realize, recognize, is I don't see Hudson creating its own power. We're not. And I don't think there's any initiatives to put in any sort of massive solar grid or nuclear power plant anywhere nearby anytime soon. Houses, as we know, are using more and more power every single day. More people are using electric cars. They're getting more electronics in their houses. Everything's becoming more connected. You go into Lowe's, every single fridge has a TV on it now, right? Everything's getting more power hungry. But we're not building any more power plants. So, I think, if anything, we should be rewarding the fact that we're trying to come at it from a grassroots level. We should be rewarding the fact that people are willing to take on that brunt themselves. We're the ones that are willing to take on the brunt of the cost of install, the cost of higher insurance, possible damages to our roofs, damage to our roofs during the wintertime. That's all on us. We're the ones fronting it, the town's not. But the town still gets to benefit from it because there's a lower load on the power grid as a whole. So, we're benefiting everybody around us. But the homeowners themselves are the ones that are taking on the main upfront brunt of the cost. If anything, we should at least be rewarding that. Give a little pat on the back. Now, I can say that I don't think that we should be rewarding fully the major massive corporations, the major buildings. They can easily afford to put those in at cost. It's not a big deal. And I think that that 100% exemption should not apply to them. But I do think that we should at least throw a bone to the people that are willing to take it on individually at that small grassroots level. That's all I got. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Anybody else like to come on up and speak? Go on once. Come on up.

Joan Zinkawich: Good evening. Hello, I'm Joan Sinkwich. I live at 79 Greeley Street. I've had a small solar array for about the last 10, 12 years, maybe even a little bit longer. And it's given me a really good return. Plus, I get what the electric company doesn't need, they sell it back to me and give me a check three times a year, four times a year. It's not a big check, but it's something to get back. I just want to say I agree with what all my neighbors have been saying. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: You're welcome. Anybody else like to come on up and speak? Once, twice. I don't see anybody else. We will close the public input at 7:10, 7:12 p.m.

## **5. RECOGNITIONS, NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS**

### **A. Recognitions**

#### **1) Zoe Burt – Capstone Project (presentation)**

Chairman Dumont: All right. We'll roll into item number five, recognitions, nominations, and appointments. First up, we have recognition of Zoe Burt for a Capstone project. I would like to take a moment to recognize Zoe, who recently coordinated a roadside cleanup for a Capstone project at Alvirne High School. At this time, I'd welcome Zoe to come forward and share her project with us.

Zoe Burt: Hi, everyone. My name is Zoe Burt, and this is just about my capstone project that I did. So, a little bit about me is my name is Zoe Burt. I'm 17 years old and a senior at Alvirne. I do cross-country and track year-round, I love being outdoors, I do a lot of hiking as well. So, what is a capstone? A capstone is a project that is required of all seniors at Alvirne. It's on pretty much any topic that you want to better yourself or the community, and it's really meant to try something new and grow. There are different types, such as a hands-on, a teaching and learning, or a service project, and I chose a service project. So, my project was to organize an event to pick up trash around the town, and I chose a service project because I wanted to better the community, and I also wanted to do this to inspire others in the community to hopefully keep doing this. I've always been passionate about the environment because as a runner, I'm all around the streets of Hudson, and I see trash all around, and I just do not like it, so I wanted to do something about it for my capstone. So, this is the route that I mapped out. It's about a mile and a half, and it should take around 40 minutes. Obviously, it's a little longer with the trash, but it goes along Derry Road and then up Haverhill and loops into a neighborhood and heads back. This is how I got people to go to my capstone. I made this flyer, and I posted it on social media, and I showed it to my friends, and it just has all the information, the meeting place, and what it is, and I also had this Google form attached to the flyer, which was just a way for me to know how many people were going to get an idea of supplies I needed and area to cover. So, for our capstone, we're required to have a mentor for an advising standpoint, and Mr. Beals helped me get in contact with the highway department, and Jay became my mentor. Having a mentor, it's really for the advising standpoint, but I also got a lot of help as they gave me signs to put around the town so that people know there's a group picking up trash, and they also gave me trash bags and fluorescent vests, which was very helpful for my group. So, this was the day of the event. It was on November 8th at 11:00 a.m. I had about ten of my friends helping me out, and we did the route. It was a little bit longer than I planned for, but it worked out great because we got four bags of trash full, and it was those big industrial trash bags, and one spot that we found had 19 bottles of chardonnay, which was a little weird, but I don't even know. It was crazy, but yeah, that's us with all the stuff, and that's one of the signs they put out, and it ended up going great.

Chairman Dumont: I'm going to stand up for one second, if you don't mind me, yeah.

Roy Sorenson: So, Jay Twardosky is here tonight, so thanks to him, Principal Beals, and I think Chief Cayot and PD helped out a little bit, too, with that route as well, and it did a fantastic job, so kudos.

Selectman Jakoby: And also, I understand that the Sustainability Committee website gave you a lot of guidance on that as well, so that there is information on the website.

Roy Sorenson: Do, you want to do a certificate?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, so with that, I just want to read the certificate. In recognition of her outstanding leadership, dedication, and development in completing a successful capstone project focused on roadside cleanup, her efforts have made a meaningful contribution to the community and serve as an example of civic

responsibility and initiative. So, I will present this to you on this day of November 25th, 2025. So, thank you very much from the Town and the Board and all the departments.

Zoe Burt: Thank you.

- B. Nominations** – None
- C. Appointments** – None

**6. CONSENT ITEMS**

Chairman Dumont: All right, we don't have any nominations or appointments tonight, so we will roll into consent items. I'm going to remove two of them. One of them will be item C2, and the other one will be item D. So, with that, I'd be looking for a motion to approve items A, B, C1, E, F, and G.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to approve Consent Items A, B, C1, E, F and G. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

- A. Assessing Items** – None
- B. Water/Sewer Items**
  - 1) Sewer Abatement – 19 Park Avenue, LLC
- C. Licenses & Permits & Policies**
  - 1) Pretty Sipsy Coffee Bar
  - 2) P!ng Coffee

Chairman Dumont: I'll speak to 6C2 real quick. I have a conflict with that, so with that I'm going to recuse myself from voting on that and turn it over to Selectman Guessferd to Chair for that vote.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, this is a Hawker/Peddler permit for paying coffee on Central Street. I don't really have a lot here. It's in the packet, so does anybody have any concerns or questions about that?

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to approve Consent Item 6C2. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Selectman Guessferd: Motion passes, I will now pass the gavel back to theoretically.

- D. Donations**
  - 1) Fire - DCU
  - 2) Police – DCU
  - 3) Police – Janie Freedom

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much, Mr. Vice Chair. So, with that, we will speak to items D on the donations list. And first, for the fire donation, I will turn it over to Mr. Sorenson just to speak on that.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, in front of you tonight, you have a couple of donations that are similar. I'll have Chief Cayot come up here in a second. He'll talk to his, but it's a \$1,000 donation from Digital Federal Credit Union. They reached out to both fire and police. Is the chief here? Come on in, Chief Tice. I did not see you out there. This is the DCU \$1,000 donation.

Chief Tice: So, we recently received a very generous donation from Digital Federal Credit Union in the sum of \$1,000. So, I would ask that the Board accept that, and we would reach out to them with a letter with a very big thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Yes, definitely. It's on a letter with thanks and appreciation. Do we have a motion to accept that donation from DCU?

[Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to approve Consent Item 6D1. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: I will ask Police Chief, Cayot, to come on up and speak. He's got a couple of donations here, so a little bit more lucky than Chief Tice.

Chief Cayot: So, I'd like to start. We also received a \$1,000 donation from Digital Federal Credit Union, and we are extremely appreciative of this, and we will be putting it into our community policing donation account that allows us to buy different souvenirs for Old Home Days and for National Night Out and several other programs that we have.

Selectman Jakoby: Excellent.

Chief Cayot: So, I would ask that we are able to accept that, and we would also be sending a letter to DCU to thank them for that.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Do we have a motion to accept?

[Selectman Vurgaropulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to accept Consent Item 6D2. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chief Cayot: Like you said, luckier than the fire department, so I have a second one to go over. The second donation is \$5,000 that we received from Janie Freedom. Janie came to us and we had a conversation, and she said she would like to donate some money so that we could start an e-bike program to go along with our mountain bike program. So, we had a conversation about that and kind of what it would look like, and then she sent a check in to the police department. So, I'd ask that we'd be able to accept that and use that money to go towards starting our e-bike program. It will supplement our mountain bike program. It will allow us to patrol a bigger area than on the mountain bikes, but it will also be used so that we can educate the public on e-bikes as well.

Chairman Dumont: So, I just had one question. Do you envision trying to grow this? How do you see this moving forward in the future? Obviously, it's a more popular thing now than ever.

Chief Cayot: We do see that we want to grow this, so Janie gave us this donation, which would allow us to get one e-bike. Typically, on the mountain bike unit, we do send the guys and girls out in groups of two, so we'll be looking to purchase one as well. The way we're looking to do that is use asset forfeiture funds. So, we'll be using money that we took in through federal asset forfeiture to buy the second bike for that program.

Selectman Jakoby: I just want to say I think this is great, and I really appreciate Janie Freedom's having this donation and really meeting with you and asking about your needs. And I think that's a great way for the community to get involved. So, I appreciate it, and I think it's a model that others might look at.

Selectman Guessferd: Absolutely. That's a very generous donation for a private citizen.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I'd like to echo that. This is an amazing donation. Very thankful. I just had a question for the Chief. We've had many conversations about e-bikes and the laws surrounding them. Do we have a plan to address community e-bike usage?

Chief Cayot: There has been some conversations, and I know actually there was a conversation at the Benson's Park Committee the other day that Lieutenant Flynn attended. And some of it's going to require looking into doing some town ordinances. But like I said, we're going to use it for education, and a lot of the education that goes on it is you're supposed to follow the same rules as you would on a regular bike as of right now. But I think those are discussions we can have moving forward as well if the town does want to look at adopting any town ordinances to regulate e-bikes.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: All right, thank you.

Chairman Dumont: And to add to that, we also had the same conversation. There's been talk about state legislation for that as well. So, we'll see in the next couple of months what comes forward for that. But I know it's a topic in a bunch of different communities.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yes. I look forward to seeing what we come up with.

Chairman Dumont: Definitely. All right. So, with that, we'll be looking for a motion to accept with a thanks and appreciation.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to accept Consent Item 6D3. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chief Cayot: And I would just again like to thank Janie Freedom as well for the generous donation.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Thank you. All right. That takes care of our consent items. I am going to change the order of business.

**E. Acceptance of Minutes**

- 1) November 10, 2025

**8. E. Manchester Veterans Council – Administration/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: I'm going to move to new business 8E first, and then we will roll back into our normal business. But I will have Selectman Guessferd speak to that item.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The town recently received a letter from the Manchester Veterans Council, and it was with regard to pavers, granite pavers, that they are installing in Manchester's Veterans Park. They're requesting our support in honoring brave men and women from our town who sacrificed their lives during the Gulf War and the global war on terrorism. So, they're proposing to honor a local resident, Ryan Phaneuf. Captain Ryan Phaneuf, Ryan Scott Phaneuf, United States Air Force, killed in action January 22, 2020, in the Ghanzi province in Afghanistan. He paid the ultimate sacrifice while serving during Operation Freedom Sentinel. He was a bomber pilot. He flew B-1Bs, and it was deployed to Afghanistan to fly an E-11A bombardier, which is essentially a civilian aircraft that's outfitted with an airborne battle communications node, affectionately called BACN. And there was only four aircraft at the time of that type in the world, and they were typically deployed in battlefield situations. So, a little background on Captain Phaneuf. He entered active duty in June 2012 after being commissioned through ROTC at the Emory Riddle University in Florida. His decorations included the Air Force Commendation Medal. He was the son of Donald and Nancy Phaneuf, who are here tonight with their daughter, Christina, and her husband. And he was a graduate of both the presentation of Mary Academy in Hudson in 2003 and Albert High School in 2007, where he also participated in the junior ROTC program at Albert, and he was actually the commander his senior year. He also served two internships with BAE Systems, one of the largest Department of Defense contractors, getting a behind-the-scenes look at what goes into developing the equipment used to protect those who protect us. In 2012, he completed his studies, earned a Bachelor of Science in Applied Meteorology, and he was commissioned in the United States Air Force as a second lieutenant in May of 2012. I might also say that he then attended pilot training and was one of the best pilots, finished very, very high in his class, came back and did some instructor piloting, and then was assigned to the B-1 and ended up at Ellsworth Air Force Base, and that's where he was deployed from. So, what we'd like to do is I'd like to have a motion to donate \$200 to the Manchester Veterans Park for a granite paver commemorating the service of Air Force Captain Ryan S. Phaneuf, who was killed in action January 27, 2020, in Ghazi Province, Afghanistan.

[Selectman Vurgaropulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to donate \\$200.00 to the Manchester Veterans park for a granite paver commemorating the service of Air Force Captain Ryan S. Phaneuf who was killed in action January 27, 2020 in Ghazni Province, Afghanistan. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: I would just like to add that I think this is extremely important. I was happy to see this put on the agenda. Selectman Guessferd worked through that by adding it with Mr. Sorenson. He's definitely a hometown hero and I think should be shown the respect and appreciation that he deserves, and this is one way of doing that, and hopefully we can find more ways in the future. With that, if there's no other discussion, Selectman Guessferd.

Selectman Guessferd: Just one other point. They are planning to dedicate the monument on Memorial Day, May 25, 2026, and so they're looking to have enough time to do this. That's why they asked us for this now. So, if I know myself, if I have an opportunity to attend, I certainly would do so and represent Hudson.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you.

Selectman Jakoby: I just want to say I'm really glad we're able to do this. It's such an important commemoration for someone, for a family, and for a person who's been so involved in the community and in the defense of our country.

Chairman Dumont: Would you guys like to come up and say anything? You don't have to. Don't feel obligated. I just wanted to give you the opportunity. Don't feel obligated, but you're more than welcome if you'd like to come on up.

Christina Larsen: I usually am. Sorry, I don't really know your forum, but born and raised in Hudson, obviously, because we've lived here, and Ryan grew up here as well, so both of us made our way through PMA. We made our way through Alvirne. I had a two-year stint in Merrimack, but I came back to Hudson. Hudson's always been very near and dear to my family, specifically when everything did happen. All of the businesses in Hudson with the, I don't quite remember what they're called, but the signs out front where they put all the little letters and stuff, having all those messages that everybody said, you know, rest in peace or everything, or having those messages coming home from the airport was incredibly important to my family. And I'm sure as most of you drive through the back roads, you'll notice that a lot of porches will have, like, a green light out. Some neighbor, really don't know to this day who did it, but when that happened, one of our neighbors put a letter in a lot of mailboxes talking about putting a green light out, and ever since 2020, there's a lot of green lights out. And that's kind of one of my favorite things, driving home from work and being able to go through the back roads and seeing those. It's kind of a, obviously, we always remember Ryan, but it's just always a constant nice feeling that the town is still there. So, I definitely appreciate you voting on that and wanting to fund it, and we're honored to live here and have the support. So, thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Thank you. All righty. With that, we will roll back into our normal order of business. We have Old Business to handle, which would be item A, solar exemptions, and I will recognize the Chief Assessor, Mr. Jim Michaud.

## 7. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Dumont:

### A. **Solar Exemptions** – Assessing/Discussion

Jim Michaud: Good evening, Board members. I am back in front of you on the solar exemption article. We last talked about this in October. The Board has three options in front of them. One action is to not put a warrant article on, that would be an action. Another action would be to put forward a warrant article limiting or capping the dollar amount of the assessed value for the solar exemption. And another one, which was brought up in October, it's not in my memo, was to put forward a repeal of the warrant article. My memo is in front of you. It has a lot of statistics. It's approximately 229 properties that received a solar exemption in the 2025 tax year. The mean kilowatt rating is 11 kilowatts. The median kilowatt rating in that grouping is 9 kilowatts. The assessed value exempted range is between \$8,600 and \$10,500. If the solar exemption were to be repealed, it would represent approximately \$150 to \$200 in a property tax increase in year one, based on this year's tax rate. The state legislature does have a bill in front of them for this coming session that is proposed as a total statewide repeal of the solar exemption. It's got a lot of sponsors, but that doesn't necessarily mean it's going to go anywhere, but that's just a point of information. The town could go through a capping warrant article, and then the state could turn around and just repeal it, right? Or it could change on a dime in the legislature to do something different and try to limit the amount that communities can choose to allow for a solar exemption. Once it goes up there, you never really know where it's going to end up, right? But in terms of Hudson, we've had some phone calls on it. We've had some discussions with property owners. Obviously, we hear from the folks that are receiving the solar exemption. I'm not receiving any information from the folks that are not receiving the solar exemption. So as with any exemption or credit, it shifts the amount of taxes that other people pay. It does not decrease the revenue that we receive. It's like a balloon, you push on one side, the other side goes up. In terms of relative value of the exemption in its aggregate, it's a little over \$2 million in exempted value. It takes approximately \$50 million in value to move our tax rate by a penny. So, it's significant in the sense that it's above zero, but if you keep in mind that a penny on the rate is really a fraction of a fraction of a penny on the rate.

Outside of that, I'm available to answer any questions. I have some statewide data, but I'm not sure that that's made germane for tonight.

Chairman Dumont: Questions or comments from the Board? One quick one. The initial exemption was put in what year? I apologize. I'm sure it's 2015.

Selectman Jakoby: 2015.

Jim Michaud: The board adopted it in December of 15. It came into being for the 2016 tax year.

Chairman Dumont: And just for a point of clarification, so it came to the town originally as a petition warrant article in what year?

Jim Michaud: In 2015, March of 2015. It was a petition warrant article.

Chairman Dumont: Which failed.

Jim Michaud: It had a 3-2 support of the Board of Selectmen, but it did fail.

Chairman Dumont: And then the Board of Selectmen under RSA 41:14b adopted an ordinance on their own accord. So, the voters said no.

Selectman Jakoby: The voters said no.

Chairman Dumont: The Board chose to adopt it. Just wanted to make sure that that was clear. So, with that being said, it would be up to this Board whether or not they want to go the route of the voters or utilize the same RSA 41:14b that allows the Board of Selectmen of the town of this size to create or amend ordinances.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Selectman Vurgarouplos: I'm not in support of completely repealing it, but I would be in support of, like, an 80% cap. I think that's fair. I think that will move the line a little bit, still give the benefit to the, as one of our residents said, the grassroots, the regular individuals in the town that are putting these on their house to help support offset. Yeah, that's pretty much what I have to say.

Selectman Guessferd: I'm kind of in the same place. We have received a lot, obviously, as you said, that we've received a lot of input from those with the exemption. And from where it falls for me is that these people made a decision, partially depending on how much of that decision, but on the fact that there was going to be a tax exemption. Also, they do get money back. The lady back there got some checks. She gets checks. They get checks back. So, it is really a financial decision because it's a big outlay up front. We've had many people come by our house and ask us if we wanted to put solar panels in, and we've been through all the numbers. I sympathize with those folks that have the solar panels and that put out that money because it takes a long time to recoup. I also understand the other side of this decision as well, where the rest of the taxpayers out there will have to basically pick up part of that cost. As you said, it's like a balloon. So, the cost is still going to be there. I get that. Part of me just says we do nothing at this point and just see what happens with the state legislature. And if the state legislature repeals it, then there's not much we can do about it. But the other part of that would be the most I would consider doing is a cap, a cap that would cover the folks that have the exemption. So, they could maintain their exemption. That would be my thought process.

Selectman Jakoby: So, when this was put in place, it applies to residential and commercial, correct? And there is no way of separating those two. I am adamant that some of the larger commercial buildings in this community, I don't believe they should receive 100% exemption. So, looking at that, the idea of a cap is what appeals to me at this point to make sure that we're allowing for our residents who choose it to take on that. As the gentleman said, there is a lot of risk with solar as well and I would look at a cap. I see here on the pages aren't, I guess on the second page, it said if the BOS or others were to propose a warrant article or if we wanted to put on a cap, I think it's interesting that seven other communities have a cap of \$20,000, which from my understanding would cover most or all of the residents currently.

Jim Michaud: It would cover all of the current residential solar exemptees.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I would be open to a \$20,000 cap.

Chairman Dumont: So, I'll make my piece with it. So, I'll start off with saying I don't think anybody's happy with getting a property tax bill. I know I'm certainly not. And I think it's upon this Board, the school board, and the state to try to find property tax relief in any avenue that they can. With that being said, I have a hard time with most exemptions because of what they signify. And what that does is it offsets the burden of the tax rate that's there, and I understand that it's a negligible offset, as Mr. Michaud had just said, however, an offset nonetheless. And to incentivize a certain product through taxes, I have a hard time with. As we heard, and I'm sure you guys have read the e-mails, a lot of the payback is minimal, if anything at all. Some people said that, quite frankly, without the incentive, it's not worth it. And I just don't know if that's government's place. Personally, I think that the free market should handle those things, I think it does a lot better. I think these people in the room do a lot better in making their own decisions than we do behind this desk. So, for me, I have a hard time with the exemption. I lean towards what Selectman Guessferd said, though. At this point, I understand the support in the room. I think that we're better off not doing anything, wait and see what happens up at the Statehouse with what they do with that bill. No matter what, we would need to schedule two public hearings for this. This is an action that can be taken here tonight. We'd have to schedule two public hearings and move that forward. This could be considered, I guess, the first public hearing, and then you would move forward to a second one. But for me, I think at this point, I would be leaning towards kind of a wait and see.

Selectman Jakoby: So, my concern with a wait and see is if the state doesn't act and, you know, some of our larger buildings act, that's going to be significant. So, I would rather take action, an interim action of putting a cap on it, and then wait and see. That would be my recommendation.

Chairman Dumont: Mr. Sorensen, do you have anything?

Roy Sorenson: Well, I think, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, Jim, I think you have the authority to do that at any time. Right now, yeah. If you don't, or get your vote.

Chairman Dumont: Well, my understanding of changing any ordinance, you have to hold two public hearings.

Roy Sorenson: Correct. But you wouldn't have to necessarily meet the warrant timeline.

Chairman Dumont: No, no, exactly. Yeah, you could do this meeting and a following one in January. You could do two in January. The February one doesn't have to be at any point in time. Any action within that, quite frankly, you know, somebody has the right to petition it and force it to go to a warrant article in March.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes.

Selectman Guessferd: I understand that sentiment. I mean that, you know, we want to try to, that, I mean, again, it's in the realm of things that I've been thinking about is the cap piece, because, you know, at least we would save some, you know, we would, the large corporate, you know, corporate, you know, businesses would have to no longer get the exemption, you know.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, I ...

Selectman Guessferd: You know, so no, it's a good thing.

Selectman Jakoby: Can I just clarify?

Chairman Guessferd: Yes.

Selectman Jakoby: I mean, I believe it's true that any large building that is looking to put on solar, that would have to go through planning and et cetera. So, it's not ..., I want to reiterate that to the public. I don't want to be like, oh, I'm against this. But any large solar array still needs to go through the proper channels. So, I'm not just arbitrarily saying no.

Chairman Dumont: No, I wasn't trying to ...

Selectman Jakoby: No, no, I'm for the public, because I think that gets confused sometimes.

Chairman Dumont: To that point, there are, and Jim can probably speak to it. I'm sure he's been keeping an eye on it. There are, I can think of at least three projects that already have approvals for them to go in place. They

may not have done it yet. But there **were** provisions made in the building and brought up at site plan from when I was planning way back when for them to do that in the future. And it would be a significant amount.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I just want people to know that some of those are in process.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, or have already been approved.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, what is the will of the Board? Motions to scheduling another public hearing? Are we waiting? Are we ...

Selectman Jakoby: I would make a motion that we consider change. Do I need a motion to change the ordinance or a motion to have another public hearing?

Chairman Dumont: I would say that you would need to schedule, and quite frankly, we would need to open ..., if you want to do it with one, you'd need to open this one up tonight. You would need to ...

Selectman Jakoby: I'm fine with one or two, but I would like to move ...

Roy Sorenson: I would say you have to do two. I would not count tonight, draft the ordinance, and then go to your first public hearing effective after that.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, so we come back and do two of them.

Selectman Jakoby: That's what I would ... So that would be the action item I would recommend. Do you want that in a motion?

Chairman Dumont: I think the consensus would be fine, but you can make a motion if you'd like.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Move the motion to the table to a future date?

Selectman Jakoby: Is there consensus? It's only me who said it. No. I'm not consensus.

Selectman Guessferd: I'll go along with that. I'll go along with it with the cap that covers the folks that have it.

Selectman Jakoby: The \$20,000. I'm recommending a \$20,000 cap.

Roy Sorenson: So, the motion should be to ask staff to prepare an ordinance based on . . .

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to ask the staff to prepare an ordinance putting a cap on the solar exemption of \\$20,000. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: You have your marching orders.

Jim Michaud: December 9th or first meeting in January?

Selectman Guessferd: I'll go with January.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, yeah. I don't ... Yeah, prepare the ordinance. We're working into the agenda and time frame that we can adequately notify the public.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. Yeah, I think that's fine.

Roy Sorenson: Before Mr. Michaud leaves, I just want to make an announcement. So, Mr. Michaud, as you know, has been with the town for 30 years, and he most recently received the President's Choice Award from the New Hampshire Association of Assessing Officials. His performance, obviously, has been excellent during those 30 years, but his outstanding achievements and dedication to the profession speaks for itself. He's certainly known in the assessor circles as one of the most important people in that profession. And there's not a lot coming up through the ranks, as he can tell you, so that means something.

Jim Michaud: Thank you.

Selectman Guessferd: It means he can't retire. Congratulations.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, exactly. So please don't go anywhere. Congratulations.

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you very much. Congratulations.

**8. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Hawker/Peddler Permit Update – Development Services/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: All right. With that, we will roll into our new business. Next up we have a hawkler peddler permit update, and I will recognize the Director of Development Services, Elvis Dhima.

Elvis Dhima: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening, everyone. As we, one of the things that we've done as a town is, I apologize for the voice. I've been yelling a bit this weekend, I was at a tournament. Who can tell, right? Such an easy-going guy, yelling. Unheard of. One of the things that we've done as a town is kind of look at the rules we have in place and see if we can change things, especially the ones that are outdated. The Hawker and Peddlers and Vendors license is one of them. It hasn't been updated since 2011. It's not very friendly to the user. It's not very friendly to the staff either. It's time we start looking into that. And basically, one of the things I want to do is I want to have the Board's blessing tonight to basically move forward with staff, start reviewing this, and then set up two public meetings related to the ordinance change in January 13th and January 27th to basically go through the motions. One of the things that we're dealing with, we have a lot of models out there that do not, they're not covered under the rules we have. And one of them, for example, is automated systems. They're coming out there. So, there's not really anyone involved behind it. Our rules are not basically keeping up with what's happening out there. So, one of the things we need to do is see what everyone else is doing, making sure that we can respond to the new methods that are coming out there. But also, I think one of the things tonight I'm going to ask the Board is, do we want to start changing things in a way that we're friendly to the small businesses starting up? Do we just want to choke them from the very beginning with just complete oversight and rules and all the things we have in place? So that's kind of what I'm asking you tonight. We're going to start looking at this, and which way does the Board want to go? Do we want to just start being a little bit more business friendly than we are? I mean we are open to everyone that's coming in. But the main concerns that we're seeing out there is if someone is starting to start a small business, there's a lot of financial burden, some of the things we have. Do we want to give someone a chance in like a temporary setting? And then if they want to get serious about it, then kind of ask them for additional things. So, what's happened a lot, too, is it starts in as like a Hawkers/Peddlers, and then eventually they move to Hudson, right? They have a beginning and they go from there. So, I think one of the things that I see is if we provide support at the beginning and give them some breathing room, I think that usually results in basically something good for everyone. I also feel that if that's a successful business and everyone likes it, I think the community is going to support it, and that's something they want to have to be staying town. So I think you kind of have to decide like you want to be that community or you want to be one of those like some of the communities around us when it's just so much burden from the beginning, there's no breathing room, and basically that person or he or she has to decide like I'm going to start this somewhere else because there's no breathing room here. And with that said, I'll open up, take any questions you might have, and go from there. What you have on the packet, too, also is a draft of the application to where we want it to go. It basically provides more information, asks the town planners to sign off. I also would like to add in a current requirement list so every applicant that comes in, they know exactly what they need to do, definitions, what's short-term, what's long-term, and the list goes on and on. But I want everyone to kind of be educated from the very beginning and then have that on paper because I think that's very important so everyone knows what they're getting into. With that said, I'll open it up to any questions you might have.

Chairman Dumont: A couple things to add to that. I think that Mr. Dhima is correct. We would need to update, obviously, the ordinance again. Same thing, we would need two public hearings for this. The way that we've been utilizing this doesn't match with the way that the policy is written currently, so there's a need for some housekeeping to clean it up. And I think, I don't know if anybody's had a chance to read through it, but it needs to be simplified. The intent of a Hawker's/Peddler's permit, I think, is just that, it's a simple vendor. The biggest key in there, at least that I find, is for this Board to define really what temporary is. When you have somebody who sets up shop and they never leave, well, then that obviously becomes more of a permanent structure versus you have a food truck or a vendor, a farm stand that sets up for six weeks out of the year, closes down and then may come back the following year for a different six weeks or something along those lines, but doesn't have really

a permanent structure or a permanent place. So, when I look through it, for me, I think that the one-year mark being revisited by either the Board and or staff together, you would determine at that time, okay, this guy is clearly permanent, or, you know, no, he meets the temporary standard, he can continue on. I also think that in there it should be kind of just cut and dry, you know, is this allowed in the zone for one, and then two, are you meeting all your state licensing requirements, and then to follow up and get recommendations from police and fire and the development services. For me, I think that, you know, we should encourage those types of things. We did have a warrant article two years ago to allow food trucks in a certain zone by right. To me, those fit this. Personally, I don't see them, why they would need a kind of minor site plan or a site plan of any sort myself. I think this is the correct path, but I think we need to simplify it.

Selectman Guessferd: Just a question. Would this apply to, we talked about temporary, would this apply to these, like, Halloween businesses that pop up, like, six weeks before Halloween?

Elvis Dhima: And that's the question, right? Like, you know, I mean, if they're not selling any goods, it doesn't really, because they, you know, I guess they are providing a service because they're charging someone for certain, you know, if you're going to their properties or whatever. But my biggest thing is, like, if someone was to set up, like, a shop, like a coffee shop, right, and they tried a couple months, it doesn't work, and they're like, all right, I'm going to try something else, so they won't go to a different location. Are we, are you hitting them every time they're changing this, or can they just go around town and they give us some addresses? Like, we've seen a lot of, like, I don't know, it's like, I don't want to say a burden, but it's kind of like, do we really need to go through this with someone that's, like, just starting to do this to see if it works or not? And instead of spending the money into, like, trying to tweak things in their business, they come in here spending money on, like, a site plan or things like that. And to Mr. Chairman's point, if someone has a successful business and they think it's going to be permanent, I think they need to know, like, all right, now it's at, you're at that threshold that you need to start looking long-term, right? And those people are going to do that. Like, I talked to a couple of them, like, absolutely, obviously. If I'm at nine-month mark and I'm seeing a projection that's going to be good, they want to do that. But they want to be told that. They want to be informed up front. So they don't find out at the last minute, like, all right, well, your apartment expires tomorrow. You can't do this anymore. Just trying to make it a little friendlier. But we're going to try, to your point, trying to cover everything we can because a lot of things are changing. And we have a set of rules that doesn't allow us to see beyond a certain thing. So, you know, we're either not doing it correctly or we're basically telling them no because, well, I don't have the rules to cover your scenario. So, the easiest thing to do is say, no, we don't want to do that. We want to make sure that everyone that comes in has some kind of accommodation. It has to be reasonable. All right, just kind of give everyone a chance that wants to start something in Hudson. That's basically the theme here.

Chairman Dumont: And so, Selectman Guessferd, to your point, an existing building, you know, the first thing I thought was like Spirit Halloween, right? They move into an old NAMCO. Well, that's an existing building with a site plan that's labeled for retail sales. They would just run right in there, there would be no need for this. This is you have, you know, a vacant lot or a parking lot and you have, you know, Joe's Coffee or whatever that wants to sell that. Or I don't know if you guys see there was a barbecue place over by a barbershop for a little while. It would be an avenue for them to say, you know, I'm not a set in stone business, I'm a mobile truck here. I'll be here these weeks out of the year or these months. Could I, you know, file for my permit? If they wanted to be more permanent, either go into a location or build something, then they'd go to site plan.

Elvis Dhima: We were looking at Londonderry today and Londonderry's is 30 days. They're good for 30 days. I'm like, you expect someone to come in every day? I'm like, it's ludicrous. There's some stuff out there, like, I don't know. Like, well, I also don't want to see these, like, come up like mushrooms either. But I also don't want to be, like, overkill. So where is that fine line? So, I think through the two public meetings we're going to have and the staff kind of doing the research and providing you something that's simple to follow, I think it will be a good end product.

Chairman Dumont: And to that point right now, the ordinance reads that no matter when you file for it, they all expire December 31st of that year. Now, that could be a good thing. You know, everybody's doing them all at the exact same time. But then again, the people that file, you know, we just approved two of them here tonight. Well, they're coming back in two weeks.

Selectman Jakoby: Right, right, right.

Chairman Dumont: So, for me, I almost tend to lean, okay, we should at least give them a calendar, one calendar year. But that's something else that we'll have to look at.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, I think it's important, you know, me. I like clear policies and ordinances that help people. And that make it easy for them to understand what they want to do.

Elvis Dhima: I'm reading it and I'm like, oof.

Selectman Jakoby: And, you know, I think, you know, on the form you have day, week, year, I mean, you know, a month, a quarter are the other two. Because I think some of those businesses are seasonal. They are. They're really, you know, you're not going to do a food truck in the middle of a freaking snowstorm. But you might do it in the spring for three months. Yeah, so I just, that's the only recommendation that I have.

Elvis Dhima: You're not selling ice cream in the middle of the winter, though.

Selectman Jakoby: You are here, in New Hampshire. But, you know, I'm going. But anyway, that's, those are, I think that's great. Look at other ones. And I do want to promote people coming here and being able to do business. And I want them to make sure we know they are.

Elvis Dhima: I mean, is that the consent of the Board? Do they want this to be business friendly? I need some kind of feedback from you about which way, okay? So, is that the consent?

Selectman Vurgarouplos: Yeah, no. I'm in agreeance with this. I think this is great. For lack of better terms, it's kind of like a feeder program, right? So, like, Joe, whoever, decides, wow, I'll give this a try. I make a heck of a good brisket, you know? But he doesn't really understand business and all that. So, he's got to work through it. He's got to grind through it. And rather than nickel and diming them, you know, every 30 days or whatever policies, it gives them a chance to breathe and have that liquidity there. And then, obviously, if they hit that threshold, we say, all right, you've been here for this amount of time, you've got to make a choice.

Elvis Dhima: Yes.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: But I say it's kind of like a feeder program, right? Because you're bringing in those, you're not bringing in business, you're bringing in ideas. So, like, I think it's a really good initiative to allow people to have those ideas and try to develop them to see if they can work out as a business plan.

Elvis Dhima: And we've got a lot of folks that come in that are trying new things, to your point. And, you know, we'd rather see them focusing on what they're trying to do versus, like, worrying about what they need to meet here. So that's the intent, like, focus on what you need to do, which is your business you're trying to start up, and then we're just going to support you as much as we can. And that's basically it. That's what we're trying to do. We're looking for ways to make Hudson, I guess, more accessible, if that makes sense.

Chairman Dumont: I think that kind of puts it perfectly, because a lot of people don't realize, too, when you talk about site planning, you figure, okay, well, yeah, you just got to go get a plan. Well, in actuality, you know, it's \$20,000 or more to just get that plan, depending on your size. And if you are just, you know, Joe's brisket or whatever, chances are you don't have 20 grand just lying around. And there's no guarantee that you get it approved. Right. You know, you're throwing that, hoping you get it approved, but there's also chances where you don't. So at least this gives somebody some breathing room, like Mr. Dhima said, and yourself.

Elvis Dhima: But we also have folks, to your point, Mr. Chairman, that they start the process, they see what it's going to take, and they just walk away, they go somewhere else. Because I can't wait six weeks or eight weeks without knowing exactly which way it's going to go, and they move on.

Selectman Jakoby: I like to see more reasons for people to stop in Hudson.

Elvis Dhima: I just want the brisket.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, yeah. So that's my other thing. It's like, let us be a stop. Let us be a stop and not a pass-through.

Elvis Dhima: Pioneers. The pioneers. Giving everyone a chance to see.

Selectman Jakoby: Exactly, so I just wanted to add that.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. So having said all that, I think we're all pretty much, you know.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to authorize staff to begin a comprehensive review of the Hawker, Peddler, and Vendor licensing process and associated ordinance, and to schedule public meeting notifications for January 13, 2026, and January 27, 2026, to discuss proposed updates. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

**B. Drainage Pipe Repair – DPW/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much, Mr. Dhima. We do have you next up as well with Director of Public Works, Jay Twardosky, for drainage pipe repair.

Jay Twardosky: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Board. So recently we identified a drainage pipe that outflows directly into the river between the twin bridges out here that is in need of repair. Right now, it's an aluminum pipe. It's somewhere around 18 feet in the ground. It takes all the water from Central Street, Ferry Street, and Library Street. And the most cost-effective way to fix that is a pipe liner, cure-in-place pipe liner like we did out on Adams Drive. We have a couple of companies that we use that are pre-selected that we went out to bid for a couple of years ago, and our request tonight is to use one of those companies, sole source this, rather than spend the time to go out to bid. This has to be done while the river is still low before it starts raising up again because once the water level gets to that pipe, we won't be able to touch it until it drops again.

Roy Sorenson: What is it? Corrugated galvanized pipe?

Jay Twardosky: It's aluminum, corrugated aluminum.

Elvis Dhima: Another thing to your motions, so when we went out, as the Public Works Director said, we were only able to get one of the vendors to respond to us, and that was for \$42,000 and change. As of Monday, we had another vendor that reached out to us, the second one we replied to, and that cost was?

Jay Twardosky: \$108,250.

Elvis Dhima: So, tonight you're not really sole sourcing it as of Monday, and I am sorry we couldn't put it at the last minute, but I think if you want to change the motion tonight to say to the lowest qualified contractor, I think you can change the motion to that. Basically, Vortex is what you're seeing right now in your packet, and National Water was the other one, but we waited over a month for them, and they finally submitted it Monday, but did not make it in the packet because it was on Thursday. But we went out to two, we finally got two back, and the one we're hiring tonight is less than half of the other contractor that we've used in the past. This contractor that's being presented tonight is also the low bid for the Adams Drive culvert, which was quite a lot compared to the other one. So, we're hiring the most cost-effective one. We did go out to at least two pre-qualified, and we're hiring the low bid.

Jay Twardosky: They're very professional. That Adams Drive one, as you remember, was a 5-foot diameter culvert. They were in and out of there, very professional, beautiful job. They do great work at a reasonable price.

Elvis Dhima: The other thing, too, is we're using drainage capital reserve funds for this, which we raise every year, every March, so we have the money.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Obviously, this is a time-critical issue because we're fighting seasonal rising of the river. So, I'm for this. I'm just interested in how long do you think this project will take to accomplish?

Jay Twardosky: First of all, they have to order the liner once we award it to them. That usually takes two to three weeks. During that time, we're going to pre-clean the drain line and have it ready to go. And once they're here and set up, they'll be done in less than two days.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay, excellent.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to say, and you answered it, that this is the company that you've worked really well with. We've heard all good things about it. I appreciate that you did get two bids. I appreciate that. And I am in full support of this, of going with Vortex Services.

Roy Sorenson: So, is it 180 feet? Is that a manhole in the middle of the field?

Jay Twardosky: Correct, from the manhole to the river.

Roy Sorenson: What do the other three legs look like? Did you camera those?

Jay Twardosky: Yes, those are all in good shape right now.

Roy Sorenson: Especially going under the road?

Jay Twardosky: Correct. There's two going under the road. One goes right up the center, a median.

Roy Sorenson: But the two under the road are in good shape?

Jay Twardosky: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: We don't want to have to tear up that bridge that we just saw.

Jay Twardosky: Well, and this stops us from having to get environmental permits for digging up to the river.

Chairman Dumont: No, I think the lining is a good way to go, no matter what.

Selectman Jakoby: I think that's great.

Jay Twardosky: Which can take up to six months.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: What's the life cycle of a liner?

Elvis Dhima: 50 years, 100 years.

Jay Twardosky: It's a secure-in-place fiberglass liner. It's actually about three-quarters of an inch thick when they're done. It's hot flown, right?

Roy Sorenson: That's quite a process.

Elvis Dhima: Some of these can handle up to, like, 11,000 pounds per square inch. It's unbelievable.

Jay Twardosky: We might try and get HGTV out there to do the actual process. The Adams Drive one, they were out there filming beforehand, but this one I'd like to see if we can get them out there to film the actual process so you guys can see exactly what it entails.

Roy Sorenson: Can you send the Development Services Director into the pipe first?

Elvis Dhima: If I can fit.

Selectman Guessferd: 30 inches, come on.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I want you to push that line.

Jay Twardosky: A little butter.

Chairman Dumont: It's probably going off the liner, it's like glass.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, it's fine.

Chairman Dumont: Two quick questions. So, you did get the second bid. I know one company that was pretty active in the air before. I know Mr. Dhima's worked on Keystone Pipeline, are they still doing stuff in the air? Did you get a chance to reach out to them?

Elvis Dhima: No, not around here, no. We had another, like, a Green Mountain thing. They kind of go. These two that we mentioned tonight are the ones that usually are basically Brox and Continental when it comes to the lining. When you talk to paving, these guys are basically the main ones. One thing is Vortex is getting a little bit more work from the town than National. So National did our flagstone. We used ARPA money back during COVID.

They're just not getting as much work because they're not the low bid on most of the projects. So, Vortex seems to be taking the lead. But these two are the ones that we've gone back and forth on using, and we've never had an issue. And we need to make sure that they're done right the first time because it's very difficult to go in and put another liner in. And every time we put a liner in, you take a look at the capacity of the pipe. So, we want to make sure we get it done right the first time. Vortex was also used for the flume, you know, the sewer flume going to Nashua, the 16-inch and 18-inch. Our problem was basically, like, flawless when public works worked with them directly. Good company.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, nothing against Vortex. I just know Keystone did a lot for Nashua a few years back, and they did a couple things for us. I don't know if they were still around just for comparable numbers.

Elvis Dhima: Have they done anything? I don't think they've done anything.

Chairman Dumont: I know they're out of New York, so you're accurate in whether they're not around here.

Jay Twardosky: No, they haven't. National Water Main we've used a number of times. We use them out on Park Ave. and commercial. They're out of Nashua.

Chairman Dumont: Well, that's fine. I just wanted to ask the question. The other question I had was the lineal foot price. How similar was this to the Adam Drive one?

Elvis Dhima: So, it's a different diameter, right? So, the five-foot diameter that we had there is completely different than this.

Chairman Dumont: The only reason I ask is they gave us a list of prices last time when we did that Adam Drive. They broke it down for different pipes. I didn't know if they were able to maintain.

Elvis Dhima: We have the same thing. Yeah, we were able to get the price for them, and I think I can tell you right now what it is.

Chairman Dumont: The only reason why I bring that up is because obviously that's another benefit that happened a couple years back.

Elvis Dhima: I did the number, too. So, it was \$42,300, \$42,300 divided by 180 feet. So, \$235 foot of linear foot. That's what it comes down to for a 30-inch.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, okay.

Roy Sorenson: So, if I may, Mr. Chair, just attach that second quote you got as well.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, we will to the bid, yes, absolutely. I meant to bring it tonight, and it's just one thing led to another, so I apologize. Yeah, I got it. And the form as well. We have it.

Selectman Guessferd: I didn't see the form in here, so.

Elvis Dhima: No, it wasn't included. I meant to hand it over to you because I didn't want to add it to the last-minute confusion, but what we'll do is we're going to add this to the packet.

Selectman Jakoby: Add it to the packet, yes.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, this form. No, they're talking about the bid, the actual bid that we got from National. So, we'll include that in. It will be part of the packet.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Do we have a motion?

Roy Sorenson: We have two motions.

Selectman Guessferd: Or a motion, just real quick. So, are we really waiving the bid process?

Elvis Dhima: No, you're not.

Selectman Jakoby: We're not.

Elvis Dhima: No, you're not. So, you're going to change the motion, too.

Selectman Jakoby: We're no longer waiving it.

Selectman Guessferd: Right, right. So, there's no need. Even the way it was, I think you still went out to the vendors.

Elvis Dhima: Correct, correct.

Selectman Guessferd: And just one of them responded.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, and you filled out the form.

Elvis Dhima: So, then that's exactly it because we couldn't get it. So, what happened is Monday we got finally the quote saying here's what we can do it for. And I wanted to explain it tonight basically saying that I don't think you're sole sourcing at this point, you're hiring the low bid.

Selectman Jakoby: Exactly.

Elvis Dhima: And so, I would recommend you have only one motion tonight. And that motion is to hire basically the low bid.

Roy Sorenson: Second motion.

Elvis Dhima: Yes, second motion, yeah.

Chairman Dumont: And the other thing just before, just to stress obviously in case if anybody wants it, please make sure that it gets added obviously to our paperwork in the minutes because obviously it's not included in the agenda so people might be wondering why we didn't do that step.

Elvis Dhima: Absolutely, it'll be done. And I apologize for the last minute with the public works director. It just, it happened at the last minute. I'm like is this for, whatever. We'll make it right.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to approve the expenditure of up to \\$42,300 for the repair of 180 feet of 30-inch drainage main to be awarded to Vortex Services LLC, who was the low bidder of two bidders, using funds from drainage reserve account 20-3916-2701-000-743 as recommended by the Public Works Director and the Director of Development Services.](#)

### **C. Request to Apply for Grant – Police/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: All right, gentlemen. Thank you very much, guys. All right, next up we have a request for a grant. I will recognize Chief Cayot.

Chief Cayot: Thank you, Chairman. I'm here requesting permission to apply for the Patrick Leahy Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant. This is a grant that provides up to 50% reimbursement for the bulletproof vests that we buy. So even though it's only a partial grant, it's something we're going to buy either way. So, this would just be reimbursement to help cover those costs. And as you'll see on here, once we apply for this, it's due by December 19th. But then this is good for two years, so any vests we buy during that two-year period, if we're accepted into the grant, we can request reimbursement for.

Chairman Dumont: And to your point, this was figured in for your budgeting anyways in the police uniform.

Chief Cayot: Correct, yes. New officers, we buy them out of our budget from there, and there's a capital reserve fund for replacement vests for officers we have. So, this would just help supplement that.

Chairman Dumont: It would offset it.

Chief Cayot: Offset it.

Chairman Dumont: Perfect. Questions, comments?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Chief, I think I asked you this during one of the budget meetings, but where are we on the life cycle of our current vests?

Chief Cayot: So not everybody is in the same life cycle. So right now, we just actually 14 of us were just sized because we're at the end of the five years. They have a five-year life expectancy. So, 14 of us are coming up on

the end of that, so we're going to be buying 14 replacement vests within the next month or two. And then we just hired three officers, so we just had to buy three vests for them as well.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay. Thank you. I just thought that's important so the public knows because these were going to be expended either way. This is going to save us money. So, I'm on board with this.

Chairman Dumont: Saves us money and protects the guys.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Motions, comments?

Selectman Jakoby: I'll make that motion.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I'll second that.

Selectman Jakoby: Do I have to put 50 percent?

Roy Sorenson: I would say, yeah, use the 50 percent. Is that accurate?

Chief Cayot: It's up to 50 percent.

Roy Sorenson: All right, so up to 50 percent.

Selectman Jakoby: This up to 50 percent grant for each vest purchased in the two years.

Chief Cayot: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: For two years.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, for the Police Department to apply for the Patrick Leahy Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program Grant which provides a reimbursement of 50% within the next two years for the purchase of bullet proof vests. Motion carried, 4-0.

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you.

#### **D. Emergency Operations Plan – Fire/Decision/Presentation**

Chairman Dumont: Next up we have the Emergency Operations Plan. I will recognize the Fire Chief, Fire Chief Tice.

Chief Tice: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good evening, everyone, again.

Roy Sorenson: One second, Chief. Technical difficulties. All right, Chief. All yours.

Chief Tice: All right, thank you. So, we have recently updated our Emergency Operations Plan, and tonight I'm going to be asking you to adopt it. But first I would like to provide you a quick overview, kind of the highlights. I will try to keep this a high-level overview so we don't get hung up in the weeds, but I wanted to give you an idea of what this plan is and what's included in it. So, we talk about the purpose of the plan. Ultimately, everything we do in emergency management is to save lives, save property, protect public health. And in this case, we want to make sure the government continues to function, that's the important part as well. Okay, this plan can be used in cases of natural disasters or any disasters that we face, an emergency situation. Typically, the type of stuff that we would see here locally would be severe weather, incidents, pandemic, or some sort of cyber-attack. How this helps us is it coordinates the local response by providing a framework for the responsible parties of how we're going to operate, identify resources that we can connect with needs, and it defines roles and responsibilities. During what we call blue sky days, which is our normal days, like days like today, times like this, we don't have emergencies going, this plan helps us to plan and identify planning assumptions and potential hazards to better prepare for emergency situations that could come in the future. This plan aligns with the state plan, which aligns with the National Incident Management System. So, after September 11th, the federal government developed a very comprehensive plan of how they're going to respond to these large-scale incidents, and then the states follow through with their plans, and then down to the local municipalities. The intention is as we outstrip our resources and we're working with the next form or the next higher level of government, everyone's working by kind of the same framework and working off the same sheet of music. This chapter also includes what they call

the situation, which is really an overview of the town. So, it talks about population, the type of population, demographics, how the government's set up, how town departments are set up, our transportation network, the primary roads such as 111, 102, our proximity to Route 93 and Route 3, natural features such as a mix of commercial, residential, rural, fairly flat topography, Merrimack River, those types of things. It talks about planning assumptions. So anytime you're going to develop a plan, you have to make some assumptions of what you're planning for. So, the planning assumptions in this plan is an emergency can happen at any time and it may be significant. The town is responsible to start emergency mitigation, emergency operations, except in a national security incident, that's the responsibility of the federal government with, of course, all levels of government working together. Each level of government's expected to use their level of resources before reaching out to regional assets and then up to the state to request resources. And then the state can reach out to regional partners, you know, with Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine, and then they can reach out to the federal government for additional resources if we have a disaster that's that big. We'll also be working with some private and some non-governmental entities who help provide resources such as the American Red Cross. Again, the government needs to continue to function. That's a priority. Our citizens expect to be communicated with, so we have to make sure we're including that in our plans and paying attention to that. All levels of government work together, and the governor has the ability to declare a state of emergency. The next chapter talks about our critical infrastructure, which here at Hudson is the Emergency Operations Center. The primary EOC is at the police station. We do have the ability to use the fire station as a backup EOC if there's a problem with the police station. We always want to have redundancy as much as possible. It talks about our shelters, which here you will not see us do a shelter at Hudson simply because we don't have the resources. We can do a warming center or a cooling center, which gives people the opportunity to come either get some warm-up, cool-off, depending upon the time of year. We would reach out in this case, this is an example, we would reach out to regional partners and non-governmental organizations. We would use Nashua. It's run by the Nashua Regional Public Health, which we are a part of, and then they are supported by the Red Cross, and that's typically at Nashua North High School. We would direct any of our people over there if they needed sheltering. It also points out our local medical facilities and the Nashua hospitals as our primary transportation destination. It talks about how the police, fire, public works, and our dispatch centers are set up. Then it talks about hazard identification and risk assessment. It takes this information from our hazard mitigation plan, specifically directed towards what type of incidents we should be considering and how it might affect our critical infrastructure, again, locally, extreme weather, infectious diseases, are our top and potential for cyber-attack, are our top hazards we need to be prepared for. So, there's two ways that we will know that we have to activate the plan and initiate an emergency operations center. One would be planning that comes, you know, something that's foreseeable. We've got a major weather event coming. During COVID, we kind of saw that the virus was starting to spread. It came from the west to the east, so we had a little bit of time to start planning, knowing it was coming. The other way, something's going to happen suddenly. Typically, police and fire are going to respond to it, and then myself, the police chief, our command staffs, will find out through our normal operations through our dispatch centers. And then either way we are notified about it, then we'll start making plans and calling in who we need to and activating the parts that we need to. If any of you have read the plan, it's a very long document. The biggest piece is the emergency support functions, but this is not a, you know, we're activating the EOC. We've got to do all of this. It's scalable, and it's modular. So, we use the pieces and parts that we need based on the type of emergency we have and what needs we think we're going to have to deal with, and then we can grow it if we need to. So, it's not, you know, complete activation every time. We do what we need to do. Sometimes it's, you know, a virtual, as easy as police chief, fire chief, and the public works director having conversations by phone and keeping in touch and just monitoring what's going on in town, you know, as opposed to an actual EOC operation. From there, we would call in any of the other department heads that we need, and then they would be responsible. They still run their departments in an emergency, and they would call in any other staff they would need to help with the EOC. There's five phases of emergency management. Prevention, which is where we're trying to, you know, stop something bad from happening. Mitigation, which is trying to lessen the effects of something that is going to happen. Preparedness is training, planning, trying to be ready to respond if something happens, and then, of course, response. Something has happened, and we need to go deal with it. And then recovery, which also includes demobilization. That's trying to get the affected areas, whatever's happened, back to a normal state. And this can take, you know, depending, you know, an ice storm might take a week to two to three weeks, where some other major disasters could take months, sometimes years. We don't have those types of incidents, but you look at something like

Katrina, which I forget how long ago it was, and they're still trying to get some of that repaired. And then demobilization, as we get back to normal, we can start releasing resources and getting our operations back to normal. So, operations, again, government continuing to function, providing training for EOC staff, which we have. I'm working on that for January, working with the state to get a training class in here for EOC staff, continuously reviewing the plan. Each department is expected to have their own policies and procedures, and back up EOC, again, for redundancy. There is a line of succession. So, each community is required by law to establish an emergency management director. If that doesn't happen, it falls to the chairman of the board. So, it's also a line of succession. So, if I wasn't available, Chief Kale wasn't available, the Chairman of the Board would become responsible for emergency management and then the vice chair. That also provides a succession plan for government, where you have a chair and a vice chair to keep the government functioning. I'll try to explain how an emergency declaration works. We have a major event, and we're going for reimbursement from the federal government. It goes by dollar thresholds by the state and then by each county. So, if we have a major disaster, and that could be anything from a major snowstorm, an ice storm, anything, all the departments, it's important that we track and save records for what we spent, whether it was manpower costs, whether we had to use supplies, whether we had to use a contractor for something, and coordinate all those costs. And then I would send that to the state, and they'd lump that in with everybody else from Hillsborough County to see if the county reached that threshold. And then to see if the state reached the overall threshold to try to get some funds back from the federal government. So that's why you see a lot of disaster declarations, they'll go by county. And I think you probably see that with the thing that just came out yesterday or today for some of the droughts up north. The three counties were named as disaster areas. Things to keep in mind for logistics, for EOC staff and other staff that isn't normally on a 24-7 type schedule, like police and fire, we might need to keep food and sleeping arrangements for them. All departments need to keep the EMD informed of their needs. All departments are expected to pool their resources and use existing resources as much as possible. One of the things you saw in COVID when we had people come give donations, we had people making hand sanitizer. They would come and donate it. We established a central supply point in a process where any of the departments needed something, they would submit a request, and we would get it out to them. Because one of the big things in a disaster is being able to have the resources necessary to help where the need is. Again, we have an issue, we have a disaster, we use our normal mutual aid, our regional partners, then we can reach out to the state, and then the state will reach out from there to get us resources. We communicate with the state EOC. If they're activated through WebEOC, which is an Internet-based platform that we can give them, we log into it, we can give them status updates, road closures, a lot of information. That's also where we would request resources from the state. During times like this when the EOC is not staffed, if we had something happen locally and we needed their help, we have contact through the Homeland Security duty officer who can then help us get resources. Again, plan management. Plans are no good if you don't update them, so we're just doing a big update now. But annually we need to look at it, make sure the planning assumptions and situations are still current. We need to exercise it to make sure when something happens we're ready to respond and deal with it. And then if we do have a major activation or a major incident, we need to learn from that experience and conduct an after-action report. That gives us the opportunity to look at how we responded, learn from what went well, what didn't go well, and then make adjustments so we get better for the future. These are all the ESFs, and I will not get into them because this is really getting into the nitty-gritty. But again, we have playbooks. It basically spells out what each ESF is responsible for and who they report up to. And again, that's all-encompassing, so each situation might not call for all of that, but it gives them kind of a playbook to say, okay, this is what I'm responsible for, and a checklist to make sure they're on top of what they need to be taken care of. Chapter 6 is the resources, and it's a very comprehensive resource list of a lot of different companies and resources, like heavy equipment companies, stuff like that, in the local area with contact information that in an emergency we could reach out and use them to help us mitigate an emergency. And there's some documentation in Chapter 7. Some of these forms, either the chairman or vice chair, and I think there's a couple of the whole Board that I'll need you to sign for adoption. I'll need also the department heads. They'll be signing off the review of the policy. On another documentation, there is a form that attests that we do follow the National Incident Management Act arrangement system, so that's all important. There's documentation in there where we can document that we've done the annual review and track that. This chapter also provides a lot of stats on the town, such as population, square mileage, those types of things. There's a long list of definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations. Again, when you get into the federal government, sometimes it's like speaking a different language, so they give you all that backup information. They

also give a list of laws because this is covered, emergency management is covered under RSA 21 in the state law that gives us certain authorities of how we operate in an emergency. It also calls out that we follow the incident command system, which the incident command system is a method to provide command and control of an incident to allow for safety and those types of things, and we do follow that as well. Chapter 8 just provides templates for some forms that we could use if needed, and that is the plan. Again, that is a very quick, high-level overview of what is a very long plan.

Selectman Guessferd: Yes, it is.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions, comments? That's pretty comprehensive. Motions?

Roy Sorenson: So, looking for a motion to adopt the EOP, the New Hampshire EOP plan as presented.

Selectman Jakoby: I just have a couple questions. Go ahead. So, I just am very thankful that this is before us today because the last one was 2013.

Chief Tice: Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: So, part of what you said was that, are parts of this a living document that you change regularly or you review it?

Chief Tice: Review it. I don't foresee it changing a lot, but I think it needs to be reviewed annually to ensure that no situations have changed.

Selectman Jakoby: Right. So, we're reviewing it annually, but the revisions are... Are you doing a larger review on a different yearly...

Chief Tice: Every five years.

Selectman Jakoby: Every five years. Okay. So, we're going to stick to the every five years. Awesome. That's what I'm looking forward to. Thanks.

Chief Tice: Oh, I'm sorry. You were in the middle of a motion.

Chairman Dumont: No, no, no. You can speak freely.

Chief Tice: I just wanted to... I don't know if you noticed it, but I thought it was worth mentioning. You kind of put in perspective the intent of a plan like this. It's by Dwight Eisenhower. It says, plans are worthless, but planning is everything. There's a very great distinction, because when you are planning for an emergency, you must start with this one thing. The very definition of an emergency is it is unexpected, therefore it's not going to happen the way you are planning.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Chief Tice: So, the plan is not meant to be a you do A, you do B, you do C. It's a framework of how we operate, and we use it to adapt it to whatever situation we're dealing with. Plans are made to be changed.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I just have one question.

Selectman Jakoby: Can I just follow up on mine?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, go ahead and follow up.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay, yep. And that's what I appreciated, that this can size to what you need and then build from there, and it is a plan, and it's a guideline. And I just appreciate knowing that you're going to review it every five years to ensure that with technology and changes that that's updated.

Chairman Dumont: Mr. Sorensen then Selectman Vurgaropoulos.

Roy Sorenson: So, we'll review it every five years.

Chief Tice: Yeah, it will be a re-adoption every five years, but it will get reviewed every year.

Roy Sorenson: What about a new plan, though? Is that every ten years?

Chief Tice: Every five years.

Roy Sorenson: It's every five years. And the grants are made available every five years?

Chief Tice: There are some grants. We do not have a grant.

Roy Sorenson: You do not have a grant for this one?

Chief Tice: We do not have a grant for this one.

Roy Sorenson: Interesting.

Chief Tice: Part of the problem is when you get that far out of date, they don't give you grants.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Now we're at 2013. I was kind of curious. You said we don't shelter, but we would send people to Nashua High School where they have the ability to shelter. We don't have the ability to do that in Alvirne?

Chief Tice: We have the space, the amount of people that it would take. So, to be a true shelter, you have to have sleeping facilities, you have to have cooking facilities, bathing facilities, facilities for dogs, you have to have the ability to provide medical assistance. When you get to a shelter, there's a lot to it, and that's why I say...

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay. No, I was curious. I appreciate that, because in my head, initially, I'm thinking disaster relief, like cots, you know, and everything like that.

Chief Tice: To be a true shelter, there's a lot to it. Thank you.

Selectman Jakoby: So, speaking of that, what came to my head, you know, being someone who lived on Long Island, and I knew there was no way to get off the island in an emergency, if the bridges are closed, then the shelter, then there's shelter in the other direction?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: That's what the boat's for.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah. No, but I'm serious. There are two bridges. The third one is way down. And you're talking about relying on going over a river.

Chief Tice: Any of the shelters provided by the Nashua Public Health is going to be on the other side of the river because we're pretty much the end of the line, us and Pelham.

Selectman Jakoby: As for that grouping.

Chief Tice: ... for the Nashua Regional ...

Selectman Jakoby: That's what I thought.

Chairman Dumont: And to that point, I would say that if those bridges went down, without a major problem like that, Hudson is severely crippled for a number of reasons. And I think it's important for everybody to be aware.

Selectman Jakoby: Be very aware.

Chairman Dumont: Which is why it was so critical that we repair those two bridges this year. So, while it was painful, if we had lost those, emergency services would be significantly depreciated.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Chief Tice: Yeah, because that's also how we get to the hospitals where we transport between 90% and 95% of our patients.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah. I just want to remind people that we are on the other side of the river, as I like to say.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. So, I think we're ready.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to adopt the Hudson, New Hampshire, Emergency Operations Plan, EOP, 2025. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much, Chief.

Chief Tice: Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Appreciate it. There's a lot to get through. All right.

Selectman Jakoby: Start all over again.

Selectman Guessferd: Yes, and now we've got the pages to sign later.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah.

**F. Hudson Speedway 2026 Permit – Administration/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up is the item F, the Hudson Speedway 2026 Permit, and I will recognize Town Administrator Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, before you tonight is a request from the Hudson Speedway to operate up until April. You can see their dates, which they submitted. This will take them through basically the month of April, which they are insured for, and they're able to do that in our ordinance. They'll come back in the spring for their spring and summer schedule moving forward. So, they're looking for us to give them the permission to do that through April. What do they do over the winter? They actually do some snow racing from what I heard.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, it's on there.

Selectman Guessferd: I was not looking through all that.

Roy Sorenson: There's only a couple of dates. One is the 18th, one is March 15th, and then April. You know, the weather kind of opens up a little bit.

Chairman Dumont: I will say I know that obviously it tends to be a very loud hobby. However, growing up in Hudson, seeing what that speedway was and how it was beginning to dilapidated and really underutilized, what the new owners have done over there is truly fantastic. They have a school that they're running over there as well. If you guys recall, I think we took that up last year and gave them permission for that. So, I think that's just a great space over there. So, with that, any motions, comments?

[Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to approve the Hudson Speedway License to Operate a Motor Vehicle Racetrack for the 2026 racing season through the end of April 2026 with the conditions required by the police chief and Inspectional Services Division. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

**G. Domestic Partners Health Insurance – Administration/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: Next up we have Domestic Partners Health Insurance, and we'll turn it back over to Mr. Sorensen.

Roy Sorenson: All right, thank you. So, we've had some employees come to me asking or inquiring whether we had or could add Domestic Partners Insurance to our current binder of health insurance. So currently it's not in our binder. HealthTrust, who is our health insurance provider, does offer it. We would have to add that as such. So, what is Domestic Partners Insurance? The best detail to read this is if you go to the affidavit that the folks who want to sign up for this have to fill that out, and they're legally bound by what's in this declaration of fact, as you can see, so you hit your points one through seven. Basically, these are couples. They're not married, but they have been living together more than 12 months. They would have to prove that, and then they would have to follow up on that requirement as they move along in their relationship. So, the cost to the town would be, in essence, you may have an individual who's on the single plan, okay, and they want to add their significant other, who they're calling their domestic partner. So, they'd be up to a family plan because there could be children involved as well. You can't have it both ways. So, in other words, if you already have coverage through marriage and or have to still represent that coverage if you're divorced per se, but you're covering, you can't add someone in that aspect. It has to be one or the other. And basically, they are affirming through an affidavit that what they're telling us is truthful, so that counts for something because that is a legal document. But as you can see kind of how it's laid out here in the declaration of fact, these are the requirements they have to meet. Some towns do this. Some towns don't do this. It's really the purview of the Board. Is it an opportunity for your staff? I

would say yes. Is it a recruiting tool? Perhaps. But it's not a definitive type measure by any means. It's really at the discretion of the Board to do it. But the cost, if you say, well, what is the cost, it's really elevating that plan, which could happen at any time. You could have, you know, police could hire a young patrol officer. He could get married and have the family plan. So, it all adds in anyways. So, if you look at it along those lines. Do you know if the schools do it at all?

Stephen Meyer: I have no idea.

Roy Sorenson: But anyways, I thought I'd bring it forward. I have had a couple inquiries on this, and I said I would bring it to the Board's attention and see if you would entertain to add this as part of our coverage.

Selectman Jakoby: I have a question. So, we have a single plan and a family plan?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, so you have single, you have two.

Selectman Jakoby: You have a couple.

Roy Sorenson: And then you have family. And there's three different plans as well.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay.

Roy Sorenson: All right, so it's not one plan, one, two, and family. And there's also three plans in there.

Selectman Jakoby: Right. And then they have a choice within that.

Roy Sorenson: Correct. So, you would pick your plan first.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Roy Sorenson: But all three plans would offer for that ability to do so.

Selectman Jakoby: So, by doing this, it would either be, then they would be a couple or a family plan.

Roy Sorenson: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to make that clear.

Chairman Dumont: Okay, questions or comments?

Selectman Guessferd: So just to clarify, so there is a cost to the town, and there is a cost to the individual to upgrade to that plan?

Roy Sorenson: Correct. The individual would have to pay that extra, their 20% as well.

Selectman Guessferd: Right.

Roy Sorenson: Which would be increased.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. So, I have a couple of concerns about it. One of them would be, you know, who's going to monitor? HealthTrust isn't going to keep an eye on who's living together for how long, and could this possibly be abused, which I think it could be, obviously. Yeah, they sign an affidavit, but that doesn't always mean that somebody is truthful, as we've seen in the past. So that's one big concern for me. The other part of it is, I don't know, yeah, how many towns do you know roughly around us that do this? Do you have any idea?

Roy Sorenson: I don't have a – we actually asked HealthTrust that, and all they said was other municipalities are doing it, they would not tell us which ones.

Chairman Dumont: So, I don't quite think, I don't hear of it too much here in New Hampshire. That's the only reason why I asked. I'm sure that some people must do it.

Roy Sorenson: No, we would have to certainly monitor it internally. It may even require a separate policy, I guess, perhaps. But, yeah, I mean, it's based off of a – you know, if you read the declaration of fact, it's based on the 12 consecutive months, right? So, you would want to make sure that that continues throughout that, and or if it did break, that there was separation given.

Chairman Dumont: And that's kind of one thing I'm wondering, okay, well, how do you prove that? So, I know, obviously, with anything, you're looking for a utility bill or something along those lines. But then I guess you're asking a member of staff to collect 12 months of utility bills. So, you know, there's more work on their end to try to figure that out. We've talked about HR. I've talked to Mr. Sorensen about this. Obviously, that's where that would fall if we were fortunate enough to get that position funded. I don't know. I have some concerns about it, I guess, but we'll see what the Board thinks.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Would there be a way along the lines of what you're saying, Mr. Chairman, like to monitor it? Like, obviously, it's going to cost the town to monitor. Is there any way to offset that by creating a web page where we write it into this motion, not the motion, but the guidance, where they have to supply that and, like, upload it to maintain?

Roy Sorensen: Like an online docu-server?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, where they would have to submit monthly to show that proof, and if there's a lapse, it's a break in the coverage thesis.

Roy Sorensen: Yeah, I think, ultimately, it's going to come down to a maybe.

Selectman Jakoby: A policy.

Roy Sorensen: Yeah. Yeah. Go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I think there's a couple of things here. Am I in support of this in principle? Yes. But I think there's a lot more that needs to be put into place before we take action on this.

Roy Sorensen: That's too simple with the affidavit.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, the affidavit is too simple. I think it's important also within our hiring guidelines that there's a commitment to truthfulness and, you know, like if you misrepresent yourself on an affidavit or something to this effect, that there can be consequences. So, I think we have to put some things in place in order to then look at this. Also, when we put this in place, would this be at the time of renewal, like this time of year?

Roy Sorensen: Yes, open enrollment.

Selectman Jakoby: So, open enrollment. So, I don't want to act quickly to get this in place for now. I think this is something we need to look at over the next year and possibly have a more comprehensive proposal, because we may or may not agree with it, but a proposal with those safeguards in place for next enrollment.

Chairman Dumont: And to that point, I would agree. I don't think even if you did adopt this time, I don't think anybody, it's not a life-changing event, so nobody would be eligible to make that change.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah. Because it would only be new hire, which is open enrollment automatically, and annual.

Roy Sorensen: Yeah, well, I mean, we would have to talk with HealthTrust on that for the next open enrollment if we were going to do that, but I don't think we're there yet.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I agree. We need to develop some background for this to support it.

Selectman Jakoby: Because I think some of our policies are not clear enough to really make sure that our employees are clear on our expectations of them and going forward, especially those. So, we need a little more policy in place.

Roy Sorensen: I don't disagree with you at all on that statement.

Chairman Dumont: All right. With that, if there's no other questions or comments, I'm going to table that. We'll come together at a future date and continue to work on this. All right.

#### H. Warrant Articles Update – Administration/Discussion

Chairman Dumont: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Sorensen. Next up, we have the warrant article updates. We do have some housekeeping items that we'll turn over to Mr. Sorensen. We'll take those up first. You've got a handout, everybody. Mr. Sorensen, keep it going.

Roy Sorensen: All right. So, before we get started, we have some action items, and I apologize because we didn't take these items up at the last meeting. The first is, and I handed this out so you have it, so the three motions on there speaks to the default budget.

So, we need to actually make official motions to approve the fiscal year 2027 general fund default budget, as well as the sewer and water. So, the three motions are there. If you want to ask someone to take those motions, Mr. Chair, and then take a vote, I would appreciate that.

Chairman Dumont: All right. You have them in front of you. Selectman Jakoby go right ahead.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to approve the Fiscal Year 2027 General Fund Default Budget in the amount of \\$41,262,191. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, to approve the Fiscal Year 2027 Sewer Fund Default Budget in the amount of \\$2,364,991. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to approve the Fiscal Year 2027 Water Fund Default Budget in the amount of \\$3,992,672. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: The next one up I will turn back over to Mr. Sorensen to speak to.

Roy Sorensen: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you haven't had a chance to watch the Budget Committee meeting last week, I would ask you to do so. One of the questions that came up was the Budget Committee did ask real questions regarding the finance budgeting software, which we budgeted for \$175,000. They did not remove it from the budget per se. Some of the questions were along the lines of do we feel confident in that number? Would we be best served to pull it out of the operating budget and perhaps put it up on a warrant article? I can tell you with certainty at this point that I am not confident with that number and I'll take the blame for that and the staff as well for due diligence. So, I would make a recommendation to this board tonight to remove this altogether. Now, you can't remove it from the budget. The Budget Committee has the budget right now. But when we go back to the Budget Committee next week, they can remove it and that will adjust the bottom-line budget number for the general fund. We definitely need it. However, I have since received two quotes and they're well north of \$175,000. Okay. So, what I would say is as we look forward to next year to put together an RFP committee, not unlike what the schools did, and then generate real quotes to have those in place because I think this will be a warrant article maybe for FY28 or 29. And I think the price is going to be more. We can't get everything we want out of that. And the last thing I want to do is say, okay, \$175,000, we saved the world, we got this new fancy software, and then I come back the next year and say I need another \$250,000. So, I don't want to do that. I don't think that's fair to anyone. So, I think the best way to approach this right now is to kind of just pull this back and then regroup.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: I just want to say that I appreciate Mr. Sorensen's honesty and the staff as well with this. I think it's extremely transparent to let the voters know that this is not reflective of what we believe the true cost would be, so we're not just trying to push something through halfway and then try to get the rest from you later on. So, I do really appreciate that, and I think that the request is a good one.

Selectman Guessferd: I agree.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, to request the Budget Committee to reduce Finance IT line 5377-215 by \\$175,000, as recommended by the staff. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Roy Sorenson: At the meeting next week, Selectman Vurgaropulos and myself will be there. I'll introduce this and ask them to take that action right away. In doing so, now that we're going to consider warrant articles, I'll ask you to pay your attention to the board up there. I do have Dan Thibeault running the same numbers over there, so if my numbers are wrong, Dan, certainly say something, okay? I'm going to take the \$175 out right now. Actually, let's do this first. Right now, our tax rate impact based off of the Budget Committee's changes is \$5.542, okay? I'm going to assume the Budget Committee is going to take this action, so I'll subtract the \$175,000. And the new tax rate impact right now is \$5.508, okay? Tonight's order of business will be centered around warrant articles A through W. I'm going to apologize again, because this here is not in the same order as those, so I want to work off of this document, and we'll come back up to the board and address those, okay? So, this is part of your handout. Based off of what the staff presented, if the Board accepted all those warrant articles tonight, your tax rate would be around \$5.904, okay? So, you have a starting point, you have an ending point. And then I would ask that we review all these in between and see which ones you want to push to the warrant, okay? So that being said, and then by the way, I did give you a sample of how the motion for the warrant articles perhaps should be read, okay? All right. So, we go back to this sheet here.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I've got one quick question. You said the current rate was \$5.2, but the sheets gave us a \$4.3.

Roy Sorenson: Correct. But we had to update the numbers. So, we're going to work off of this, because what happened is Dan went in and made some changes with some other things.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Like I heard what you were saying, and I was just putting pieces together.

Roy Sorenson: This is accurate to date at this point.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Thank you.

## **Article J - Property Re-Evaluation Capital Reserve Fund**

Roy Sorenson: So, \$5.508, which is right here, that's your tax rate, okay? So, I'm going to start with Property Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund. So, this article funds essential appropriations to continue funding into the property revaluation capital reserve fund. This capital reserve fund was established in 2008 for the purpose of conducting future property revaluations. This capital reserve fund currently has a balance of \$227,889, plus or minus. New Hampshire municipalities are required to reassess property a minimum of once every five years. Hudson's last town-wide property reassessment was in 2022. The last revaluation cost was \$175,000, plus or minus. And that was during the 2021 calendar year. The town is scheduled to conduct its next reassessment no later than 2027 property tax year. All right. So, I read that into the record. That one will be under what we're going to call Warrant J. So, at this point, the board can open that for discussion.

Chairman Dumont: Where's everybody at with this one? We've talked about it quite a bit already.

Selectman Guessferd: I think it's pretty straightforward. I think we need to do it. You know, a little bit at a time, right?

Chairman Dumont: I agree with that.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, I think it's we're going to leave it at \$25,000. That's my only question.

Roy Sorenson: Yes, I think I spoke with the assessor, we believe that's a number. Last year it was at 50, I believe, did not pass.

Selectman Jakoby: It did not pass last year.

Roy Sorenson: It did not pass.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Roy Sorenson: We have to do this either way.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Roy Sorenson: We're required by state law.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes. So, I'm comfortable with the \$25,000.

Chairman Dumont: All right. And just for clarification, too, what the vote would be, obviously, would be to put forward to the warrant and to recommend.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Chairman Dumont: Just so everybody is clear on that.

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to move Article J, Property Re-Evaluation Capital Reserve Fund, in the amount of \$25,000 forward to the FY27 warrant and to recommend this warrant article.

Chairman Dumont: And I'll look for a second first.

Selectman Jakoby: Second.

Chairman Dumont: Second by Selectman Jakoby. The reason why I said and recommendation, so the vote, obviously, if you're forwarding it to the warrant, I would assume that you are recommending, but I just wanted to make sure that everybody was clear that those go hand-in-hand.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, because sometimes I don't.

Chairman Dumont: I questioned it last year when I was on the other side of the table, so I just wanted to make sure I put it out there.

Selectman Jakoby: I think you and I both had ones going that we disagreed with. So, thank you.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I was going to shake my head no to it. I was having a miscommunication.

Chairman Dumont: That's okay.

Selectman Guessferd: It's not automatic.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, motion by Guessford, seconded by Selectman Jakoby. We had our discussion.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to move Article J, Property Re-Evaluation Capital Reserve Fund, in the amount of \\$25,000 forward to the FY27 warrant and to recommend this warrant article. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

### **Article U - Veteran Tax Credit Adjustment**

Roy Sorenson: The next one is going to be the Veteran Tax Credit Adjustment. And this is going to be just to reaffirm, okay, for tonight, because the Board actually did take action to make the adjustment to \$4,000. So, I would just ask if you're going to move it just to reaffirm moving article, this would be U, okay? Forward to the warrant.

So, the Veteran Tax Credit Adjustment in the amount of \$4,000.

Selectman Guessferd: Either you or me has got to do this.

[Selectman Vurgaropulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to move forward Article U, Veteran Tax Credit Adjustment of \\$4,000, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

### **Article I - Route 102 New Sidewalks**

Roy Sorenson: All right. Next item, I'll do the introduction. I would ask the Development Services Director to come on up. The background is to construct new sidewalks along Derry Road to connect sidewalks from Library Common to Alvirne High School. Currently this project is on the NHDOT 10-year plan. The funding will consist of 80 percent from the state and 20 percent match from corridor funds. There is no tax impact and the project is contingent upon state funding and will not be constructed otherwise.

Selectman Jakoby: This is article what?

Roy Sorenson: This is article I.

Selectman Jakoby: I, thank you.

Roy Sorenson: You can see on the sheet it's a \$2 million project as shown here. There is no tax impact.

Selectman Guessferd: Go ahead. You go ahead first.

Elvis Dhima: I was just going to say the main thing about this is basically two things. Through the master plan that we have in place, the feedback we're getting from folks is we need more sidewalk, which is great. Once we maintain as along the main corridors, and the main thing here is we're responding to something we've been getting from the folks, but without putting a burden on the taxpayer. Intended to utilize corridor funds related to improving these corridors. We have those funds available. The other piece is basically to respond to something that we're hearing over and over again. It feels like we're hitting a couple things, doing what we've been asked to look into, but also doing it without putting a burden on the taxpayer. I feel like this is a good opportunity. The state has this in 2035. I said, no, I'd like to do this next year. The intent here is if he passes, we're going to go ask the state if this money is available. Once we get the green light from the state, then we start the process of going out, getting a designer, getting the right of way. This is going to be a multiyear process. I feel like by the time we get there, we're going to have the funds. The feedback I got from the state is, Elvis, if you're ready to go, and if you get the green light from the folks, we're going to find the money for you. That's kind of where we're at, and that's why I'm in front of you this year, see if we can get the ball rolling next year.

Selectman Guessferd: We have been discussing this a lot on the planning board as well. It's a subject that comes up all the time. This is an opportunity to not just have sidewalks. We'll call them sidewalks to nowhere, but these sidewalks will be connected all the way up to Alvirne High School. From the center of town. I would say center of town.

Elvis Dhima: Library Common.

Selectman Guessferd: From Library Common. My only concern, just in terms of, and I hate to see, the first thing you see when you see this one is \$2 million. Now granted, below it's going to say no tax impact, but that initial reaction to it is that \$2 million. If we can't change the language, if we can't change it to indicate early up here that there's no tax impact, then we need to really sell this hard. Because I think this is important. And make sure people understand, because a lot of people don't pay attention long enough to be able to go, oh, well, it's \$2 million, but it's not going to cost us anything. So, we just need to be careful about making sure that it's clear, it's very clear to the taxpayer, that this is no impact, even though it's a \$2 million warrant.

Selectman Jakoby: I wanted to say that I know that there have been a number of residents along that corridor that have spoken to me about the sidewalks and the importance of sidewalks going through. I think this is an excellent way of approaching it. I think also as we do our explanation of the warrants, I think some of the things I've seen is putting the tax impact up front on those explanations so that that is seen first. Because on the ballot, you see it last. But in our explanation, it can be done first. So, I think there's a lot of ways we can market this. And always, I hope Elvis is up to doing some videos with me again this year about the warrants. And we'll get the word out.

Elvis Dhima: As long as it's not snowing out there, Selectman Jakoby.

Selectman Jakoby: And you have your voice back, right?

Roy Sorenson: To Selectman Jakoby's point, so this packet basically is how we're going to approach the public hearing in January as well as the deliberative. Because you can put the background in there at that point. You can't do it on the warrant. You can capture it at those two moments first. And hopefully at that point, between the other stuff we do, you can get that information out to the public.

Chairman Dumont: So, two things, I completely agree. I think this is the proper way to go about the sidewalk issue is through corridor funds that we currently already have. I think it's the best way to utilize that fund. The other part of that is obviously we had some discrepancies when it came to Budget Committee or just people asking questions about other projects we've done in town when it comes to grants. So obviously we need to put the \$2 million in there because that's the amount that we're going to be raised, or that will be raised. So, the

budget will show the \$2 million line, and then we will be reimbursed. So, it won't be a huge over expenditure where people are looking at this red line with all these questions.

Elvis Dhima: What we don't want to do is what we did with Melendy when we got the grant, right? And then we kind of like, it was too late to put it in the books, and then it's been a nightmare for Mr. Sorenson and the rest of us.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you.

Elvis Dhima: I feel like it was a good welcome to the town. Here's your first nightmare. But the bottom line is, yes, trying to be proactive. But the state has this on the books, has it for our 10 years. But what's happening is a lot of communities are not ready for the projects they want to do. So, if there's an opening, we'll be the first ones to go because as soon as I get the green light from the voters in March, I'm going to go in and I'm going to ask the state to start looking for services, for engineering services. But, yeah, it puts this to good use. We don't have any other projects along 102, and the idea is if we have a safer road for pedestrians, now the vehicles are not competing with the folks because they're walking on the road. And so, when you have folks you're competing with on the road, you have the tendency to slow down. It's slowing everything down. So, by having a sidewalk dedicated for pedestrians and completely separated vertically and horizontally, now you have the tendency to drive a little faster because you're not worried about hitting someone, right? So that speeds things up. We're processing more traffic now, and that's where that comes in. While we're not building new roads, we're improving the efficiency of processing traffic through, just like we did with the cameras and the controllers and creating ways to basically push more traffic through. And that's what the money was created for, to improve things along the main corridor. So, we're getting very good at that. We're not going to have any money in the corridors left the way we're going, but that's a good problem.

Chairman Dumont: No, it's a good way to utilize the funds, no tax rate impact, and you always find a way to dig up some more money for us too, which I appreciate, and it makes the town a little bit safer every time. So that's our goal. All right.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, to move Article I, Route 102, New Sidewalks, in the amount of \\$2 million forward to the FY27 warrant and to recommend such warrant article. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

## **Article G - Robinson Pond Improvements**

Roy Sorenson: All right. Next article, Robinson Pond Improvements. Background, the town is required to comply with federal EPA MS-4 permit requirements, and these improvements will assist the town in satisfying the EPA MS-4 requirements. Proposed improvements will help to improve the water quality at the pond by preventing runoff from entering the pond. The boat launch is in need of rebuilding to make it easier for watercraft to get in and out of the pond. I will defer to Mr. Dhima with any more information on that.

Elvis Dhima: Thank you, Mr. Sorensen. As you all recall, we tried to do this last year, and the feedback was the boat launch makes sense, the beach area does not. So, we're taking that feedback and we're kind of looking at it again. So, we're going to carve out the beach area and we're only going to do the boat launch. I was informed today that Army Corps of Engineers have signed off on this as a repair, so that was the last thing. So as of tonight, we basically have a shovel-ready project. We have the design in place. We have all the permits in place, and the only thing left right now is we're going to file for the grant, and we're going to ask the folks. I want everyone to be aware that this project is only possible through two things right now. We need to have the grant and we need to raise the money. If one of the two does not happen, so if we get the grant but not the votes, it does not happen. If we get the votes but not the money, it does not happen. The only way this is going to happen is if both gets through, the grant and that. So, what does that mean? We're going for a \$500,000 grant with a \$250,000 match from us. What this is going to do is it's going to take care of that whole area. It's going to make it safer, but also, it's a dual function. Not only are we going to make it better for recreational use, but the dual function is going to be we're going to get some credit for our MS-4 permit. We're going to reduce the burden on the Robinson Pond. And the master plan that we're going to have rolling out, I think this week, if it's already out, it says it's Robinson Pond is one of those like our biggest watershed, our biggest water body that we need to kind of focus on. And this is it in a nutshell. Basically, scaling back, getting the feedback from the taxpayers last year,

refocusing, and then getting the state to agree to allow us to apply for the grant again, because this is not every year. So, they're allowing us to file under the previous application, which is great, because now we have that opportunity to go for this again. That took a little bit of time. DOT has been great to work with because a portion of this area, it's under their jurisdiction. So, all the pieces are in play. The only thing we need is two things, just to get the grant and get the folks to sign off on it.

Roy Sorenson: All right. So, there's a \$250,000 tax impact on this project.

Chairman Dumont: I've been adamant about this one. I think that it protects the water quality over there, which we've been talking quite a bit about, as well as also you get the benefit of saving us some money in the long run when it comes to our MS-4 permit. So, I think it's very much needed. What was the article number or letter for this?

Roy Sorenson: I apologize. G.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes. So, I was very much in favor of this last year, and my big takeaway for this project is water quality. So, by doing this, it improves the pond overall and will improve the recreational area even without major renovations to the beach. So overall, and it didn't fail by that much, Elvis. It was close.

Elvis Dhima: It did not. I think it was about either 200 votes or less. It was close.

Selectman Jakoby: Right. It was very close. So, every time you say, it was close. So, I'm hoping that the taxpayers and those who voted will vote for this in this portion, and maybe at a later date we can do something with the beach area. So, I fully support this moving forward.

Elvis Dhima: You've had folks here come on to public input, talk what they can do for Robinson Pond, and this is recent and about two, three meetings ago.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes.

Elvis Dhima: So, the support is out there. They're just trying to know how to do it. And I tell them, go and vote in March.

Selectman Jakoby: Absolutely.

Selectman Guessferd: I would make one other, maybe in the background again, maybe in parenthesis or something, MS-4, MS-4, the permit. I would just make sure that that's clear.

Elvis Dhima: Yes. Maybe spell that out. Yes.

Selectman Guessferd: Right there, before the word permit, water quality. I mean, just so it's very clear to the taxpayer right up front. Water quality. This is about water quality. Because we say water quality below, and then we say the boat launch will make it easier for watercraft to get in and out of the pond, which is a good benefit, believe me. But I think that's right up front.

Chairman Dumont: I agree, because whether you're on one side or the other, we're required to do that no matter what. So, I think we receive a benefit from it, but even if you don't, we're going to have to spend money on that no matter what.

Elvis Dhima: And just to give everyone an idea, so we had a meeting with VHP, which is our consultant. On year eight, which is where we're going for, nine and ten, the feds are requiring us to remove about 14 pounds of phosphorus. What that is 14 detention basins. Wow. Because for every pound, you're basically in a massive detention basin, probably two or three the size of this room deep. And we just don't have that area out there to put a detention basin around the pond to get the water treated and release it. Now, everyone is in the same situation as us. We're being proactive and all that. But if this project can take some of that away without having to dig these holes out there, I'm going to have a hard time explaining to folks. And the second thing is, public works director and I have been talking about this with the Town Administrator. We don't even have the room to put these things out there. So, this will be ideal. It will be one of those things that we have something to show for. It's a multi-use thing. We take care of the permit. We utilize it for recreation. It's a win-win. So, I don't know

what the next project is going to be. God help us. But at least if we get this through and at least get a year, then we have something to show for. We're acting in good faith. We're trying to do the right thing.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to move Article G, Robinson Pond Improvements of \\$500,000, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

### **Article S - Ratification of Lease Agreement for 9 Industrial Drive**

Roy Sorenson: All right. The next article is going to be Ratification of a Lease Agreement for 9 Industrial Drive. The Town of Hudson currently has a lease agreement with Drive Force CDL, Academy LLC of Manchester, New Hampshire, for use of a townhouse parking area for non-industrial drive, otherwise known as MAP 161-LOT 40 and MAP 161-LOT 39, for commercial driver's license CDL training purposes. The existing lease is through March 10, 2026. This is a revenue opportunity for the town, which helps offset property taxes, including an initial term of five years, and may be extended one additional five-year term for a total of ten years. Rental payments during the first year of the lease shall be \$24,000, including taxes, and thereafter increased by 2.5 percent annually.

Chairman Dumont: So, another one that we've talked quite a bit about, good revenue for the town of Hudson.

[Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to move Article S, Ratification of Lease Agreement for 9 Industrial Drive, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

### **Article H - Revise Capital Reserve Fund for Purchase and Renovation of Former Benson's Property**

Roy Sorenson: All right. Next Article 2, Revise Capital Reserve Fund for the Purchase and Renovation of the Former Benson's Property. The background for this will be the Capital Reserve Fund for Purchase and Renovation of the Former Benson's Property was established in March of 1998, and the current balance is \$115,848.67. The revision to this article will allow the Board of Selectmen to use the funds for repairs and maintenance of the park and all the buildings located within the park, which are the responsibility of the town. So, this is just, I would call a, there's not going to be a request here, and I'll defer to Selectman Jakoby and Mr. Dhima on this, actually. So, I'll do that now.

Selectman Jakoby: Thanks. Sure. When the, so traditionally, people may remember that there has been a request for funds to go into the Benson Park Capital Reserve Fund, and what we discovered as Mr. Dhima and the gentleman who wanted to help renovate Haselton Barn was the request to possibly create another fund for the Haselton Barn, and what was raised as the liaison to the Benson Park Advisory Committee was that we have three historic buildings within the park, which we are responsible for, all of which need tender, loving care and maintenance. We have other buildings that are not historic, and we have pathways and trees and all kinds of things that need to be maintained and managed. So, my request was to look into having this capital reserve fund be clearly designated for the park and its needs, and for the future to be able to build this up so that we can do what we promised, which is to maintain those buildings.

Elvis Dhima: And the grounds within the park.

Selectman Jakoby: And the grounds, yeah.

Elvis Dhima: So basically, what we did is we used what we already have, we expanded on it so it's very clear that the money that's available, and it's quite a bit, \$150,000, can be used for anything within the park, buildings, grounds, anything of that sort. But this means that we don't have to raise money now specific for Haselton Barn or any other one, like including the kitchen building that's going to need some help. So, we're not asking the taxpayers for additional funds, we're just simply asking them to change the language so we can use the money we already have for everything within the park. That's it. That is basically the measure. It's some cleaning up to this existing article, which was set up for this reason, but it wasn't put together the proper way so we can look at it and be like, we can use this for everything.

Roy Sorenson: So, the other thing, too, is what we did here is we did put the map and lot in there to specifically identify it as an asset.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah.

Roy Sorenson: And that covers that whole property, right?

Elvis Dhima: Correct. Everything within that, correct. So now we don't have to worry about, like, is this applied to this building? As long as it's within that park, you as an agent can spend that money.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I just want clarity on the lot. So, it goes from the parking lot?

Elvis Dhima: I mean, it's got multiple frontages, right?

Selectman Jakoby: So, the HCTV building, senior center, and dog park are not included. I want to make that really clear.

Elvis Dhima: The dog park, I have to double-check, but the community, the HCTV and the senior, it's completely separate lot.

Selectman Jakoby: Separate. Okay. The question is whether the dog park is included or not. That's my question.

Chairman Dumont: Roy would you be able to pull up the GIS relatively quickly?

Roy Sorenson: I can't pull it up here.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Does this include the trails?

Elvis Dhima: I don't know how far back. It includes the trails, too. Yeah, you're correct.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Awesome.

Selectman Jakoby: And the ponds?

Elvis Dhima: The ponds, yeah. Now, the state still has some rights in there because, obviously, they're responsible for certain things within it, like water quality monitoring and things like that, but it includes basically everything within that map and parcel, and I want to say that the dog park could be included because I think that's part of Benson, but I could be wrong here.

Selectman Jakoby: I've been doing a lot of research around the dog park, and that's in question, and so I think that just needs to be clarified.

Elvis Dhima: But you still have the option, no matter if it's in or not, you still have the option to say, I don't want to spend the money on the dog park, I want to spend the money on something else.

Selectman Jakoby: No, no. Wait, wait, wait. I didn't say that.

Elvis Dhima: All right. And if you're against dogs, I'm just kidding.

Selectman Jakoby: Wait, wait, wait. I did not say that. Don't put words in my mouth.

Chairman Dumont: Separate issue for a different group.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah. We're just trying to clarify what is in that lot. That's all I'm trying to do. Not speaking for or against, I just want to know, is the dog park included, because that's what people keep asking me.

Chairman Dumont: So, what I would suggest in the easiest way, we don't have the ability here tonight, but to go on the GIS, punch in the long number, and it'll show you the outline. Because of our overlays that we're staying up to date on, you can see that on there very clearly.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, because I've been in old minutes and stuff, so.

Elvis Dhima: I'm looking it up right now.

Chairman Dumont: It's part of the can of worms.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes. I uncovered it.

Elvis Dhima: I'm looking it up right now. So, based on what I'm seeing, it appears that the dog park is included within the park itself.

Roy Sorenson: It should be.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. That's what I thought.

Roy Sorenson: I think if you're going to do something with the dog park, you would identify it specifically on that map and lot with boundaries.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah. I just wanted to ensure that was the case. So, I think it would be excellent. I think this is very well worded, and it needs to be moved forward.

Chairman Dumont: Is that a motion?

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to move Article H, Revise Capital Reserve Fund for Purchase and Renovation of Former Benson's Property, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.

Roy Sorenson: All right, Mr. Dhima. I think you're good for now.

Elvis Dhima: Thank you very much. Have a great night.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you.

### **Article A – Hire Four Firefighter/AEMTs \$590,629**

Roy Sorenson: I'm going to ask the Fire Chief, Scott Tice, to come up, please. So, this is going to be, if you're looking up here, this will be what we'll call an Article A right now. This is to Hire Four Firefighter/AEMTs background to maintain adequate staffing levels and ensure continued delivery of high-quality emergency services. The fire department is requesting funding to hire four firefighter/AEMTs. This request will only be pursued if our application for the SAFER grant is not approved. This addition would bring daily minimum staffing to 13 members, enhancing operational efficiency, reducing response times, and improving firefighter safety through better crew coverage. The proposed allocation includes \$288,813 for salaries covering base wages, contractual overtime and holiday community event compensation, \$271,522 for comprehensive benefits including health, dental, pension, and insurance, \$23,884 for essential personnel protective equipment, and \$6,410 for uniform costs. These additions are critical to sustaining operational readiness, improving response times, and enhancing community safety.

Chairman Dumont: Questions, comments? Chief, do you have anything to add?

Chief Tice: I'll just reiterate that we haven't heard anything on the SAFER grant, so I'm assuming at this point we did not hear on the SAFER grant. I'll put it out there that I believe this is for public safety, but I also believe the public has the right to determine what level of safety they want, and I know we've had some conversation at the Budget Committee level of what is the appropriate level. I bring this forward. I look at two things. I look at the number of back-to-back calls we have, which takes a lot of our resources away from being available for the next call. I also look at the amount of manpower or people power it needs when we have those critical calls such as a building fire. I understand completely that we don't have building fires every day, the number of building fires are down, but what level of service, what level of protection does the public want is what it comes down to. There's a lot of critical tasks that happen at that type of an incident that need to happen simultaneously early on in the incident, and we also need to have a short response time if we're going to have the best opportunity to save property and to save lives. That's during the day, and that's even more so at night. Fires at night are more dangerous than they are during the day. Fires are, you know, the type of fires that we're dealing with now, you know, with all the plastics, they reach flashover or fully-evolved state much faster. The plastics and the type of materials burning gives off a very toxic smoke, a very thick smoke. At nighttime, people are incapacitated either through sleep, we show drug and alcohol use are up at nighttime. There's usually a delay in discovery of the fire, notification of the fire. So yes, fires are down, the number of fires are down, but the death rate for fires at nighttime between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. have not changed since 1980. The number of deaths per 10,000 fires has remained constant for 45 years. So, I think this is important. I think this is a step to the 14 that I've talked about that would give us the opportunity to staff three engines and two ambulances. Again, we remain versatile. The ambulance crews would take fire apparatus on a fire call. If we had more than two ambulance calls going, and an engine crew needed to take an ambulance to a medical call, we would be able to do that. It would be about having the total resources and the flexibility to adapt to whatever call volume we're having at that time. So that's why I bring this forward, to handle those two what I consider gaps in our ability to provide public safety.

Selectman Jakoby: So, what I find intriguing about requesting this is that, again, it's that opportunity, it's a plan. We hope we don't have an increase in the number of fires, but when we do have a fire, we want to be able to respond in the best possible way. And that's what I see this as. And I do think it's, in this case, for me, it's up to the voters. If they feel that this is a necessity, they'll vote for it. If they don't, they won't. So that's kind of where I sit with this, because I know it would get us to where you've been saying for a few years now, where we need to be. The SAFER grant you did apply for, we have not heard.

Chief Tice: We haven't heard, which tells me we did not get it.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. So that's how I think of this warrant.

Selectman Guessferd: The only thing is, for me, well, not the only thing. You have six articles here, six warrant articles. Is this your highest priority?

Chief Tice: Yes.

Selectman Guessferd: That's all I have.

Chairman Dumont: So, for me, I'm a no on this. I'll be blunt with that. And I don't discount anything that the Chief has said. I appreciate his opinion on it, very much so. I think this Board is extremely supportive of our departments here, but I also think that it's our job to put forward a recommendation or not recommend something based on what we hear and how things are going. We added four positions last year. We got the support for that. We chose to go the SAFER grant route, however, we didn't get that grant. I think we need to let the four positions that we added breathe a little bit, let the department breathe a little bit, and see where we go, and reevaluate this next year. Again, I don't disagree with anything that the Chief said, it's just a matter at this time I don't think I'm ready to support.

Chief Tice: And I would agree. I think we've been supported very well, you know, from the Board, from the Budget Committee, from the people. I certainly would agree with that.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you.

Selectman Guessferd: I guess I'm of the mind, very similar to Selector Jakoby, let's let the voters decide if they think that that's, if it's, I mean, it's a lot of money, that's the first thing that pops out at you, right? It's a lot of money.

Selectman Jakoby: It's a lot of money.

Selectman Guessferd: But I'm kind of in the mode of, if they don't want it, then they vote no, and they come back at it, you know, next year. It's not in the budget, so it's not bloating, you know, the budget itself. It's basically discretionary on the point of the voter. That's my thought process. So, I will support this.

Selectman Jakoby: So, Chairman Dumont, looking at the other requests from the Fire Department, are you more in prone to support some of those?

Chairman Dumont: So, here's where I'm at across ...

Selectman Jakoby: Because we're talking about the whole thing.

Chairman Dumont: Yep, and I don't think it's going to be a surprise to anybody. After this, my yeses are going to be limited to only a couple more. Quite frankly, there's going to be a lot of nos coming from me. I think that our budget has increased. I think that we did a good job. We added quite a bit outside the budget requests from every department. I think we did a good job at that. I think it's time for us to stop the bleeding, I guess would be the best way to put it. I don't disagree, like I said, with the Chief's position. Just for me, it's not only this one. It's going to be some other ones coming up, too, that are going to be nos for me.

Selectman Jakoby: And to that point, I guess I would like to, I don't know, table this discussion and discuss the other warrants. This was where I was getting concerned, is looking at multiple warrants and then, because I would like to hear others' perspective.

Chairman Dumont: There's two ways to do it. If somebody would like to make a motion, they can. If not, we move on to the next one, and obviously, I would give anybody a chance to revisit these before we close out the meeting.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. That's what I would like to do.

Chairman Dumont: It's fine by me.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'm good with that.

Chairman Dumont: All right, so we're going to hold on that one for right now. There's no motion made. The next one up, Mr. Sorensen.

### **Article N – Request for Withdrawal from Fire Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund – Utility Vehicle Replacement \$96,030**

Roy Sorenson: We have, if I had this one in, I don't see it, but we have, no, here it is, I'm sorry. This is actually a, this will be shown in the revenue. So, this is going to be a Request for Withdrawal from Fire Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund for Utility Vehicle Replacement in the amount of \$96,030. This is a motion the Board took previously. This is originally an outside-the-budget request. The Board chose and asked the Fire Chief to move it to a warrant article. This will be a revenue adjustment on the revenue side, so this will be another action item for the Budget Committee. So, there's not an impact, but the authority to approve this is the voters. It's not the Board of Selectmen. And the balance, do you have a balance in that account, Dan, by any chance?

Dan Thibeault: No, I don't think so.

Chairman Dumont: All right. We have it. I can just give, I believe, \$114,000. Am I looking at the right one? Fire Apparatus, CRF. I don't know. That's projected. It looks like about \$150,000. \$154,000?

Roy Sorenson: There's a couple of them. Yeah. One's in Apparatus/Equipment.

Chairman Dumont: It would be the Apparatus CRF, not the refurb one, correct?

Roy Sorenson: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, so that one's \$154,498 as of June 30th.

Roy Sorenson: So, the background on this is to request funding, you've heard it, to support the replacement Utility 2, 2001 Ford F-250. Has reached the end of its service life due to rust and mechanical deterioration. The proposed purchase of a new 2026 Ford F-250. Total cost of \$96,030. Aligns with the fleet replacement program. Enhances operational flexibility for utility brush towing and plowing tasks. The vehicle will be offered emergency lighting, sirens, graphics, and storage solutions. Acquired through state bid pricing due to the absence of a police package. The approval will allow us to retire Utility 2. Reassign the 2022 Ford F-150 Utility 2, and deploy the new F-250 as a shift commander vehicle. Thereby extending the F-150's service life. The vehicle may be traded, reassigned, or auctioned based on residual value. Ensuring responsible asset management.

Selectman Jakoby: So, we're reaffirming what we already did.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, basically. You have to bring it to the warrant. We just called to put it on the warrant.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to forward Article N, Request for Withdrawal from Fire Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund - Utility Vehicle Replacement of \\$96,030, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Chairman Dumont: I would just like to add, with my original point, when we talked about this, I appreciate everything that the Chief brought forward to us. I think this is the best way to utilize those funds. It offsets and hopefully decreases the cost a little bit as cost of vehicles increase over the years. So, I think this is the best use of the money that's sitting in that savings account. Because I can't imagine that truck's going to get any cheaper. I'm in full support.

## **Article M – Fire Apparatus/Equipment Capital Reserve Funding \$225,000**

Roy Sorenson: Next warrant, proposed warrant, M, would be the Fire Apparatus/Equipment Capital Reserve Funding in the amount of \$225,000. This warrant article consolidates funding for three critical Fire Department Capital Reserve Funds, ensuring continued investment in apparatus, refurbishment, and equipment needs. The Fire Department relies on Capital Reserve Funds to plan and manage long-term investments in its emergency response infrastructure. These funds are not part of the annual operating budget, but are essential for maintaining readiness and safety without sudden tax spikes. Chief, I'll let you kind of give us the detail of how you would break that down.

Chief Tice: All right, so we were proposing the Fire Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund to deposit \$100,000 into that, and that's the fund that we would use to buy and purchase equipment in the future, new apparatus. The refurb and repair, we would also be proposing to add \$100,000 to that. That does two things. If we run into large repairs that aren't covered within the operating budget, we'd be able to pull from that. We're also trying to do some refurb on our apparatus when it reaches 10 years of service to extend its life and ensure we get 20 years of service out of it, which would come from that fund. And then the Fire Equipment Fund, we're proposing to add \$25,000 to that. And, again, that's building up money for future purchases when we have lump sum equipment coming up for renewal or that needs to be replaced. It's aging out.

Chairman Dumont: Where's the Board at on this one?

Selectman Jakoby: I think the number is too high. I know that this is where I agree with you, Chairman, that if we keep continuously putting warrants on to add money to these funds, I just don't see how we can do it every year. And we added some funds last year to all three of these, right?

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: I almost think it has to be every year. So that's where I'm not in support of this.

Chairman Dumont: I have the same exact belief. I think we should space these out a little bit. The Fire Apparatus does come down to roughly about \$60,000 if the voters do expel the other amount, roughly about \$40,000, a little bit under, for the Fire Equipment. The Apparatus/Refurbish and Repair has just under \$500,000 in it currently. So, I think, as far as everything goes, we're in pretty good shape. Obviously, we have a plan for that other engine going forward. If we take care of the utility vehicle, I don't see anything major why we couldn't add or propose this warrant article next year. So, for me, I would share the same thoughts as Selectman Jakoby.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I would agree with that. Did I hear you say the current balance is \$500,000?

Chairman Dumont: So, there's three different warrant articles. The Apparatus Refurbishment and Repair one has \$492,457. The Fire Apparatus one that we just decided to utilize has \$154,000. It would come down to roughly about \$58,000 and change on that, my calculator opened. And then the Fire Equipment CRF, it looks like it's got about \$36,000.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah, I lost my sheet. Thank you. No, I would agree with kind of getting this on an every-other-year rotation.

Chairman Dumont: Actually, I apologize. I'm looking at it. I didn't include the budget additions in FY26. So, all those are larger.

Roy Sorenson: What was the number?

Selectman Jakoby: So, you add the \$50,000, the \$150,000, and the \$25,000.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. Those are the ones that we added in for FY26, so I apologize. So, \$61,000 for the fire equipment CRF, a lot of line items here. \$642,000 for the Fire Apparatus Refurb. That's right, \$61,000. And then after the withdrawal, it will be around \$110,000 in the apparatus CRF.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Chairman Dumont: So, with that, I'm even more confident that I think we can hold for another year.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I agree with that.

Chairman Dumont: And I apologize, small sheet, a lot of line items.

Roy Sorenson: So, you're not moving that?

Selectman Jakoby: No.

### **Article O – Communications Equipment and Infrastructure Capital Reserve Funding**

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, we'll move on to the next one, Communications Equipment and Infrastructure Capital Reserve Funding.

Roy Sorenson: So, give me one second. This is going to be item warrant O. This is for Communication Equipment and Infrastructure Capital Reserve Funding. And again, a CRF \$50,000. Background is to the purpose of this capital reserve fund is to support the ongoing maintenance, enhancement, and future upgrades of Town of Hudson's radio communications system. Following the installation of a new town-wide radio system completed in 2022, this fund remains critical to ensuring reliability and effectiveness of communications for the Hudson Fire Department, Hudson Police Department, and the Department of Public Works. While the 2022 system significantly modernized the infrastructure, technology continues to evolve, and proactive investment is necessary to keep pace with operational demands, software updates, and hardware lifecycle replacements. Maintaining this reserve fund allows the town to plan for future improvements without placing a sudden financial burden on taxpayers. Chief, you can fill in the blanks on that if you want.

Chief Tice: Yeah. So, as we completed this three years ago, time starts ticking by. You know, this equipment is going to age out at some point, and this is going to be a very expensive equipment. The upgrade and all the work that we did three years ago was about a million and a half dollars. Not all of that would have to be done again. Some of that went to construction of towers, things that are not going to age out, at least no time soon. But some of this other equipment is going to age out, need to be replaced. It's not always predictable when that's going to happen, and this is also a police, fire, and public works communication system for the town. So, we haven't, since the last few years, we haven't put money into this, and my thought was to put money into this in case we start having some equipment fail, would have the ability to repair that.

Chairman Dumont: Thoughts, comments?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I would agree with that. I think this is a critical warrant. Communications, we can't operate in an emergency situation, especially if we just went over the emergency plan, things of that nature, or just daily operations. Without communications, we're just a bunch of people running around. So, I think that's a critical warrant that should be moved forward.

Selectman Jakoby: So, the current fund balance is the \$233,814?

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Selectman Guessferd: Is there anything else we didn't put anything in last year.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to affirm that.

Chairman Dumont: Honestly, I could be probably swayed either way. I'm leaning no just based on my prior stance. \$50,000 is not a large ticket item. We do have the \$233,000 in there. I don't think that the \$50,000 currently would make or break if we did need to do something, and it's not a real reason not to save, but more or less I think it would be OK to give the taxpayer a little bit of a breather on it. But I could be swayed the other way.

Selectman Guessferd: I think what sways me on this one is you said we haven't put any in it for a few years. Correct. Otherwise, I was kind of leaning no myself, but I think since we haven't, I think we probably should put something in this year. I'm trying to focus in on the four firefighters mostly, and this one was like, but I think it's important to have them. I do actually agree that when we're talking big dollars, \$50,000 one way or the other isn't going to make a huge difference, but every bit kind of helps in the event of a need for a big-ticket item. So, I'm probably leaning on the yes side on this.

Selectman Jakoby: So, this system was put in three years ago?

Chief Tice: It was finished three years ago.

Selectman Jakoby: Finished three years ago, and what's the expected lifespan?

Chief Tice: That I'm not sure of.

Selectman Jakoby: But that replaced all of the gear, didn't it?

Chief Tice: It did. It built several towers, replaced a lot of the hardware.

Selectman Jakoby: And individual gear.

Chief Tice: Yes.

Selectman Jakoby: OK. I'm leaning no.

Chairman Dumont: Motions? Wait.

Selectman Jakoby: We can go on to the next one.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, where do you stand?

Chairman Dumont: That's what I was about to say. If there is no motion, we will be moving on.

Selectman Guessferd: You said yes, right?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I said yes. I'm for putting some inexplicit since we haven't.

Selectman Guessferd: Even if I said yes and you two say no.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, we're at a draw.

Chairman Dumont: Either make a motion, or we're moving on to the next one.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Let's move on to the next one.

Selectman Guessferd: All right given the stance here.

Chairman Dumont: All right. I said I could be swayed. You guys didn't do a good enough job selling me.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: There might be other ones we need you for.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, that's all right.

### **Article P – Fire Station Pre-Alerting System \$255,000**

Roy Sorenson: All right. Warrant article P, Fire Station Pre-Alerting System, \$255,000. Hudson Fire Department is requesting up to \$255,000 in funding for the purchase and installation of a modern fire station alerting system, an additional \$9,000 annually for ongoing maintenance. This system is designed to enhance firefighter health and safety by replacing abrupt high decibel tones with ramped, cardiac-friendly sounds and red night vision lighting. It features a line with NFPA 1550 standards aimed at reducing psychological stress. The system will integrate directly with existing dispatch platforms to improve turnout times. It will also provide synchronized audio-visual messaging across all stations, enabling personnel to receive pre-alerts and assignment details before dispatch. Additional benefits include selective activation of individual stations and dynamic audio adjustments to ensure clear communication in high-noise environments, such as apparatus bays.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Currently, right now, I'm very sympathetic to this, especially psychological stuff. I feel that's very important, especially as we discussed over this cycle right now, a lot about mental health and all that. I just think maybe we bring this back next year.

Selectman Guessferd: Just to be clear, it's physiological.

Chairman Dumont: Do you know of any possibilities of grants for something like this?

Chief Tice: I don't know off the top of my head.

Selectman Jakoby: So, is there any reserve fund that would be applicable to this, something like this?

Chief Tice: Not that I'm aware of.

Selectman Jakoby: I never know how these things split out, so I thought I'd ask that question. I, too, believe that this might be a grant opportunity. Yeah, that's where I'm at.

Chief Tice: We would certainly look into that.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Like I said, I'm very sympathetic, and I understand where you're coming from. If I could make everybody wake up with sunshine and everything, I definitely would. We're getting tight. There's a lot of requests out there, I think, maybe next year.

Chief Tice: Yeah, I understand where you guys are at, too.

Selectman Jakoby: I just want to say, because the reason I ask that is the communication equipment and infrastructure, there's a communication piece to this that is the thing that I keep. This is why this is important to me, but yet I don't think the timing is quite right, is the clarity of the communication that they'll receive, that they'll be able to hear it more clearly and respond in a better manner. So, after reading that report, that was the part, and that's where I was coming from. But, yeah, to me, this money would be more towards hiring more. So, yeah, not supportive of it for this cycle. Supportive of it in theory.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, agreed. I think I'm in the same place. It's needed, but not this year in my mind.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, with that, that wraps up the Chief. Do you want to go forward with the other warrant articles, or do you want to circle back to his hiring one?

### **Article A – Fire Station Pre-Alerting System \$255,000 (revisited)**

Selectman Guessferd: I'd like to revisit the four firefighters.

Chairman Dumont: While he's still up here?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Selectman Guessferd: Not that he hasn't articulated it very clearly.

Chairman Dumont: You just want to make sure you give them the opportunity, or you guys?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. If we're going to say no to something like that, I want to say it to your face.

Chief Tice: I appreciate that.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, we're back on the hire of the four firefighters. Do we have any other questions or motions?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Chief, currently we're at full staff, right?

Chief Tice: We will be.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Minus one.

Chief Tice: Yeah, given what we talked about earlier, yes.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, I'm focused in on this one. I think we should do it. That's, I mean, again, understanding the situation, and we all look at things a little differently. And it's why I'm saying no to some of the others, so that I can focus in on this one.

Chairman Dumont: It's a good thing to be different.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. Anyway, so yeah, I'm a yes on this. Again, I'd like to see what the public thinks.

Selectman Jakoby: Are you making a motion?

Selectman Guessferd: I can. I didn't know anybody else wanted to talk about it anymore before I make a motion.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I'm like 50-50, but I would definitely leave it to the voters. I think that's where we would probably win.

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to forward Article A, Hire Four Firefighters/AEMTs for an amount of \$590,629, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried 3-1. Dumont opposing.

Chairman Dumont: The only thing that I will add to that is, while I don't disagree for any of that, I just want to point out the two biggest things that I hear from everybody is property taxes and housing. While these Boards don't have control over the housing, we do have control over property taxes. So, I appreciate you guys working through this with me. I will not be able to support this.

Selectman Guessferd: I totally respect that.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Thank you, Chief.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Can we take a quick pause here?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, that's fine. I knew you were going to get me.

Chairman Dumont: We'll take a five-minute recess.

Chairman Dumont: We are back from our recess at 9:53 p.m. Mr. Sorensen, first one up, a Hire One Part-Time Prosecuting Attorney, correct?

Roy Sorenson: Before we do that, the Chief just left, right?

Selectman Jakoby: Yes.

Roy Sorenson: Did we defer the communications equipment?

Chairman Dumont: There was no motion made on that one, so we're not taking action.

Selectman Jakoby: Currently, it's not taking action.

Chairman Dumont: That will not be put towards the warrant.

Roy Sorenson: All right, it's not going to the warrant.

Selectman Guessferd: Not going to the warrant.

Roy Sorenson: It's off the table.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, unless one of us brings it back before the end of the meeting.

Selectman Guessferd: One of us wants to bring it back.

Selectman Jakoby: The Chairman said that. We can re-circle if we'd like.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. I just want to make sure that's all.

Chairman Dumont: Robert's Rules. If there's motions being made, we have to at least acknowledge them. Only if there's a second. But anyways.

Selectman Guessferd: Didn't know if, Roy, you had a particular thing to say about it.

Roy Sorenson: No, I just want to make sure I'm getting everything done properly.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

## **Article D – Hire One Part-Time Prosecuting Attorney \$90,275**

Roy Sorenson: All right. So, this is going to be Warrant D, Hire One Part-Time Prosecuting Attorney, \$90,275. Background, The Hudson Police Department currently manages its prosecution duties through existing legal and administrative staff who are responsible for preparing cases, coordinating with the court system, and representing the Department of Court proceedings. As case volume and the complexity of legal processes have increased, these responsibilities have placed additional demands on departmental resources and staff time. The addition of a part-time prosecutor would provide additional legal expertise to support case preparation, review of evidence, and ensure timely and consistent court representation. The recent expansion of the Department's Body-Worn Camera Program to include in-car video systems has further increased the volume of digital evidence requiring review and management, adding to the legal and administrative workload associated with case preparation and prosecution. This position would help maintain compliance with legal standards and improve the efficiency of case resolution. With that, I will turn it over to Chief Cayot.

Chief Cayot: I'm going to say some of the things that you guys have heard me say numerous times, and I know that I also spoke on this at the Budget Committee. Over the past five years, as we came out of COVID, we look at our arrests, our warrants, and our car stops, and those have all been on an upward trajectory. The men and the women of the Hudson Police Department are obviously putting in a lot of hard work. They're making those arrests. They're solving those cases. Those cases are moving forward, and as they move forward, they then have to enter the court system. And there's a lot of work that goes into that, and I actually brought Attorney Clay with me here today to kind of speak to that because she sees it on a day-to-day basis, all the work that goes into these arrests, these warrants, the review of the body camera and now in-car camera systems, and some of the changes to the court system which have made these cases take longer and put a lot more workload on our legal division. So, I'm going to let Attorney Clay speak to this.

Attorney Clay: Thank you. Thank you for having me. I know it's late in the evening, so I'll keep my commentary short, and certainly any questions I'm happy to answer. But to Chief Cayot's point, the court has increased the number of court days we actually have, so in addition to our activity being up at the Hudson Police Department and our men and women being proactive in the community, the court schedule has changed significantly in the last couple of years. So, in 2024, in January, we had Felonies First Rewind. You may remember that Felonies First started back in 2017, and it was a fast-track way to get felonies from arrests straight to the Superior Court for Prosecution. Well, we've now reverted back to how it used to be, aptly named, I guess, Felonies First Rewind, and we now have all felonies starting in the District Court. So, what does that mean? That means every single arrest that gets made by a Hudson police officer comes to the District Court for Prosecution, with the exception of very few protective custodies. So, we had an influx of cases coming back to the legal division within the Hudson Police Department. To accommodate that, the court actually changed up the schedule quite a bit. So, it used to be we had one dedicated trial day, and we could kind of prep around that and organize our case prep throughout the course of the week, expecting to only be in court one or two days a week. Now, between myself and the court liaison officer, we are in court Monday through Thursday every single week and some Fridays for some specialty dockets. The court also changed us from, and some of these are minutiae that I won't get too much into, but our arraignments used to be in the morning, now they're in the afternoon. Our trials used to be in the afternoon, now they're in the morning. The court has also gotten rid of any kind of in-between hearings. So, a case goes from arraignment straight to a trial for any misdemeanors. There's no opportunity to have any kind of conference or status hearing in between, and so we have to prep every single case for trial. That's the next date every single time. In 2025, they added even more court days, and so there's actually some days during the month that we're running double courtrooms, and there's two of us. So, we are in separate courtrooms dealing with separate case dockets that we do our best to prep ahead of time, but things come up, and I'm the lawyer, and our court liaison officer is very well versed at this point. He's been in the division for a couple of years, but he's a police officer, very good at what he's doing, but he doesn't have the legal expertise to handle some of the nuances that come up in these cases. And now in 2026, I've already learned that we have even more judge time, which is great for trying to clear a backlog, but that means more double court days. So, we are at a point where we're not able to prep cases sufficiently. I believe Chief Cayot submitted a memo along with this warrant article that speaks to this and the kind of case prep that we really need to be doing and ideally would like to be doing for each and every case. I don't want to get to the point of prioritizing and saying, well, I'm not going to pursue a conviction in

this case because I don't have the time to prepare or have the trial, and I'm going to have to prioritize this case. I want to do right by the people of Hudson, and I want to do right by the officers that work for the Hudson Police Department and all the work that they're doing in the overall effort of keeping the community safe, right, reducing crime. And that just takes more man hours than we have right now, and so that's why we're asking for the part-time prosecutor position to be added.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions or comments? All right. So, I guess it will be me again. I apologize I can't support this, and the reason why in the budget we included the new Deputy Chief position, we, while the Budget Committee did unfortunately put it down to a dollar, we did include the Central Square Pro Suite. I think we put a lot of good additions in there. I'm not ready to add another staff member or salary. One of the biggest conversations at the Budget Committee was salaries. I think that they're going to make us think about this, and I also think that the voters, same as my comment with the fire, will look at it that way. While I appreciate it and I would like to see it back next year, I think for me this year with what we've already put into the budget, that would be the reason for my no.

Selectman Jakoby: I would like to talk about the other employee requests and then have the Chief speak to his priorities. The next one is a part-time, and then there's the higher one additional full-time. That would be my request. I don't know how the rest of the Board feels.

Chairman Dumont: Where's everybody else at?

Selectman Guessferd: I was kind of heading in the direction of priorities because I don't think we can support all three of these. I'd like to understand the priorities of those three positions for you. I'd love to be able to approve them all, but I don't think we're going to. We probably should on behalf of the taxpayer. Like I said, I understand exactly where you're coming from. You need time. Otherwise, I'd hate to see you not pursue a conviction on something that deserves one. I'm trying to figure out which ones of these can we – the bleeding will be less, I guess, when we talk about these three different positions.

Selectman Jakoby: To that point, if we don't – where does the part-time, full-time legal clerk fit into this whole process?

Chief Cayot: I'll let Attorney Clay speak in a minute. What I'd like to say, for this first part, it's a prosecuting attorney. I think Attorney Clay hit on it. There's too much workload for one attorney right now.

Selectman Jakoby: Correct.

Chief Cayot: We are going to get to a point where cases are going to start falling through the cracks, and there aren't band-aids we can put on it because we don't have attorneys we can just pull out and put into the legal division. So, I guess my request would be I understand the plight of the taxpayer. I do. But I also feel like the people of this town aren't going to want the hard work of the police department and these crimes they see happening. We already see it on the Facebook posts and everything. Why isn't anything being done? Why is this person being released? Why aren't they being prosecuted? Why aren't they going to jail? I don't want to see they get worse. So, I guess my request to you would be maybe let the taxpayers decide which direction do they want to go with this. Do they want to go to the point where let's see what happens or we don't want these cases falling through the cracks and we understand that it's getting busier and there's more crime happening in town. We want to see these cases. We don't want to just see an arrest and this person get put back out on the street. We want to see an arrest and then this go through the full legal process.

Selectman Jakoby: So, what I'm hearing, it's vitally important that this prosecuting attorney be someone that we've hired that is totally enmeshed in our system. It can't be a temporary. It can't be a one-off. It can't be one this week, a different one next week. I just want to put that out there.

Attorney Clay: Correct. This needs to be a member of the Hudson Police Department, a member of the legal division so that we are lockstep with how we're approaching all of these cases. Right now, we have the legal division is five people. Myself, a court liaison officer who's full-time, a victim witness advocate who's full-time, a full-time legal clerk, and a part-time legal clerk, which is what the next warrant article gets to make her full-time or that position full-time. The court team, as I refer to, is myself, the court liaison officer, and the victim witness advocate. And we are lockstep with how we're approaching cases, the communication that we have, and making

sure that all the stakeholders in each case, which you can imagine can be a lot, right? A theft from Walmart has different stakeholders than a domestic violence case, than a driving case, than a driving under the influence of case, or a suspended license case. And we are in lockstep right now to ensure that everyone is getting the communications that they need and also understanding the court process, which we find is very helpful for people to understand why things, like I had, it was public record today, I dismissed a domestic violence case. I had the opportunity, though, to meet with the victim ahead of time and explain all of the legal issues that we would have faced for that case and why we were dismissing it in light of the fact that there was another case that the offender had taken responsibility for in the Superior Court with the same victim. So, it's vital that that person be a part of the team so that we can continue our service to the victims that are sometimes Hudson residents and sometimes not, but also the witnesses, the reporting parties, the people who are driving through and saying, hey, I'm behind someone and they don't look like they're driving safely. Can you do something about this? And then we do. And then at the court end, we can fill them in on that. So, yeah, it can't be someone who's just stepping in and trying to cover on a day-to-day or week-to-week basis. It really does need to be someone who's fully enmeshed.

Chief Cayot: And the one other thing I would just like to add, and I know we have other warden articles to move on to, is I also don't want to see the trickle-down effect that something like this can have, and it's the hard work that starts on the streets with the men and women of the Hudson Police Department. Now these cases they're putting all this work into for the members of this town, now going nowhere. And what that does to morale and how that makes them feel at the start of that work product.

Selectman Jakoby: I have another question. So, they went from felonies first to felonies rewind. Is there anything coming down the line that's indicated, any changes coming, or you think that this is where we're staying?

Attorney Clay: I think this is where we're staying. And so, I actually have the benefit of having prosecuted in this district court in Nashua as a police officer. I was a Hudson, I'm Hudson now, that's my family now. I was a Nashua police officer for ten and a half years. And I spent about five years in the legal division there, prosecuting in this same court, and at a time where felonies were coming through district court. And then I was part of the legal team as felonies first took over, and then I came to Hudson right at the very end of it. And so, I think it was an experiment at best. It was about seven years, and before that, felonies always started in district court, and that's where we're back now. I've spoken to many people about this, and everyone's just kind of looking at it as a, that was a blip. We tried it, it didn't work. I don't see it changing any time in the future.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Unfortunately, you know, I'm not really happy about the felony rewind. Obviously, I thought, you know, if it's a felony, you deserve what you get. So, my question is, what do you, what is your current rate of ...

Attorney Clay: Dismissals?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Dismissals, thank you.

Attorney Clay: I try desperately hard not to do them unless it's something out of my control, and I truly mean that. I will take, if I have a witness that shows up, I will take it to trial or get some kind of responsibility acknowledged by the accused in a manner that I think is fair and just in each individual case, which is something that takes time in and of itself. You know, defense attorneys have a job to defend their clients and not have them found guilty, and that is their job and their ethical obligation. As a prosecutor, and I spent time at the attorney general's office as well, I have always viewed my job as seeking justice and not convictions, and what justice requires in each case is very nuanced because it's dependent on the facts of the case. It's dependent on the specific circumstances of the offender, what they've experienced in their past life, what brought them to the position that they're now facing criminal charges. So, I try very hard to have some level of responsibility in every case, and I fight very hard against any outright dismissals or no process unless it's something I really can't prove or I have a witness that's not showing up to court.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: I don't need an exact number. I need this one answered so I can ask the follow-up.

Attorney Clay: Sure, sure.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Can you give me an approximate of what your percentage is of dismissals?

Attorney Clay: I apologize. I don't have those numbers. I can get them for you if you want to come back to that because I know that one of our clerks tracks those things. I can tell you that the vast majority of dismissals is because the victim is not showing up, and usually it's domestic violence-related, and there's a whole psychology behind domestic violence and why victims don't participate in the court process.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay. I'll ask the other question.

Attorney Clay: Sorry.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: No, it's fine.

Attorney Clay: That's a very lawyerly answer.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: You lawyered me up. I guess with the rewind happening, do you have a guesstimate of how much increase you'll see in dismissals?

Attorney Clay: The rewind has already taken effect, so we're about two years into it, and there's far less dismissals from my end because if it's got a victim like a felony-level assault, we're pushing that to Superior Court. That's not something that we generally want to resolve, and if they do resolve, they have to be guilty. That's my position because I want them to take responsibility, and it saves the victim from having to go through testimony and all that. The benefit for the rewind for us is that we can maintain some control over the sentences that we get. A lot of our cases are felony possession of a controlled drug. It's a very small amount of fentanyl or crack cocaine or meth, and it's user amounts. It's not people selling. It's not people having such large quantities that they're distributing in town. It's user amounts. When someone has no prior drug convictions, I know, and I've spoken to the county attorney's office about this, they're going to resolve that as a misdemeanor anyways. The difference between them resolving it as a misdemeanor and me resolving it as the misdemeanor is we have systems in place to ensure that we're also going to check their compliance throughout the course of their sentence. At the end of the year, if they've not been of good behavior, then we can do a motion to impose, and I think we'll have better success with that than sending it to the county.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Okay. Thank you.

Attorney Clay: You're welcome.

Chairman Dumont: I'll make my case one more time, and I hope you guys truly understand this. I'm always one to support the police department, just the same spiel that I gave to fire. I don't discount any work that Attorney Clay, the Chief, or anybody involved does. I understand it's superior to what you see in other communities, and that's what makes Hudson great, and that's what makes Hudson safe. I believe 100% everything that they're saying here, otherwise they wouldn't be here asking for it. I do not believe that the department in any shape or form ever asks for something that they truly don't need. However, what I struggle with is if I was to look at it in a vacuum, I would 100% support this. We can't. We've added positions. One of them went to police. We've increased salaries. We've adjusted salaries. We've made reorganizations for executive coordinators, another one that was in police. We've increased those salaries. We've done a lot of changes this year. I, and I will say it across the board, and I mean no offense, but I can't support any of the new staffing positions. Not this year. We've done too much, and I mean that hopefully by saying we do support everybody. We saw issues. We took those to heart. We addressed those. We fixed them. They're in the budget. We need that budget to pass. The more we put on the warrant, I get nervous about that not passing, and all of that hard work then goes away and we start over again next year, and it's that much harder to make up the ground. So, I really do appreciate everything, and I appreciate the ask. I would never say not to, I just can't support the new positions.

Selectman Jakoby: Can we move on to the legal clerk?

Selectman Guessferd: So, while we're all talking here, I've been looking at all three of these positions as well. Like I said, I can't really, I probably can't get behind all of them. I try to figure out which one's most critical, and it sounds to me like this is the one to me. Even though, you know, you've got all your legal clerk activities and duties. You know, I see the words efficiency in there, and I see, you know, the justification for the sergeant as well, but I think we can operate another year without that. I think we can, I mean, not well maybe, not as well as we'd like. It's not optimal. This one I see, I just, I have a very high level of, you know, wanting to make sure that

justice is done, and so for this one, I'm okay with myself. But I don't think I'm going to be able to support the other two. We'll see, we'll see, you know, how well you can articulate. But no, I, to a certain extent, I agree with Chairman Dumont that, you know, we've got a lot here in front of us, and we are, I don't think you can say that this board in any way, shape, or form does not support the police or the fire. I think we've done a pretty good job over the time I've been here. Sometimes we have to pivot, change, move things out a little bit. I'd like to see some of this come back next year. But this position, my view is I'll support this one position.

Chairman Dumont: So, do you have a motion, or are we moving on to the next one?

Selectman Guessferd: I didn't know, well it looked like there might be other people. Okay.

Selectman Jakoby: I think that's a good motion to make.

Selectman Guessferd: All right. Okay. All right.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I would support that.

Chairman Dumont: We've got to make a decision here at some point.

Selectman Jakoby: Let's move it.

Selectman Guessferd: Come on. Midnight, right? You said midnight, right? All right. Which article number is this?

Selectman Jakoby: D.

Selectman Guessferd: D letter.

Roy Sorenson: This is the part-time prosecutor position, correct?

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Roy Sorenson: All right. So, you're on warrant D.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to forward article D, Hire One Part-Time Prosecuting Attorney in the amount of \\$90,275, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 3-1. Dumont opposing.](#)

## **Article B – Part-Time to Full-Time Legal Clerk for Police \$72,249**

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up is the part-time legal clerk.

Chief Cayot: Before I move into that, I would just like to agree that this Board and this community in general do give the police department a ton of support, and we do appreciate that. So obviously my job is to sit up here and to fight for these positions and to get them put on there, and you guys have an obligation to the taxpayer, so we understand that.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, we have an obligation to the taxpayer. We also have an obligation to you, and to make sure you have the tools that you need to do your job. So, we don't take that lightly.

Chief Cayot: We appreciate that.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay.

Chief Cayot: So, for the part-time, right now we have a full-time and a part-time legal clerk. When we started the position of part-time legal clerk, the intention always was to try and move that to a full-time position. We knew the work was there, but it was kind of start small and try and move bigger as we worked through that position. I don't want to rehash everything, but the caseload, yes, an attorney kind of sees it on one end, but we need the legal clerks behind the scenes to be doing the dock. It's getting everything prepared, getting the discovery out to the defense attorneys. So, there's a lot of behind-the-scenes stuff they're doing in the legal division. I'll let Attorney Clay speak to that a little bit more.

Attorney Clay: I will be more brief on this one. It's just like Chief Cayot said, it's the back-end processing stuff. It's the discovery. We have timelines and obligations that we have to get discovery out in a certain amount of time. Again, otherwise we risk losing cases. So, all the same stuff. The caseload increases, the admin work increases.

And certainly any questions, but I don't want to. You're all intelligent people. I'm not going to say the same things over.

Selectman Guessferd: Thanks.

Chairman Dumont: Questions, comments?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: No, I don't have any questions. Just a statement. I'm kind of in the same boat as Selectman Guessferd and Selectman Dumont, Chairman Dumont, and we can't add them all. I think the prosecutor is a huge one, and I don't know that I could support this one as much as I would like to.

Chairman Dumont: These are the fun decisions.

Selectman Jakoby: I'll just put my comments in. I think it's an extremely important area. I cannot support it at this time. I hope that, again, there are opportunities to think outside the box for ways of getting that help. So that's my hope.

Chairman Dumont: All right. No motions, no other comments?

Selectman Jakoby: No.

### **Article C – Hire One Additional Full-Time Police Sergeant \$166,416**

Chairman Dumont: Moving on to the next one. Hire one additional full-time Police Sergeant.

Chief Cayot: So, I know this one was brought up at the Budget Committee, and I had a, I think this was the one I probably had the most lengthy discussion with them about at the Budget Committee. And currently, like I explained to them, we have a six-day rotation for our patrol officers. During two of those days on one of the shifts, there is a sergeant that covers it. So, you don't have a first-line supervisor. You have a lieutenant who's filling in on those duties. Obviously, like all the things we discussed for efficiency and everything, it would make the most sense to have a first-line supervisor on every single shift so the patrol officers have that first-line supervisor to discuss cases with, to have on the calls with them, to just have that person there as opposed to on those couple days having a lieutenant they have to go to. It would also allow us to use our lieutenants in a more administrative role to start giving some of those projects, and that also allows with that succession planning because now we can take those lieutenants and have them in that more administrative role, learning the ways the department runs so that when people retire, people move on, they're ready to move up into those positions. I'd be happy to answer any other questions that you have on this position.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I did listen to that conversation at the Budget Committee, and I really appreciate that explanation of the supervisory role. Actually, this is one of those that I would be in support of putting out to the public. That's where I stand.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'll circle back. I forgot my question. Apologies.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, I mean, obviously it would be great to have that. And I've said already, you know where I'm going to land here. It's not that I don't support it, but I don't think we can do it this year. I think it's really important, the succession planning, having that sergeant to be that first-line supervisor. I think of the three positions, this is probably the one we can cobble along for another year. I do think we need it. I do think we should put it in for next year, one way or the other. But I think I see us being able to probably, you know, move along and not gravely affect safety without it at this point yet. That's just, you know, when I look at all three of these positions, I think probably it's probably the one that I would – I probably support the least of the three in terms of getting it on the warrant. Again, like you said, Selectman Vurgaropoulos, all three positions, you know, are definitely needed. But I tell myself I'm not happy falling on this side of the table.

Chairman Dumont: It doesn't feel too good, does it?

Selectman Guessferd: No, it doesn't.

Chief Cayot: What I can say, too, is obviously, you know, we're going to obviously do the best we can to make sure we're responding to all the calls. And like I discussed at the Budget Committee, there are priority calls we're

going to make sure we get people there where we can get them there as fast as we can. They asked a question about response times. What I will say is this position does add a sergeant for that first-line supervision, but what it also does is on the back end, it gives us one more patrol position. If you look at the Police Department, we have not grown our patrol division by much, really, in the past 8, 10 years. Yes, one position here, one position there. We really haven't grown. Our minimum staffing hasn't changed. So, we're operating, even though these numbers are going up and up and up, we're operating with the same number of people on those shifts. And I know I go to a lot of community events, talk to a lot of different groups, and when they find out what our staffing levels are, they're shocked. And not shocked and like, wow, you have that many guys. Shocked and that's all. That's all you have working at these times. So, at some point, we are going to have to grow the Police Department. As this town grows, as everything grows, we're going to have to grow this Police Department. And this was one of the ways we were looking to do it to kind of get the most bang for our buck.

Selectman Guessferd: Okay. All right.

Selectman Jakoby: The other piece of this that makes me support it is that it reduces the overtime, which I continuously hear from the Budget Committee and others about overtime and balance.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion to forward Article C, Hire One Additional Full-Time Police Serqant, to the FY27 warrant. Motion failed, no second.](#)

Chairman Dumont: Motion by Selectman Jakoby. Do we have a second? Going once. Going twice.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Can I just have a comment?

Chairman Dumont: Looking for a second. Three times. No second. The motion on the floor dies.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you. I gave it a shot.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'm in the same boat here. I understand the necessity, and I really would love to support this. Looking at everything that we've done and then looking at how we're operating right now, I know it's not fun, but we're making it happen. I would definitely love to see this one come back because I do think frontline supervision is very important because they play numerous roles critically, not just in the frontline, and they provide that support that the policeman needs. So please bring this back next year.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, and expanding the patrol as well. That's noted.

Chief Cayot: And just to go to the overtime that you discussed, as we fill those positions and get those additional ones, like I said, we have minimum staffing. We don't have, you know, if someone takes it out, we have to fill it unless we're at that minimum staffing. So, as we fill those positions, it does decrease the overtime, and you'll kind of see that if you look back in history on how the police department budgets worked out.

Selectman Jakoby: Can I just make one comment?

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby: I'm sorry. I just think it's really important as we look at the reorganization and staffing that we have staffing conversations early and continuously. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: And I just want to throw out, I know I mentioned it, but the compression issue that obviously resolved earlier this year is another part of that basis of my decision. I hope that you guys appreciate that, and I don't mean that in a bad way, but that was an issue that we at the Board knew was going on between some of the higher-ups and some of the lower guys with their new contract that was approved. So, it's just difficult to work it all in. That's all. So, thank you. All right.

Chief Cayot: We do appreciate the support.

Roy Sorenson: Have a good night.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up, Mr. Sorensen, what do we got?

Roy Sorenson: One second. Do you want an update?

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I might as well give an update for whoever's watching at 10:24 p.m., 10:26 p.m.

Roy Sorenson: So right now, right now with everything you did that's going to the warrants in yellow, items with no color are still on the table for discussion, and your rate is \$5.80. Is that what you have, Dan?

Dan Thibeault: Yep.

### **Article L – Drainage Capital Reserve Funding \$100,000**

Roy Sorenson: Okay. All right. So, I move forward, and we are going to proceed to Drainage Capital Reserve Funding. I'll ask Director Twardosky to come up. Article L. This is going to be Article L, Drainage Capital Reserve Funding in the amount of \$100,000. This CRF, established in 2024, is used to offset costs related to installation, repairs, lining, upgrades, and replacement of stormwater drains on town roads to accommodate heavier flows to help alleviate costly road damage, property damage, and is vital to improving the town's drainage infrastructure. These upgrades are also necessary for MS-4 stormwater permit requirements, and I will congratulate Director Twardosky and Mr. Dhima for coming in and withdrawing how many? \$45,000 earlier in the night, and how that might tie into this request. But all kidding aside.

Jay Twardosky: Well, it just goes to show you that we definitely need this. That's a good example, right? It's a good example of why we need this, because this stuff comes up during mid-budget. So, if you don't already have it budgeted for, you're pulling it from somewhere else. So, it's great to have this fund. It's very important because these type of projects, as you can see, get very expensive real quick. The Adams Drive project took the whole Capital Reserve fund at the time, or near all of it. So, it's just very important that we keep moving forward with these drainage projects. The aging infrastructure just isn't going to get better on its own. The Capital Reserve report, I'm not sure which numbers you guys have, but there's actually \$102,204 before tonight?

Roy Sorenson: I think that's correct. I did ask Dan to run that number up tonight. That number I think is wrong.

Chairman Dumont: So, we didn't have the \$207?

Jay Twardosky: No.

Roy Sorenson: So, your balance is going to be, what was it, \$102,000 minus what was the request for \$43,000?

Jay Twardosky: \$42,300.

Roy Sorenson: So, you're around \$57,000 in there after tonight's approval.

Chairman Dumont: Why was that? Was that a mix-up on our end, or was that the Adams Drive? Because I thought the Adams Drive was quite a bit more.

Roy Sorenson: Do you remember how much the Adams Drive one was?

Jay Twardosky: I don't off the top of my head. But the general ledger report right now is \$102,204.29.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. I might not have showed previously to when it was done, that's why. But I think you're right, it was that project.

Jay Twardosky: But it could be because I want to say that was around a \$105,000 or something like that.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I know it was over \$100,000. Okay, that makes sense. All right. So, we've talked about this quite a bit, the drainage. What's everybody's thoughts?

Selectman Guessferd: I think we need to put something in there.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'm ready to make a motion.

Selectman Guessferd: Whether it's \$100,000 or it's \$50,000. \$50,000 would do it up to \$100,000, a little over \$100,000, back up to a little over \$100,000. Still not, I know, a ton because if something happens.

Jay Twardosky: But something's better than nothing.

Selectman Guessferd: So, I would support \$50,000, not \$100,000.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I think that's fair to the public and to you.

Chairman Dumont: A motion?

Selectman Guessferd: I can do that.

Chairman Dumont: I would love it.

[Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to forward Article L, Drainage Capital Reserve Funding in the amount of \\$50,000, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'll just supplement. The impact rate is 1?

Chairman Dumont: .01¢

### **Article F – DPW Vehicle Repair/Replacement Capital Reserve Fund \$50,000**

Roy Sorenson: All right. Next item is going to be DPW Vehicle Repair Replacement Capital Reserve Fund request in the amount of \$50,000. The CRF was established in 2025. Utilized as a supplement to repair and replace public works aging fleet. Currently has a balance of \$150,000, of which \$80,000 plus or minus is proposed to be utilized to offset the balance of the DARA grant reimbursement for replacing a public works dump truck. Adding \$50,000 to the remaining balance will help fund future replacements or major unexpected repairs.

Jay Twardosky: As we well know, we have a very aging fleet. Everything just keeps getting more expensive. Adding some to it now just helps us keep from having a bigger impact later on.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, we know. We know the state of those trucks. We've been talking about this for the last couple of years with replacements and everything else and all the rust. I support the \$50,000 for this. I think we have to keep money in that account to be able to take care of these things.

Chairman Dumont: I'll say while I supported that last year, I'm not going to support it this year. I think we take a break on this one. Nothing against it. All of Mr. Twardowsky's concerns are valid. If anybody has taken a tour and looked at those vehicles, well, this is not a knock on him, but it's part of my decision. He did a fantastic job to get that grant for us, which really helped. So, I think that we can afford to hold off for this year. I would like to see us file again for that grant. I know they came out with some more funding for it. I just think for a couple of these we're going to have to skip. I know I've been nose on a lot of them, but I'm going to at least stay consistent. Where's everybody at? Do we have a motion? Any other comments, questions?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: What was the current balance of the CRF?

Chairman Dumont: It had \$150,000, taking out the \$80,000. You're looking at about \$70,000 roughly.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Jay, what do you anticipate your next vehicle in dire need of?

Jay Twardosky: The next ones in dire need are going to be we have one loader that's getting pretty old now. The four 2001 dump trucks, we put those aside to do the '06s because they were worse rust-wise. The old ones obviously have more time mileage on them. So, those are definitely going to be high on the priority list to get out of there. Like I was saying before, just an engine replacement on those is right around \$100,000.

Chairman Dumont: One thing, obviously, to keep in mind, we created this last year while adding that \$150,000. So, we created it last year or the year before, give or take. Added the \$150,000 in there, which was a good idea. Obviously, it gave us the money to chase that grant, which we did. We also put two vehicles into the budget, which thankfully was approved. So, again, we've worked at this. I just don't think it's something we can do every year.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I think I would agree with that sentiment.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, I do not support this warrant.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Selectman Guessferdf: No motions, then.

### **Article K – VacCon Truck Replacement Capital Reserve Fund \$30,000**

Chairman Dumont: Next up, the VacCon Replacement Capital Reserve Fund.

Roy Sorenson: So, this is going to be warrant K, VacCon Truck Replacement Capital Reserve Fund. The background is through the article, adds funding for replacing the vacuum truck used to keep sewer lines, drain lines, storm drains clear and flowing, preventing backups in infrastructure and helping improve the town's MS-4 permit requirements. This vital machine is in its fourth year of operation and has a lifespan of approximately 10 years. The CRF currently has a balance of \$180,850, with the cost of a new machine estimated at \$600,000. This would build up the reserves in advance and would help ensure the town has funds for replacement with minimal impact on the tax rate.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to forward Article K, VacCon Truck Replacement Capital Reserve Fund for \\$30,000, to the FY27 warrant. Motion failed, 2-2. Dumont and Vurgaropoulos opposing.](#)

Chairman Dumont: I'll make my piece real quick. I do not support this. The truck is three years new or three years old. I believe that with the way the DPW maintains their vehicles and what they know how our budget is, we'll get a lot longer than 10 years out of that vehicle. We have to. We and the voters have done a very good job, I think, at supporting the departments and making sure that these things fit. The voters deserve a chance to breathe. So that is my same song and dance I'll be singing, I guess, the rest of the night, but I can't support it. Any other questions or comments? Discussion?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: How old is the current one? Is it three years?

Jay Twardosky: Three years. It'll be four in the next budget.

Chairman Dumont: There's \$180,000 in that reserve fund apparently.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I would not support this myself.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, motion made, seconded, discussion done.

Motion fails. There's nobody in the affirmative. All right. Move on to the next one. So, Establish an Extreme Weather Capital Reserve Fund.

### **Article Q – Establish an Extreme Weather Capital Reserve Fund**

Roy Sorenson: So, this one here, I did talk to Director Twardosky about this. I think, and if you can correct me, Jay, you just want to set this up, you're not asking for the \$10,000? Or are you still asking for the \$10,000?

Jay Twardosky: Right now, I put it through as not asking for anything.

Roy Sorenson: So, this is just a pass-through? This is just to set up a CRF. As we talked about with this one, if he has money left over in his extreme weather account at the end of 27, we can take that money and transfer it into the CRF and vice versa. So, this would just be to establish the CRF.

Chairman Dumont: So, with the money being left over, can we actually put it in the CRF, or does it go to the general fund?

Roy Sorenson: No, because we're setting the CRF up to receive it that way. So, it's specific to that account.

Chairman Dumont: What was the article number again? Q. Select with Jakoby, I apologize.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to forward Article Q, Establish an Extreme Weather Capital Reserve Fund, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Selectman Guessferd: Do we want to say at \$0?

Selectman Jakoby: It'll say that.

Chairman Dumont: The motion would be just to create the warrant.

Roy Sorenson: I think that does it. Jay, just remind me, you did withdraw a warrant, Article R, which is to create and fund sidewalk replacement capital reserve fund?

Jay Twardosky: Correct.

Roy Sorenson: All right, so that's deferred.

Jay Twardosky: One other note. Back in my department update, I talked about the need to eventually hire more employees, a couple more employees. And because of where we are this year, I decided not to move forward with those. I just didn't want to discount the fact that we do need those employees, and I will be coming forward with them next year.

Chairman Dumont: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Jay Twardosky: Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: I do remember that in your department update. So, I don't take it lightly to know it's a hard decision.

Jay Twardosky: Absolutely it is.

Roy Sorenson: All right. Thank you, Jay. Thank you very much.

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you, Jay. Appreciate it. Have a good night.

## **Article T – Modify Hudson Community Television Revolving**

Roy Sorenson: Have a good night. Mr. Chair, if I may. We have two items left, and one of them is HCTV Director Mike Johnson. Do you want to go to that? Do you want to go back to the communications equipment? Because you really have three left on the table right now, \$50,000, \$70,000, \$794,000, and \$25,000. So how do you want to work that?

Chairman Dumont: Any of those that no motion was made. Let's go to Mike at this point. Any without a motion are gone.

Roy Sorenson: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: In my opinion.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, we didn't make a motion on the communications stuff, so I think that one is off the table.

Roy Sorenson: All right. So, this one here is going to be Warrant Article T. Obviously, Director Johnson has been in here many times to tell you about the revolving fund. Currently, the split is 80% to the revolving fund, 20% to the general fund. He's seeking to capture all of the 100% because of that, and this is where this FY25 we finished at \$7794. That would be the number, and that's the basis for this. I'll turn it over to Mr. Johnson.

Mike Johnson: All right. Good evening, everybody. Thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to speak about this again. I came to you guys last spring and started the early conversations about this warrant article. This is going to be a crucial piece for HCTV and our department's survival, ultimately the next three fiscal years. Right now, just for full transparency, we lost about \$2,500 last quarter again. That's going to continue with cord cutting. It's not going to stop. So, planning for the future on my end has been difficult. In my capacity, I've been doing the best I can. I plan on that decrease when I'm budgeting. With that being said, just to reiterate, I was asked what percentage we felt we needed, and Roy mentioned the full 20% is where I feel we're going to need for the future. This year, if I'm able to fill all those underwriting spots, we'll break even with the revenue. Last year, we actually, in FY25, we started the year with \$82,000 in our revolving fund. We actually ended the year with \$97,000 in our revolving fund, so we were able to put a little bit of money last year away. What's in that fund can fund some of our large equipment needs. We're very similar to IT in regard to a lot of our gears turning 10 years old. It's going to fail on us. It's electronics. On top of that, HCTV over the years, I've been here since I just graduated high school part-time, but I've seen it develop over the years. We have a large broadcast vehicle, as many of you know, that costs money for us to maintain. We have a Chevy Tahoe we maintain. We have the

studio, all these equipment rooms, or meeting rooms, sorry, it's late. But it's a lot of electronic equipment, and I'm always eyeballing it, seeing, okay, what's failing here, what's failing there. So essentially what this is going to allow me to do, it'll fund a department. Next year, my budget was around \$353,000 when I presented to you. Getting that in would allow me to, the 20% would allow me to break even, while the underwriting revenue, in theory, if we're able to get potential subscribers to that, will help us build up that revolving fund. So, while we continue to see decreases, we'll be able to offset it with that in future fiscal years. So even if we're in the negative, we can offset it with that. We're also going to be able to meet what we need to for our software maintenance. As I mentioned in my budget presentation, we have to maintain our web services, our streaming services. If you guys ever want to see a tour of our IT room, I can show you kind of how everything works at the studio. But yeah, it's a tough situation. It's not just in Hudson, unfortunately. And I know the economy is tough right now in the world. I'm very sympathetic to that, and it is a hard ask to ask for that money to be put back into our account. I might be biased in saying I think we provide an essential service to this community. I've seen it grow over the years, and I can tell you when something goes off the air, my phone's beeping and ringing all night. So, I'm happy to answer any questions, and I just want to thank the board for all your support of HCTV.

Chairman Dumont: So, I think this one for me, this is a simple one. I'm in favor of funding HCTV. To me, if there's a shortfall, obviously we have to find a place to make it up. So one way or the other, if you're in favor of funding it, well, it's kind of a wash. So, for me, I support this foreign article.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Thank you. I am in the same boat. I think giving them everything, as Mike stated, it's going to help them break even, and then hopefully the underwriting will help them so they can be profitable. I support this 100 percent only because I know the product you put out, and I know that the majority of the town, at least everybody that watches, it's very valuable to them because not everybody is going to come down here. So, I support this.

[Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, to forward Article T, Modify Hudson Community Television Revolving Fund, to the FY27 warrant. Motion carried, 4-0.](#)

Mike Johnson: Thank you guys very much for the support. I hope you all have a happy Thanksgiving.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you for the wait, Mike.

Roy Sorenson: Next time we'll put you in the front, all right? You only have one item.

Selectman Jakoby: Don't promise things.

### **Rebuild the Energy Efficiency Capital Reserve Fund**

Roy Sorenson: Well, public safety first, right? There is one more.

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Roy Sorenson: All right, so I did receive notice from the Sustainability Advisory Committee with a request to submit a warrant article forward to rebuild the Energy Efficiency Capital Reserve Fund. That request came from Carl Hubert in the amount of \$25,000. I don't know if you want to speak to that at all, Selectman Jakoby, or...

Selectman Jakoby: That fund has been and was used to offset some costs for efficiency for the police department and different programs throughout the years. So, I think it's just important for them to put it before us each year. And it's down to \$3,000, right?

Chairman Dumont: What is it? \$3,025.

Selectman Jakoby: \$3,025 because of the expenditures to help with the different programs. I know the police department was the biggest receiver of it.

Chairman Dumont: So, for me, I'm going to stay with Pat with what I've done with every other one pretty much. I'm not going to support this. However, what I would like to see is them continue to offer the energy efficiency solutions that they did just like they did with the police station. And for dollar amounts like that, I do believe we

can find areas in the budget where we can make that up, whether it be a contingency fund or a different line item in somebody else's budget depending on the department. If there's some savings there, I think the department head would be open to it. I would rather see us go that route for this year.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Thank you. So, Selectman Jakoby, can you explain what this fund is used for? I'm not entirely sure exactly what it's used for.

Chairman Dumont: These lights.

Selectman Guessferd: Energy-efficient lights, yeah?

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, so it's different.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Energy-saving initiatives?

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, but they do, they, so they find programs through the state or other areas, and then this is a way of funding that so that the individual departments or other areas don't have to find the funding for it.

Selectman Guessferd: And it also does reduce costs. Part of their charge. And it also does reduce energy costs as well.

Chairman Dumont: We've done lighting in this building, police department, windows. We've done quite a bit of projects with it.

Selectman Jakoby: And being that we are addressing their charter this year, you know, I think it's, I'm not overly drawn to it one way or the other. I think as we establish both the charter for the Sustainability Advisory Committee and reaffirm their charge and reaffirm the Benson Park Advisory Committee's charge, I think going into next fiscal year, we can really identify the purpose for both this fund and the Benson Park Fund to more clarify, to better clarify its use and purpose and to justify any additions to it. I do not think that this is timely at this point.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions, comments, motions?

Selectman Guessferd: No motion here. I'm in full agreement.

Chairman Dumont: With that, I'm going to close this item off. We'll take a look at the final dollar amount and then we're going to move on.

Roy Sorenson: All right, so I'll put it up there first. And then Mr. Thibeault can correct me, but we started, we were at, well, this was the tax rate before warrant articles, \$5.542. And then after the work that the Board did, we are at \$5.749, is that right?

Dan Thibeault: You got it.

Roy Sorenson: All right, so what we'll do is based on that, I'm going to call this the unaudited version because we're going to get into the coffers. We'll make sure this is right and then we'll report back to the Budget Committee next week with the numbers, okay?

Selectman Guessferd: Excellent.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Can we get an updated copy of this? Like, I know we have a couple old copies floating about.

Roy Sorenson: For this actual cover page?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Yeah.

Roy Sorenson: We'll create it once.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: All right, awesome.

Roy Sorenson: Once he goes through it tomorrow and just double-checks it. All right?

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Thank you.

**9. SELECTMEN LIAISON REPORTS/OTHER REMARKS**

Selectman Vurgaropulos: It's been a long night. I don't have much to say, but I would implore the public, if you have any input, especially on the budget or any matter for the town, that matter, please reach out. I don't find my inbox being flooded, but I would like a little activity.

Selectman Morin: Excused.

Selectman Jakoby: I would like to remind people that we do have a deliberative session coming up in February where you can address your concerns and questions. We also have public input at each one of our meetings, so please feel free to let us know your thoughts on the work that we're doing. I have an update from the Sustainability Committee, just that they are going forward with their Christmas lights collection, so that if you have Christmas lights that are dead and you want to dispose of them, do not throw them in the trash. There will be collection bins around because they do abrupt the way we handle garbage. They can be a tangle and a problem. So that's happening. Please take a look at the HCTV. The pumpkin smash was a great success, and there's a great video up on that. I don't know if anybody was going to talk about the composting.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, I got it. I'll have a slide.

Selectman Jakoby: The composting. I had a great time seeing the composting that was happening, and the town administrator will address some of that. Benson Park. I want to let all those who came to the Benson Park Committee and to thank Lieutenant Flynn for being there. We had a lot of conversation about the dog park, about the park itself, about rules and regulations, policies and guidelines, and what's enforceable and not enforceable. So, I do want the public to know that many of those things will be coming up and before this Board, especially the conversations that I've had about the dog park, will be coming forward. I started that conversation recently. So, I wanted people to be aware of that. I wanted to thank all the volunteers in Benson Park. All those are helping keeping it moving forward, and especially DPW and all the staff for all their hard work and communication. And happy Thanksgiving.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, I don't want to say too much at this point, but let's see, we had a library meeting last week. There wasn't a lot of significant news. They're doing great work, and we'll be seeing them sometime soon to talk about the transfer of the hills and how we go forth with that. No Planning Board meeting tomorrow night. Our next Planning Board meeting is on the 10th of December, and I'm going to do a very kind of concise Rec update, again, given the situation, but I can't believe I'm saying this, but the Santa's sleigh ride is coming up.

Selectman Jakoby: That's right.

Selectman Guessferd: I can't believe I'm saying that. So, we've blown through this year. Just amazing how fast it's going. It's on December 14th, so mark your calendars. Santa's going to be riding through town, and we'll have more updates and information regarding where he's going to be when, how the procession goes with streets and all that. He's going to be taking off at 12 p.m., and he's going to be touring 100 streets of Hudson, starting in the south end. So, watch for the route details. I got a note from Chrissy Peterson tonight about we saw earlier a young lady who had her Capstone project. Our town employees' mentor many of these students with their capstone projects. Chrissy has mentored, in addition to everything else she does, she's mentored 10 of these projects, 10 of these students, and I'm not going to go through all 10 of them at this point with what they all have, but she recently featured, I'll put the names out here, Julian and Taylor Small, Natalie Goulet, Lexi Moritano, Tegan McTaggart, Julia Adams, Julia Allison, Nora Lizmaris, and Alexis Floyd, who's the last one. I told her to come talk to you, Roy, about perhaps giving Alexis a chance to come in to another Select Board meeting tonight. She ran a basketball clinic and raised \$1,800 to help kids who can't pay for sports, who can't afford to play rec sports because they can't afford the fees. So, I think that was a very good project for her. So, there's a lot of this that goes on. So anyway, so that's kind of what's happening on the other things going on. I do want to reiterate what Selectman Jakoby said. Everybody, please have a happy and safe Thanksgiving. I know people are traveling. Be safe. Be safe. Don't drink and drive. Have all that good stuff, right? And enjoy your family and your friends. And, you know, we'll see you after the break. And then we're heading off toward the end of the year and Christmas. So, it's amazing. I'm done.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. I will just echo. I would appreciate that everybody get involved with the budget process. Take a look through. Send your recommendations off to the Board of Selectmen. If you have anything, the deliberative session is another chance to take a look at and have conversations. Board of Selectmen has the right to change recommendations. And everybody obviously has the right to make additions or subtractions to the budget. So, I hope everybody gets involved and takes a thorough look at it. With that, I'll just keep it short and sweet that I hope everybody has a happy Thanksgiving and slows down and spends time with their family. So, thank you very much. And I will turn it over to Mr. Sorensen.

#### **10. REMARKS BY TOWN ADMINISTRATOR**

Roy Sorenson: All right. So, I'll get through this pretty quick. Pictures will be worth a thousand words. So Public Works is out doing a good job. You've probably seen a bunch of catch basins, manhole covers being repaired throughout town. So, the rush is on to get this work done before the snow flies. They also finished up the paving for the year ahead of schedule. So basically, the paving program is complete for fiscal year 26. Selectman Jakoby talked about this. Quite a product being made and quite a site up at the transfer station. So, this is the composting operation. This piece of equipment that screens it is remarkable. And the end result is even more remarkable. So, we'll continue doing this through the winter. And this will be put out to the residents next year through the PR of Sustainability Advisory Committee and Public Works. I'm sure that the Hudson residents are going to be more than happy with what will be made available to them. Police training, they've been out. You may recall they came earlier in the year using some target funds. So, they've been out. Nate Glowicki, who's the training officer up at the range, and they've actually done some more of this. I'll report on this at the next meeting. But out at the range using their new guns and their new pistols with the red dot optics. Myself and the Chair actually got to sit with the CALEA evaluator. So, this is for their CALEA certification. And that went extremely well. And I think he was pleasantly surprised and or happy with all the things that were happening in Hudson and with the police department. So, we expect a good report from them come March of next year. Another big night, the Hudson Fire Department Awards Night. So, this was held at Red's Tavern upstairs, which is a great venue if you haven't been there. It's really remarkable up there. But they covered a lot. So, they gave a bunch of awards, promotions, pinning ceremonies, rescue awards, Lion Club Award, military recognition, and unit citations. So Chief Tice did a great job with that in getting some awards out and creating that teamwork and that family aspect of the fire department. This is development services. This is the Marsh Road Booster Station. Mr. Dhima is wrapping this project up with the pump station itself, and they'll begin dismantling and decommissioning the actual in-ground or vault pump station. This is me showing Mr. Dhima how to program the pumps. I did this in my past professional experience. I want to make sure he got his pressures right and just showed him how to use that. But the station came out great, great new equipment in there, and obviously I don't know if you've seen this and or you saw what it replaced, but it's two different worlds. I did miss October recognition, so I just want to make sure we capture that. You see the folks from in October that we want to recognize for the years of service. We've got a 30-year library candidate all the way down to a one-year police candidate, and a lot in between. So, kudos to those folks for putting in their time and dedicating themselves to public service. Same thing in November. As you can see, Bruce Daigle, Public Works, 29 years. That's a long time if you do the math. And then you see some new recruits and fire. And as I mentioned, myself and Mr. Dumont saw some of these recognized for their years of service as well. I'm going to turn this one over to Selectman Jakoby because she came to see me and she said, there's some kind of monument in the woods. Do you know anything about it? And I said, I have no idea. So, I dug into the Ruth Parker guide of the history of Hudson. But I'll turn it over to Selectman Jakoby because it's an interesting story.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, it's just interesting living on the south end. So, this particular marker is at the entrance to Musquash, and you can read it there. And it marks the meeting house, which was actually Nottingham West, Massachusetts. And online, it's moved around. But according to what's here, it was at the old schoolhouse.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah. So, it's interesting, right? I mean, because you see these things and you look at it. But, yeah, and it was, again, you tell that story before it was even Hudson. So pretty remarkable. So that's the history snippet, and that's it. Town hall is closed, obviously, for Thanksgiving and the day after Thanksgiving. I want to wish the boards, the committees, the staff, and everyone, the public, as well, a happy Thanksgiving. Thank you very much.

Chairman Dumont: I, for one, am happy that we were saved by New Hampshire, so I appreciate that history snippet. I will turn it over to our School Board Liaison, Mr. Stephen Meyer.

**11. REMARKS BY SCHOOL BOARD**

Stephen Meyer: Yeah, I'll keep it brief. I just want to say I appreciate seeing capstone projects in front of this Board and just being highlighted on that something, obviously, through the school district. We're excited to just see the students get a chance to do that work, engage with the community, and also receive recognition for the hard work they're putting in. Otherwise, no surprise, we're mostly just budget focused. Our budget is with the Budget Committee. We're expecting review in the next couple weeks. And the only real update, since we submitted, we were pending receiving our health insurance rate that came, like, mid-November. It ended up being less than we were anticipating. They gave us a range, I think, of anywhere from 8% to 35% when they were trying to project for us. So, we took a more conservative approach. So, we are expecting to bring before the budget committee, proposing a reduction of around \$400,000 based on the rate that we ended up getting, which anytime we can bring that down, we're happy to do so. Other than that, as everyone else has mentioned, I'm wishing everyone a happy Thanksgiving. Thank you very much.

Chairman Dumont: That takes care of remarks. With that, we're going to move on to our non-public motions. Mr. Sorensen, if you could please read the first motion into the record.

**12. MOTIONS MADE IN NONPUBLIC**

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, to hire Daniel Sanchez as a patrol officer for the Hudson Police Department with a starting salary, \$34.10. Step two, per hour, all in accordance with the Hudson Police Employee Association's contract, as recommended by the Police Chief. Motion carried, 4-0.

Selectman Vurgaropulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to hire Corey Booth for the position of Firefighter/AEMT in the Fire Department at the contracted salary of \$33.85 per hour. Step six, this assignment will be a non-exempt position, in accordance with the International Association of Firefighters Local 3154, as recommended by the Fire Chief. Motion carried, 4-0.

**13. ADJOURNMENT**

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropulos, to adjourn at 11:02 p.m. Motion carried, 4-0.

Recorded by HCTV and transcribed by Lorrie Weissgarber, Executive Assistant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dillon Dumont, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Guessferd, Vice-Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Xen Vurgaropulos, Selectman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Heidi Jakoby, Selectman

\_\_\_\_\_ Excused \_\_\_\_\_  
Dave Morin, Selectman