



HUDSON, NEW HAMPSHIRE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Town of Hudson Deliberative Session

Minutes of January 31, 2026

Hudson Community Center

1. **CALL TO ORDER** The Honorable Debra Stoddard call the Town Meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. **POSTING OF THE COLORS** by the Hudson Police Honor Guard

4. **THE NATIONAL ANTHEM** sung by Alan St. Louis

5. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** by Chairman Dumont

6. **MOMENT OF SILENCE** in memory of former selectman, Marilyn McGrath

7. **INTRODUCTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN**

By Chairman Dillon Dumont

Vice-Chairman Robert Guessferd

Selectman Morin

Selectman Jakoby

Selectman Vurgaropulos

8. **INTRODUCTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE**

By Chairman James Lawrence III

Vice-Chairman Kim Rice

Kevin Walsh

Bob Wherry

Shawn Jasper

Bill Cole

School Board Liaison Dan Kilgore

9. **REMARKS BY THE MODERATOR**

Moderator: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you. Mrs. Brewster, our Hudson Town Clerk, have you received the official Town Signed Warrant? Thank you. She has validated she has received it. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Deborah Stoddard. I am your Interim Town Moderator. I was appointed as your Town Moderator in July of 2025 to fill the vacancies of the previous elected Town Moderators. I would like to take a moment, if you don't mind, to just extend our gratitude to Paul Inderbitzen for his numerous years as Town Moderator, and to just be aware that in the event that I need assistance, he has offered to help. So, thank you.

Welcome to the deliberative session of the Hudson Town Meeting for 2026. You will act as a legislative body to determine the final form of the warrant articles with which have been provided to you, and that will be voted on, on the March 10th Town Election. All of the articles, by law, must be placed on the ballot. The moderator sets the rules that we will follow, which are located on pages 36 and 37 in

your handout you received when you checked in. If you have any questions about the rules, please feel free to ask for clarification at any time by raising a point of order. This body may also vote to establish its rules that you deem necessary. You may also vote to overrule any rule made by the moderator. If you are new to the deliberative session, please feel free, please review the rules before we begin. As a legislative body, we will be discussing the warrant articles before us. Please be respectful of all comments and opinions made by others, as you would want yours to be respected as well. Please do not cheer, applaud, boo, or groan on any comment made. To keep personalities out of the debate, please use terms such as the previous speaker, the selectman, or the budget committee member. All questions and comments are to be directed to the moderator. If you have a question of a specific person, please direct your question to the moderator, and I will see that it be the individual or someone else from the board of selectmen or budget committee would yield to an answer. There is no requirement that anyone must yield to answer a question posed to them. You have a lengthy amendment to put before this session. Please take a moment to have it written out and handed to the HCTV staff so that they can project your amendment for all to view. If you are a registered voter in Hudson, you are issued a red voter card when you checked in. You will use this card for any votes that are taken at the meeting. Do not lose your voter card, as you will not be given another one. After the meeting, please place your voter card in the box at the back of the room. Only registered voters of Hudson are allowed to participate in the discussion of a warrant. There are some non-voters, staff members of the town, and others who are allowed to speak and answer questions to assist in this meeting. Please turn off or silence your phones and any other electronic devices so as to not interrupt any discussions. We will be taking breaks as needed.

Refreshments are for sale by the GWFC Hudson Women's Club set up by the kitchen area. This meeting is being televised live on Hudson Cable, the HCTV website, and Facebook. It will be available for viewing and streaming after today on HCTV. We would like to extend our thanks to the Hudson Cable committee and their staff for all they do in keeping the citizens of Hudson informed. Today we will be dealing with articles 2 through 20. Articles 21 to 25 are zoning amendments and are not available for changes as they will be discussed at a separate planning board meeting, which you are welcome to attend.

ARTICLE 01

Moderator: At that, let us begin the meeting. Article 1, the inhabitants of Hudson and the county of Hillsborough in the state of New Hampshire qualified to vote in town affairs are hereby notified that the two phases of the annual town meeting are held as follows. The first session of the annual meeting, the deliberative session, is being held here today, January 31st, 2026, started at 9 a.m. at the Hudson Community Center. The second session of the annual meeting, the official ballot voting, will occur on Tuesday, March 10th, from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Ward 1 will vote at Hudson Memorial School and Ward 2 will vote at Alvirne High School. This will move to the ballot.

ARTICLE 02 – GENERAL OPERATING FUND

Moderator: Shall the Town of Hudson raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling Forty-one million, Six Hundred Forty-eight Thousand, Three Hundred Fifty-five Dollars (\$41,648,355)? Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be Forty-one million, Two Hundred Sixty-two Thousand, One Hundred Ninety-one Dollars

(\$41,262,191), which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Hudson or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-1

Moderator: I recognize Chairman Lawrence.

James Lawrence: Thank you, Madam Moderator. Hudson is an "SB2" Town and as such there are two numbers for warrant articles two through four respectively. The first is the proposed Operating Budget recommended by the Budget Committee and the Board of Selectmen. The second number is the default budget which cannot be amended and which is set by the Board of Selectmen. The default budget goes into effect if the Operating Budget is voted down. The Police, Fire, and Public Works budgets make up approximately 72% of warrant Article 2. The General Fund Operating Budget. The municipal budget makes up approximately 32% of the overall property tax bill. The remainder of the bill is for local education - 54%, state education tax - 7%, and the county tax - 7%. The Board of Selectmen delivered a general fund municipal operating budget including the library in the amount of \$42,080,176. That budget was based on a directive of no more than a 2.5% increase exclusive of labor and benefits, utilities, and contractual obligations. Major items or new initiatives were included separately and discussed accordingly. Some of those are in the budget while others are being considered as individual warrant articles. The Budget Committee held several meetings discussing and debating the Board of Selectmen budget and eventually reduced that budget by \$431,819 which equates to the budget before you today in the amount of \$41,648,355. This is recommended by the Budget Committee by a vote of nine to one. The projected tax rate for this budget is \$5.578. Now to clarify something because we have had a lot of questions about this number in the past, this is not representative of an increase to the budget. This is merely the actual amount required to fund this portion of the budget. So, \$5.578 per thousand of assessed value would be what is required if this budget were to pass which will result in a zero dollar increase over the FY26 or previous year's budget. Understanding that the municipal tax rate was just set for 2025 and established at \$5.57 per thousand of assessed value. The Board of Selectmen also delivered a sewer fund operating budget in the amount of \$2,065,033 which is less than the last year's and which no further action was taken by the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee is recommending this article go forth by a vote of ten to zero. The Board of Selectmen also delivered a water fund operating budget in the amount.

A voter calls attention to multiple warrants being discussed at once.

Moderator: Thank you for directing that.

James Lawrence: I'll withdraw my comment on that.

Moderator: Please stick to only article two.

James Lawrence: At this point I would like to thank the Board of Selectmen, department heads, town employees, and the Town Administrator, Mr. Roy Sorenson for their assistance in assembling and answering the questions throughout the formulation of this budget which allowed us to make prudent decisions while balancing the financial needs of our town. I especially want to thank the members of the Town of Hudson Budget Committee for their tireless efforts that resulted in a fair, reasonable, and appropriate budget. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you, Chairman. We are now open article number two, general fund operating budget to questions, comments, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak?

Peggy Huard: Good morning, ma'am. Welcome. My name is Peggy Huard. I live here in Hudson on David Drive. I rise this morning to propose a reduction to warrant article two in the amount of one million dollars. Thank you.

Amendment by Peggy Huard to reduce warrant Article two in the amount of \$1 million.

Moderator: Thank you. The amendment is to reduce the budget by one million dollars?

Peggy Huard: That's correct.

Moderator: Can you state the reasoning for your amendment?

Peggy Huard: I'm not required to do that now. You ask for a second and then I will.

Moderator: Okay, I'm sorry. Thank you for a point of order. Is there a second?

Moderator: Your name, sir?

Adam Haverstock: Adam Haverstock

Moderator: Can you spell your last name for me?

Adam Haverstock: H-A-V-E-R-S-T-O-C-K.

Amendment seconded by Adam Haverstock to reduce warrant Article two in the amount of \$1 million.

Moderator: I addressed the article amendment.

Peggy Huard: Well, it did take some time to go through the exercise of choosing specific line items to see if this reduction was feasible. Line items are irrelevant since the administration has the opportunity to apply this reduction anywhere they wish. This reduction relies on strengthening financial policy and controls for more ethical and prudent spending. Entities that collect and spend public money have a duty to have the most pristine financial controls. The proposed reduction asks the administration to take responsibility for more efficient, prudent and ethical spending without sacrificing the appropriations needed to provide basic public services. My goal is to relieve the tax burden this burden places on Hudson residents once again, a common concern voiced by many. The administration needs to be reminded that the government serves its people and not the other way around. Instead of the taxpayers making a sacrifice to support abusive and imprudent spending year after year, it's time the town make the sacrifice and reduce their budget by removing all of the wasteful and abusive spending. Instead of increasing the tax burden for the taxpayer the town is supposed to serve, please look carefully at your requested appropriations. To my fellow taxpayers, please vote in support of my amendment. Thank you.

Moderator: Are there any other comments made to this motion amendment?

Ted Trost: Good morning, my name is Ted Trost. I live on Rangers Drive. My question is why 1 million? Why not 500,000? Why not 2 million? Where did that number come from? And if the person making the motion could identify specifically where that waste is and what the dollar amount came from, I would appreciate it.

Peggy Huard: Why certainly, thank you for asking. The budget committee stopped at level funding, the budget level funding, zero increase on the non-salary and benefit line items from the year before. Level funding of a budget that we all know had a significant surplus in it. Surplus that has been used in the past to fund such items as appropriated earned unappropriated earned time payout that has a capital reserve fund to support the cost between \$500,000 and \$700,000 has been funded from surplus year after year without proper disclosure and appropriations of approval. If that \$500,000 to \$700,000 were

paid in this budget year, we'd be almost at \$1 million. But even in addition to that, there's other areas. Consider the budgets for insurance, grant, patriotic purpose, and solid waste. Small reductions in these line items can add up fast. Patriotic purpose had zero spending in fiscal 2025. I question the legal right or requirement to make \$100,000 worth of grants from taxation. Consider the requested appropriations by the library and compare them to prior year spending. Consider the surplus left on some of the line items requested in support of a considerable reduction in appropriations in this area. Consider the needs of the facilities, software, assorted equipment, supply printing, and postage line items across each department. Look at actual spending. Do you really need to continue at these levels when these lines have had surplus and abuse of spending in prior years? Assess the level of street overlay that has been budgeted. This line item came in with a large surplus of about \$100,000 in fiscal 2025. Consider the duplicative coverage and cost reimbursements that both costly health insurance and special screenings provide. Eliminate duplicative unnecessary outside services where staff can do the same job. Gain a greater control and oversight on overtime in every single department. Consider having proprietary functions support their own function in their entirety instead of commingling so much of the cost with the public service arm of the government. This way, when you increase the staff and other costs for these proprietary functions, the taxpayers will not be inappropriately taxed for the burden of such increases. A budget is supposed to be a plan and one of the most important financial tools available. It is far too easy for the administration of this local government to deviate from the budget, a detriment to the taxpayers this local government serves. I could sit here and list off a number of areas. Understand that this isn't proposing to eliminate any single line item, but to look at it. If you took \$500 to \$1,000 and averaged off of every single line item, instead of asking your taxpayers for an increase, it is feasible. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else would like to speak on this amendment? Seeing none, we will put this to a vote. Please take your red cards. All in favor of the amendment, raise your hand, raise your cards. All opposed?

FAILED: Amendment to reduce warrant Article two in the amount of \$1 million.

Moderator: This amendment does not pass. Thank you. Moving on to warrant article number three, sewer fund operating budget.

Shawn Jasper: Point of order. You should be asking if there's any further discussion on warrant article two.

Moderator: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Apologies. Yes. Back to the operating general operating budget. Seeing that there was no amendments accepted, we were going to vote to, is there anybody else who would like to make an amendment to warrant article number two?

Chris Landry, 25 Beechwood Road: I have a question for either the selectmen or the budget committee.

Moderator: Sure. And your name, sir?

Chris Landry: Chris Landry, 25 Beechwood Road.

Moderator: Go ahead.

Chris Landry: I certainly support the work of the selectmen and the budget committee. I think the town is generally very well run, and I'm happy with the services and stuff like that. However, historically, Hudson has had, the percentage of our taxes that go towards the town is higher than I think the state average, and certainly much higher than any of the other surrounding towns. At the 32%, I was just looking at some of the numbers of surrounding towns, like Londonderry and Derry and Hollis and Bedford and stuff like that, and they all run in the 20% to 28% range. So, it's not clear to me why that is, whether we are spending more on the town side than we need to, whether we're not sending

enough on the school side, because that's part of it as well, compared to those towns. Historically, that's always been the case, and I would like to see if anyone really has an explanation for why our town side seems to run higher compared to our peer towns.

Moderator: And is your question to the board of selectmen or the budget committee?

Chris Landry: Whoever can answer that question.

Moderator: I yield to either committee.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much for the question. I think towards the end of your question, you kind of hit the nail on the head there. I think if you look at those other towns, and I don't have their numbers in front of me, you'll see that their school spending is higher, which would increase their percentage on that end and decrease their percentage on the municipal side. Hudson tends to be a little bit more balanced. I believe that both budgets obviously are produced fairly, which is where you see that percentage kind of deviate from some of their towns. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you, Chairman. Sir?

James Crowley, 4 Fairway Drive: I have a question, pretty much. The fall budget increases spending by \$2.36 million over the fiscal year 26, I assume due mostly to past March-approved warrant articles. The proposed budget fiscal year 27 budget adds \$136,811 over the default. I'm puzzled as to what taxpayers received for that additional \$136,800. To put it another way, it appears if the town votes for the lower default budget, how will Hudson actually suffer by not expending the extra \$136,000? I don't know if the Budget Committee or the BOS could answer that.

Moderator: Thank you. Would the Budget Committee or the Board of Selectmen like to respond? Thank you, Chairman.

James Lawrence: I want to thank you for that question. Probably the biggest impact if the town were to vote down the recommended budget and we were forced into a situation where the default budget would actually be our budget is that that would restrict many of the provisions that were new, that were not previously funded, that was proposed in this new budget. For example, there are several projects that are proposed in this budget to modernize our IT equipment, upgrade software, and those things bring efficiencies into our town and actually help us keep our budgeting down in the future. If we pass the default budget by voting down this budget, none of those new projects would be able to be started. We would be forced to stick with some antiquated older systems that might make the town run a little bit less efficient. In terms of the exact areas where the \$138,000 comes into play, it's impossible to track it that way because that's not how this budget was formulated. But we did, I believe, do a thorough job at analyzing this budget and right-sizing it and making the adjustments, in this particular case a downward adjustment, to get it to a reasonable level. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you, Chairman.

Peggy Huard: With all due respect to the previous speaker, if you voted this budget down, it would not be that detrimental because I already told you there was a million dollars and the difference between the actual budget and the default is much less than that. And if the town administrator has to get rid of some important key improvements instead of going after some of the areas I discussed and mentioned and more, I can certainly give him my list. We need a new town administrator. There is no harm in voting this budget down.

Moderator: Thank you. Is there any other comments or questions or amendments to the budget article two? Yes.

Kevin Walsh, 5 Stony Lane: Thank you, Madam Moderator. I just wanted to amplify some of the comments from Chairman Lawrence. Some specific items that are in the budget that should the default budget be voted in, some of the things are going to go by the boards. There's a new position for a GIS specialist that's in the budget that's split between engineering and sewer and water for \$78,000 and change. There's a new police department deputy chief position that is being proposed in the new budget as well. There's also a change in one of the positions. There was an assistant town administrator position that is going to be put in as an HR generalist to support the town as well. As previously mentioned, there's an IT request for new array backup technology that's about \$42,000 that would not be able to be spent. There's also a 4% increase for the town treasurer. That position is actually an elected position, but in the past couple of years, we've seen these kinds of recommendations go forward for elected positions to be put in there. The other side of the coin is on the revenue side now, because obviously revenue will keep coming in as projected, but I thought it would be interesting to point out a couple of things that the budget committee is recommending at this point. If you look at starting on page 11 of your handout, the budget committee actually made several recommendations based on historical trends and some recent activities that impact the revenue side of the ledger. So, for example, on page 11 under licenses, permits, and fees, there's motor vehicle permit fees. You'll notice there's a \$200,000 increase from the proposed that the Board of Selectmen had from \$6.3 million to \$6.5 million. Going down the page a little bit further, under the state sources, \$3,352 meals in rooms, tax distribution, the Selectmen's recommendation was \$1.7 million and change. The budget committee's recommended \$2.2 million. The 2026 number that's going to come into the town is \$2,584,777.25. There also happens to be a piece of legislation right now under consideration that will impact the meals in rooms tax distribution as well. For anybody that has a business that has meals in rooms tax to report, there's a 3% administrative fee that they can withhold to accommodate that. There's a bill up in Concord right now to reduce that to 1.5%. So, what that means is that there's actually going to be more money that could theoretically be redistributed amongst the towns. And looking at that bill projection, that would say Hudson would get \$2.7 million. So, there's that to consider. Lastly, income from departments on page 12 under charges for services, 3401 income from departments. Budget committee is recommending a \$100,000 increase from 1.32 million to 1.42 million. And that's basically regarding the fees that are collected by the ambulance service. So, those items are important for consideration when you're looking at theoretically a level funded town budget tax rate. There's a huge impact because of the increases that the budget committee is recommending on the revenue side. And you'll also notice that the town is looking to use 1.3 million of the fund balance to help offset that as well. So, there's a lot to consider when you're looking at the budget. And you just have that for your consideration. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments? Yes, ma'am.

Deborah Putnam, 59 Rangers Drive: I must admit, I did watch a few Board of Selectmen meetings, and one in particular regarding the IT with the head of the accounting department finance present. It was mentioned that the current software that is being used by the town is simply put antiquated. Now, there has been mention here that some expenditure will be made to improve the, shall we say, the effectiveness and stability and efficiency of that software. But I believe at one point, it was brought up that actually replacing the software, because apparently only one individual at the company that services the town regarding IT, that they're the only one that knows this antiquated software, how did that all resolve? Because I know there's been mentioned that there's been increase in expenditure allowed for some adjustment to that software. I'm concerned about how far down, and of course I'm going against everything that's been said so far about cutting the budget, is that how far down the road is this can going to be kicked until we have a mass failure in the software system that runs the town? And what steps, intermediary steps, have gotten us through to bridge this situation? Because the cost

of completely replacing the software apparently will exceed something like \$200,000. Yeah, I know Mr. Sorenson did point this out.

Moderator: Mr. Sorenson would like to respond.

Deborah Putnam: Yeah, and the need to address this.

Moderator: Thank you, ma'am.

Roy Sorenson: Good morning, everyone. Roy Sorenson, Town Administrator. To answer the question, we actually did have a line item of \$175,000 in the budget for that originally, which the Board of Selectmen approved. We had some discussion at the Budget Committee. I myself withdrew that, because that number is going to be much larger. Okay, so that's no longer in the budget, and we'll assemble a team to put together, we'll go out for a request for qualifications, and we should have a sound number at this time next year. And just to let everyone know, regarding the software, it is antiquated. It's very old. Regarding the one individual, that's just the one individual that supports it right now, okay? And many municipalities have moved away from it. It was good in its day, but it's no longer efficient for what we need to do with it. Does that answer?

Deborah Putnam: Yes, that answers my question, but that's what I was trying to pull.

Moderator: Can you speak closer to the microphone, please?

Deborah Putnam: Thank you. That answers the question. That's what I wanted to pull that information out, so that those who were not present or viewed the HCTV recordings of the Board of Selectmen meeting are aware of that information, and that then the thought goes through my mind of perhaps the overages that might occur, could they feasibly be redirected to solving the situation instead of waiting a whole another year? I mean, I feel like we're standing on quicksand, and we've been standing on quicksand for too long.

Roy Sorenson: No, the Board wouldn't have the authority to do that, all right? It would have to be put into a request. The question would become at that point, at this time next year, how might you want to take up the cost of that, whether it's in the budget, whether it's via a warrant article, it's split, and then what are the funding sources? Are they through taxation? Is it through something else, potentially any type of surplus we might have? Those discussions still need to be had. As I mentioned, the need is still very urgently there, okay? We just weren't prepared from a staffing standpoint to put together a sound number. I didn't feel confident in it, and I didn't want to be standing here at this time next year saying we need another X amount of dollars and have people say, well, you brought this to us last year, you said this was the solution.

Deborah Putnam: Thank you for explaining all that to everyone at home.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you.

Moderator: Any other questions, comments, amendments?

Rita Banatwala, 29 Fairway Drive: I do not want to sound harsh, but with an increase in a budget to bring in some new software and increase of positions, what positions are going to be eliminated by that new software? I've worked in document imaging for decades, and the purpose is to eliminate humans so that things can flow and move. And I know that sounds really harsh, but it is a reality, but that counteracts the cost of the software. So, has that been taken into consideration? And we only heard about additional positions, but it is a fact that staff positions will be eliminated with new and improved software if it is used properly. And there's nothing to reflect any of that, and that would help counteract the increase of the budget.

Moderator: Was someone on the Board of Selectmen? Thank you, Roy.

Roy Sorenson: So, if I could address the question somewhat, I would say if you're looking, this is financial-based software. So, this software would live within the finance department itself as a day-to-day function, but it would support the whole town, all right? So other staff would be able to have access to it, but for the actual day-to-day operations and to work with it on a daily basis within, for myself and with the Board of Selectmen and then ultimately the Budget Committee at this time of year, that would be the finance department. I think when you'll see that our finance department, the structures in the budget, we do not have a lot of positions in our finance department. Right now, we have a finance director, we have a town accountant, we have a payroll manager, and accounts payable, accounts receivable. That's four positions to support a town of almost 30,000. And staffing-wise, town-wide, I believe we're a little bit north of 235 total. So, this is finance-based, and this is going to support, this is going to give them the support they need. The software we currently have with those staffing levels causes a hindrance. I mean, I could stand up here and the Budget Committee can tell you this. We're late on our reports, getting reports to the Budget Committee. I report each month to the Board of Selectmen.

Chris Landry: Point of order. I think we're discussing something that's not even in this budget. We're talking about something that's potentially in next year's budget. So, this doesn't seem like an appropriate discussion for this year's budget.

Moderator: Is this going to be something that's extracted out of this year's budget?

Roy Sorenson: It's not in the current budget at all.

Moderator: Okay, then I think we should move on.

Roy Sorenson: All right, thank you.

Moderator: Any other questions or comments?

Peggy Huard: I did want to close with a reminder. Twice we heard two of the members of the Budget Committee state and claim the key important costs and positions would have to be removed if we went into default. And again, that is not necessary with proper management and fiscal control. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments? Seeing none, we will now go to a vote on the amendment number two, General Fund Operating Budget. All in favor, raise your cards.

Voters remind moderator there is no second amendment.

Moderator: There is not. We closed the amendment. Motion to approve. Sorry, I apologize. Motion to approve article number two. All in favor. No? Thank you. Hold on a moment. I'm sorry, folks. Give me a minute.

Paul Inderbitzen: Madam moderator, sorry. Since this warrant article does go to the ballot automatically, all you need to do is close the discussion and it goes to the ballot and you go move on to the next one.

Moderator: Thank you for clarifying. Seeing no other amendments, we will now close this one article number two and it will move to the ballot. Thank you.

WARRANT ARTICLE 2 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 03 – SEWER FUND OPERATING BUDGET

Moderator: Thank you for your patience. Article number three, Sewer Fund Operating Budget. Shall the Town of Hudson raise and appropriate as a sewer operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amount set forth on the budget posted with the warrant or as amended by vote of the first session. For the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$2,065,333. Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$2,364,991, which is the same as last year with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Hudson or by law or the governing body may hold one special meeting in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only. This is recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5 to nothing, recommended by the Budget Committee 10 to nothing.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-0

Moderator: We now open article number, sorry, I apologize, Selectman Jakoby to present.

Selectman Jakoby: The background for this article is that the fiscal year 2027 sewer fund budget of \$2,065,033 represents a decrease of \$392,359 versus the fiscal year 2026 sewer fund budget of \$2,457,392. The sewer fund supports the full operation and maintenance of the Town's sewer system. Hudson's sewer system serves major corridors such as Route 111, Route 102 and Lowell Road. The system consists of approximately 77 miles of gravity sewer, four miles of forced mains, seven pump stations and two siphons which convey wastewater from Hudson to the City of Nashua for treatment.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number three, sewer fund operating budget for discussions on, for any comments, questions or amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article three?

James Crowley, 4 Fairway Drive: I see that it'll be reduced by about \$300,000 but I know as a taxpayer everything keeps going up. I would assume that if we go with a vote for the budget then this \$300,000 will vanish out of the sewer fund. I'm not a budget expert but does it make it sense to hang on to that for reserve so in the future there will not be a major increase or property taxes. I'm just wondering if that's part of a consideration I should make when I vote. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Would the budget committee or the Board of Selectmen like to respond?

Roy Sorenson: Thank you. Roy Sorensen, Town Administrator. Regarding the sewer fund this year it's lower because we pulled out of capital projects out of that. As you may recall over the past two years the sewer rates went up and that's what funds this particular utility. It's your sewer rates. So, the sewer users pay for this utility. If you don't have sewer you're not paying into this utility. All right. We're trying to play catch up with our fund balance in the sewer so we pulled back on that. We do have capital reserves we can use if something happens within the sewer system for a major repair or whatever it might be. So, for now we pulled back a little bit. I think on this one even if the default budget was put up on this, I do not think the Board of Selectmen, I don't want to speak for them, but I would say it would not be my recommendation to spend that extra \$300,000 whatever thousand it was that lives in that budget.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else would like to make a comment?

Peggy Huard: A point of clarification and question. The sewer budget is not part of the operating budget. So could you explain why when we look at the budget documents you come down to a point almost the end of the operating budget, then you tuck in water and sewer, then you go back to library and conservation fund, conservation committee. So that's confusing for the reader and the taxpayer. Without further clarification it does appear that the water and sewer is part of taxation. So, is there a

reason why you keep that intact like inside the operating budget when you're presenting it or can that be broken out in the future? Thank you.

Roy Sorenson: I'll take the easy way out on this one Ms. Huard and say that this is how it's always been done. I think it's something we can look at because it can be confusing. When you're talking about the general fund you're talking about as it was introduced by Chair Lawrence and then you add library and conservation which is a small standalone is in that as well and then you have water and fund. Typically, it's built into the DRA portal department of revenue administration and it's a transfer out. Comes out and it goes back through into water and sewer separately that way. So, I think that's why it was built that way.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments questions or amendments?

Kevin Walsh, 5 Stony Lane: Thank you Madam Chair. I am not a sewer user nor a water user. So those rates that are set by the water selectmen are what funds the sewer department. I will say and this goes for any department in the town, they welcome the opportunity to have people come in and go through on tours of the departments. I had a wonderful tour of the sewer department. That was a lot of fun. When you go climbing down into these pump stations and look at that, you look at the equipment that is there, the amount of technology that is there to monitor the system, the amount of equipment that's there for spares and backup so that when you flush your toilet, it works. You know, that's what you expect from utility. So, I would highly encourage folks to contact our development director, Mr. Dhima, who would be more than happy and proud to take you through the sewer department, hold your nose. But I highly recommend that you will see how well run that department is and the pride that the folks that manage the sewer system do that and that is a reflection of the budget today. So, I highly encourage that and I commend the folks that take care of our sewer system so that when you do flush, it does go where it's supposed to go. And for a real bonus, if you do this at the right time of day, you'll actually see the flume that gets spewed out on the Nashua side that goes into the river. It is really quite a waterfall.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments, questions or amendments? Seeing none, we will now close this warrant article number three to end discussion and it will be moved to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 3 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 04 – WATER FUND OPERATING BUDGET

Moderator: Thank you. warrant article number four, water fund operating budget. Shall the town of Hudson raise and appropriate as a water operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amounts set forth on the budget posted with the warrant article weren't as of and or as amended by vote of the first session for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$4,043,264. Should this article be defeated, the default budget shall be \$3,992,672, which is the same as last year with certain adjustments required by previous action of the town of Hudson or by law or the governing body may hold one special meeting in accordance with RSA 40, 13, 10 and 16 to take up the issue of a revised operating budget.

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

Selectman Vurgaropulos: Good morning. The background for this article, sorry, for warrant article four is the FY27 water fund budget of \$4,043,274 represents an increase of \$69,075 versus the FY26 water fund budget of \$3,974,199. The water fund supports the operation and maintenance of the town's

water systems. Hudson water system include approximately 120 miles of water mains, 850 fire hydrants, four pump stations and three interconnections through which the town both receives water and provides water to neighboring communities.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number four, water fund operating budget to questions, comments and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak to article four?

Peggy Huard: In case you haven't figured out, this operating budget drives your water bill just like the operating budget.

Moderator: I'm sorry, Peggy, may I have you speak closer to the microphone, please? Thank you.

Peggy Huard: This operating budget drives your water bill just as the operating budget drives your real estate tax bill. The same people manage this budget and the same financial controls are in place for this operation as well. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else would like to speak on article four? Seeing none, we will now close this article number four to end discussion and it will move to the ballot. Thank you.

WARRANT ARTICLE 4 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

Moderator: Yes, sir.

Kevin Walsh: I'd like to make a motion to restrict reconsideration of articles two, three and four.

*Motion by Kevin Walsch to restrict reconsideration of articles two, three and four.
Motion seconded by Chairman Dumont.*

Moderator: Thank you, Kevin. They've moved to restrict reconsideration of articles two through four. What that does is lock these articles in. We cannot bring them up later in this meeting. If we don't do that, then someone later in the meeting could say, I want to reconsider that and make changes to it. Restriction of reconsideration means that theirs will now be moved to the ballot the way they are. They cannot be brought up again in this meeting. Is that clear to everyone? Thank you. Motion made to restrict reconsideration of articles two through four. You will now use your red cards to cast your vote. Those in favor of restriction, please raise your cards.

***PASSED**: Motion carried to restrict reconsideration of articles two, three and four.*

ARTICLE 05 – CREATE ONE PART-TIME PROSECUTOR ATTORNEY POSITION

Moderator: Shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$90,275 which represents the cost of wages and payroll taxes to hire one part-time prosecuting attorney in the police department.

**Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3-1
Recommended by the Budget Committee 7-3**

Moderator: I recognize Selectman Vurgaropulos to discuss.

Selectman Vurgaropulos: The Hudson's Police Department currently manages its prosecution duties through the existing legal administrative staff who are responsible for preparing cases, coordinating with the court system and representing the department in court proceedings. The case system, sorry, the case volume and complexity of the legal process have increased. These responsibilities have placed additional demands on the department and resources in staff time. The addition of a part-time prosecutor would provide additional legal expertise to support the case preparation review, to review

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 efficiency of case resolution.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number five, create one part-time prosecutor attorney position to questions, comments and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article five? Seeing none, we will now close this worn article to end discussion and it will move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 5 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 06 – HIRE FOUR FIREFIGHTER/AEMT’S

Moderator: Should the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$590,629, which represents the cost of salary and benefits to hire four additional firefighter AEMTs in the fire department.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3-1

Not Recommended by the Budget Committee 4-6

Selectman Morin: Good morning. Warrant article number six, shall the town of Hudson vote to raise the appropriate and appropriate the sum of \$590,629, which represents the cost and salary and benefits to hire four additional firefighter AEMTAs in the fire department. Recommended by the board of selectmen three to one, not recommended by the budget committee four to six. Tax rate impact is 1.113. The background for this is to maintain adequate staffing levels to ensure continued delivery of higher quality emergency services at the fire department and the fire department is requesting funding to hire four firefighter AEMTs. This addition would bring the daily minimum staffing to 13 members, enhancing operational efficiency, reducing response times and improving firefighter safety through the better crew coverage. The proposal allocates allocation includes \$288,813 for salaries covering base wages, contractual overtime and holiday community event compensation of \$271,522 for comprehensive benefits including health, dental, pension, insurance, \$23,884 for essential personnel protective equipment, \$6,410 for uniform costs. These additions are critical to sustaining operation readiness, improvement response time and enhancing community safety.

Moderator: Thank you. Thank you. Does anyone wish to speak on article number six? Hire four firefighters AEMTs. Mr. Jasper.

Shawn Jasper, 83 Old Derry Road. Thank you. Just want to give you some information about what we were presented and the budget committee was presented with all 593, 5,093 calls that the department responded to. We were particularly interested in the multiple calls occurring at the same time and over the course of the year that was just under 800. So, what I did is went down and looked at how those calls broke down and what the multiple calls were. It was quite enlightening and I appreciate the information that Chief Tice provided to us. The budget committee is not recommending this article which is a little over 11 cents on the tax rate. And part of it and one of the things that really I looked at was what are we providing to Litchfield? It's quite actually quite startling what Litchfield is getting from us for free. Now we just talked a little bit about the fact that we increased the ambulance revenue looking at that. The whole ambulance revenue is \$600,000 for the town. The budget for just the suppression part which includes these firefighters they man the ambulances and the engines is \$8.8 million dollars. Litchfield is taking up and I just left that sheet back at the table but I believe it's 17% of

the calls are Litchfield. That's \$1.5 million dollars of services that are going to Litchfield. And it's the town of Litchfield is not giving us any money. I have a recollection in the back of my mind that many years ago we did have an agreement with Litchfield and they were paying us money. That doesn't happen anymore. So right now, the town of Hudson is subsidizing the taxpayers of Litchfield. God only knows what but even if you were to say all that revenue from the ambulances went to come from Litchfield which by no means does it probably 17% of it does. You know we're spending you know well over a million plus we're maintaining the equipment. So, of those 795 calls I looked at I'm not going to go into all the detail. One of the problems is of those calls is 365 at a minimum if somebody answers the phone in Litchfield at eight o'clock there's a daily call between Hudson and Litchfield to test the lines. That's at least 365 of those calls are built into that 593. And when we look at the 700, 800 multiple calls what was really amazing was 75 of those multiple calls are as a result of us just simply picking up the phone and calling Litchfield the same time another call is going on. There's also the issue of how many calls that are just Litchfield alone that so 203 of the calls roughly and I'm not going to say my numbers are exact if somebody went through but around 300, 200 of those calls involve Litchfield. 40 of them are Litchfield alone. Two calls into Litchfield. Then you get into things like illegal burns, mutual aid calls, station coverage, investigations. We actually come down to somewhere around 200 actual murder medical or fire emergencies at the same time. I don't think we can really look at these, these numbers from a financial standpoint and say we can add another 11 cents onto the tax rate with these numbers until the Board of Selectmen negotiate with Litchfield and have them pay their fair share for what we are currently paying to provide these services. This is outrageous. The numbers are in total and that this is if you include the 365, there's over 900 of the 5100 calls, 900, 17% that are Litchfield. We cannot continue to do this and we shouldn't continue to do this. This is an outrage to the taxpayers of Hudson. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else like to speak on warrant article number six? Yes sir.

Chief Tice: Good morning. I'm your Fire Chief Scott Tice. Yes sir.

Alex Woodyard: Point of order. The gentleman is not holding a red card. My understanding is he has to be recognized by ... (Chief Tice shows his red card) Oh, excuse me.

Chief Tice: I'm Scott Tice. I'm your fire chief and like you I am a taxpayer in Hudson. I don't want my taxes to go up any more than anybody else does. But as a fire chief, I have responsibility to ensure the public safety, your safety. So, it is then my responsibility to come forward when I have a gap that prevents us from providing what I feel to be an adequate public safety. But in the end through your vote, you get to choose what level of safety you want and what level of safety you're willing to pay for. I do not believe our current staffing level is adequate to provide what I feel to be an adequate level of public safety to the community. Last year with the support of the Board of Selectmen, the Budget Committee and the voters, we went from 11 on shift to 12 a shift with the stated goal of getting to 14 a shift. Emergencies get worse with time. They don't get better until we have enough of the proper resources on the scene to complete all the important tasks that need to be done to make it better. On an MVA, this can be anywhere from five people to 10 people based on the number of patients, the extent of their injuries, and the amount of extrication required to get them prepped to transport to the hospital. A medical call could be a simple medical call requiring two people or based on the severity of the patient could take up to five or six people. A building fire in just a plain single-family house takes upwards of 16 to 17 firefighters. Simultaneous calls, Mr. Jasper is right when I presented the information to the Budget Committee and there was calls in there that should have been filtered out as not exactly emergency calls. I'd be happy to review the numbers with him because the numbers I got when I thought to filter those out was much different. The average fire call in 2025 lasted 14 minutes. That was how long from the start of the call at that end of the call when our forces were

committed. The average length was 14 minutes and within 14 minutes of a call we received a second emergency call 711 times. Most of our calls are EMS calls. In those calls, the average time was 54 minutes. In 2025, within 54 minutes of an emergency call, we received a second emergency call 2,145 times. With the 12 people on duty, we operate three stations. We have three people at the Lowell Road and the Robinson Road stations that cross staff and engine and ambulance and they take whichever apparatus is appropriate for the call they're going on. We have six at Central Station which is our shift commander. We staff three on the engine and two on an ambulance. The ambulance crew will cross staff fire apparatus if it's that type of a call. At 14 at shift, we would be able to continue to have three at Robinson Road. We'd be able to put five people at the Lowell Road station staffing an engine and ambulance and again the ambulance would cross staff fire apparatus as needed and Central Station would continue to run the same and then the engines would be able to cross staff ambulances if we continue to have multiple ambulance calls. This would still require us to rely on mutual aid. We would still have times where that would not be enough people and our more serious calls would still require more people but it would give us enough people that we could handle a lot of the critical tasks needed to provide more public safety. One caution with using mutual aid is everyone around us is also getting busier which means they're going to be available to respond mutual aid less. The time factor for them to respond mutual aid is also increased therefore increasing the amount of time that our emergency situation is not getting better. Having more staffing will help us provide you a better level of public safety. In the end it's up to you to vote however you feel is the most appropriate and we will continue to provide you the best service we can with the resources we have. The median assessed value of a single-family home in Hudson is \$465,700 with a tax impact of 11.3 cents that's \$52.62 of additional tax over the course of a year. So, I appreciate you listening to me for the last few minutes and I will respect your vote whatever it is the Hudson Fire Department will provide you the best service we possibly can regardless of the vote. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes sir.

Brian Clarenbach, 99 Highland Street.

Moderator: Brian can I have you spell your last name for me?

Brian Clarenbach: C-L-A-R-E-N-B-A-C-H.

Moderator: Thank you.

Brian Clarenbach: So, I'm the president of the professional firefighters of Hudson. I'm here to speak.

Moderator: Please be closer to the microphone.

Brian Clarenbach: I'm here to speak in support of this warrant article. The chief stole most of my speech but I just wanted to point out that like he said we are cross-staffing. We do have multiple incidents multiple times a week where we are completely tied up and do not have any units available to respond to any additional emergencies resulting in us needing mutual aid. I think I would push back on the budget committee members numbers. The Hudson Fire Department does track both what we refer to as call numbers and incident numbers. The call numbers as he pointed out are a little over 5,000 and those are encompassing all of the duties that occur in the fire department. So, like he like he said the calls to Litchfield to test their alerting systems and things of that nature. We also track incidents which are emergency calls where a truck is actually going out the door because somebody either called 911 or called the fire station. So that is inclusive everything from building fires, heart attacks to going to check for fire permits. Those numbers are about 4,200 a year and I don't have the exact number off the top of my head but there are 4,200 times a year where that's a fire department is going out and responding to some type of call with either an ambulance or a fire truck. As he said there is a significant

number of those who are not insignificant. He said 17 % so he is on the budget committee. I would trust his numbers on that but probably about 17 % of our calls are responding to Litchfield. As far as the Hudson not receiving any money for that I don't know if that's accurate but I don't believe that the budget committee or the Board of Selectmen would allow us to be giving that away for free. So, I don't know if, if the town administrator would potentially have those numbers on how much Litchfield is paying Hudson. Okay all right thank you. But we are we are receiving something for that we are not giving that to Litchfield out of the goodness of our hearts. So, to go back to our staffing currently as the chief said we have 12 members on duty. Those are split between the Lowell Road the central and the Robinson Road fire stations. We do practice cross staffing that means if you have an emergency in the south end if you have a fire the firefighters at the Lowell Road fire station are going to be taking their fire engine and if you have a medical emergency that means they're going to be taking their ambulance. If they take one or the other there is nobody left at that station to take the opposite truck. So if there's a fire call in the south end and then you have a medical emergency there's not anyone there to respond and your response is going to have to come either from Central Station or Robinson Road. The same is true at Central Fire Station obviously we have enough people there to have two crews but depending on the severity of a call in that district or in other districts you might potentially only have the ability to respond to a single call out of that station. So, in total if we're receiving one three or four lower acuity or one or two higher acuity calls simultaneously then we simply don't have enough personnel left to respond. There will be apparatus available but we don't have anyone to staff them. In addition, our current staffing doesn't meet the National Fire Protection Association standards either for firefighter staffing per company or for total firefighters on a first alarm response to a house fire as the chief alluded to. So, their standards for a residential house fire are 17 firefighters on the scene. Obviously, we are at 12 so if all our members are in service and available to respond we don't come close to meeting that. We do pull in automatic mutual aid from Nashville which brings a further four members which is still leaving us short of that 17 firefighter mark. So, as the chief alluded to, we can't always count on that mutual aid. All our communities around us are getting busier and they might or might not be able to send someone and that's before you even get into looking at all the response times that involve coming from a different community. So, this warrant article is the second step in a multi-year staffing plan that Chief Tice put forward two years ago and the plan is designed to reduce the department's reliance on mutual aid, improve coverage for simultaneous calls and increase the number of firefighters that are available for fires. If this warrant article passes this will allow us the firefighters of Hudson to better protect the citizens of Hudson in your property and I would encourage the voters to support it. Do we have any luck on the numbers?

Roy Sorenson: Thank you once again Roy Sorenson, Town Administrator. I will push back on the chief a little bit on this. The numbers we have reflect is around \$50,000 a year for Litchfield okay for service calls. Now we do have a contract with them which is coming up I think in the next year or two so that might be something we'll look into a little bit closer but again I will defer to you Chief Tice on this one.

Moderator: Thank you.

Chief Tice: We do have a contract with Litchfield. We charge them per call this year is \$205 per EMS call which is a little it's somewhere between a \$100,000 and \$140,000 a year in revenue. We also bill for services and collect billing from the patients. I do not know the number of that off the top of my head and I do not know if Comstar can separate that out but I can ask.

Moderator: Thank you.

Brian Clarenbach: Thank you. I just wanted to make the point that we are actually receiving money from Litchfield for those services and it is not in fact zero so thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Go ahead Mr. Jasper.

Shawn Jasper: I had asked the question. I'm not sure where the revenue is showing up. I don't know if it's an ambulance billing or whatever but there's no line item showing up anywhere in the budget and we did ask the question. I did mention that so this is news to the Budget Committee but it's still insignificant when you look at the total number of calls but I would like to know where that is showing up. Is that \$203 in addition to what is being billed by the town or is that just what is billed? Is that baked into that our ambulance numbers and if so then that really doesn't help the situation but we were not given information that there was a separate contract and that has been a point of contention.

Moderator: Thank you. Mr. Sorensen.

Roy Sorenson: So, did I mention we need financial software Mr. Jasper? You are correct. We do not break that out. It is in the ambulance billing. It is baked in there. I think it's something we'll after the fact we can provide, we'll try to break get that break out and provide it to the Budget Committee as well as the Board of Selectmen to get kind of get through that up to see what it what it might be. That answer your question?

Shawn Jasper: Yes, I think it does but you know it doesn't change what I was saying we're still providing this service and you know that's baked into that \$600,000 of revenue. Again, if you just look at that \$600,000 versus the \$8.8 million that suppression without dispatch, without administration, anything this is a disgrace to the taxpayers of the town.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments, questions, amendments?

Raymond LaFortune, 18 Hockey Road.

Moderator: Can I have you spell your last name for me?

Raymond LaFortune: L-A-F-O-R-T-U-N-E. And I am a taxpayer. I don't want to see my taxes go up either but I can say that where I live they just put 70 houses in behind me. That's just one small project that's been going on in this town. For your taxes to go up this much and the fire department have what they need I think it's more than appropriate. As far as Litchfield, I don't think the taxpayers should be penalized or punished because we go to Litchfield. It's up to the town board of selectmen to maybe go and negotiate and get a better rate so that we're getting a return on our services going there. We do mutual aid to all the surrounding towns. I would hope that if we have a fire they're going to come to us also. So, I mean it's very, very important that with all the building get on a low road go up off of over by the racetrack. I mean it's crazy the amount of building going on and 70 homes you're probably talking 150 people at least. At least if I had a heart attack or my wife was sick I'd hope that the fire department wouldn't be somewhere where there isn't enough help to come and help us. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes sir.

Len Siegel, 6 Beachwood Road: And it's S-E-G-A-L.

Moderator: Thank you.

Len Siegel: You're welcome. I support the article as presented by the fire department and I think the previous speaker said it well that we as taxpayers in Hudson should not be penalized because there might be an issue that we're being let's say underfunded from Litchfield. That's a separate that should be a separate issue negotiated by the Selectmen with the town of Litchfield. But the thing is that if someone would have a lot of accidents in town a lot of medical calls and as population grows and as population around us grows that's because we're a pass through to other towns driving through our major roads that the need for services by everybody you can't always rely on mutual aid. My understanding is the first six minutes in a heart attack are absolutely critical to whether the person

survives or not. If we've got all of our firefighters EMTs out on calls and someone calls with a heart attack getting mutual aid from another town basically means a body bag or a good chance of that. Is that what we want for our town, to save 11 cents on the tax rate? Or, it was 52 dollars and change as quoted earlier on the average house. I'm not educated on fire science but I remember reading that a fire a house fire doubles in size and I think it's 30 seconds every minute counts and once again the taxpayers need to be protected. You heard that we are not up to code relative to what the I think it's the NFPA recommends for staffing and this is a step in that direction and it's also a step that it was a multi-year process so that we didn't have to bite the bullet on bringing the staffing totally up to speed in one year. So, I support the article as presented and I think that the Selectmen need to do some work with the town of Litchfield but we should not pass we should pass this article and deal with Litchfield as a separate issue completely. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Next yes sir.

James Crowley: I have a few questions concerning this first per testimony 12 members Hudson Fire Department members are now on duty before article six increase of four firefighters. One of my questions is the new platform truck is coming. Does this also cover a future staff increase needed to man that equipment? I also I wonder on article six I only see a current year impact. Is there any projected tax impact study of adding the four fire department EMTs over the next five to ten years and then finally I'd like to close. I generally support this but I want to support the fire department but these are things I would like more information on like is this staffing going to cover us just for the next year or two or farther out. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. I yield to the budget committee or the Board of Selectmen to respond.

Chairman Dumont: My understanding is that this staffing is requested by the fire chief here regardless of that of that platform truck and I would ask him to come up here and clarify that once he's done his conversation. Fire chief? The question was about staffing for the future needs of the platform truck and whether or not this staffing is needed to offset that platform truck and will you need future staffing?

Chief Tice: So, we do not staff for a specific piece of apparatus. Most everything is cross staff currently except for engine two out of central station. They do have the ability to cross staff if they need to but they're primarily assigned to that. Everybody else cross staffs between multiple apparatus. That's we don't have enough staffing to just staff specific apparatus. In the future 14th shift we do have the tower truck come and we will have two ladder trucks. We would be spreading the ambulance crews out between central station and Lowell Road and we would have a ladder truck at each station so it's not specifically asking for staffing for the tower truck but it would give us the opportunity to have one or the other ladder trucks a higher percentage of opportunity of having one of the other ladder trucks available because I would expect with the number of calls we do that when we have a building fire if we don't have an ambulance available right now if we don't we don't have a ladder truck. So, with two ambulances cross staffing fire apparatus we would have two chances to potentially have one ladder truck available for a fire call. The other thing it would do for us if we had everybody available and we had a fire outside of the hydrant district would be able to take a ladder truck from Lowell Road and a tanker from central along with the engines so we'd be able to establish a water supply and have a ladder truck available. So, we're not looking to staff the tower truck or the ladder truck we're looking to have more staffing to provide more flexibility to provide more a staff more apparatus overall.

Moderator: Thank you. And next yes sir.

Alex Woodyard, 14 Pasture Drive: Last name spelled W-O-O-D-Y-A-R-D. My question is looking at the detailed breakdown of the appropriation it says it's \$271 and change for benefits and I guess I was

looking for clarification on how does that break down between health and dental? And, that number just seems very high to me given the overall salary number that's quoted here so I guess can someone back that number up and justify it a little bit.

Moderator: I yield to the budget committee or the Board of Selectmen to respond.

Chairman Dumont: Well, wait for them it looks like they're pulling up some numbers over there, but, just to speak to that. So basically, that's as if worst case scenario is if all of those members were to take a family plan based on health and dental, as well as, other pension and benefits that go along with that. So, it's not just insurance coverage that's rolled in there but I will defer either to finance director or to Mr. Sorenson once he is ready.

Alex Woodyard: So, is it I guess to follow up to that, is it common then that the benefit cost for town employee is equal to their salary or put it differently is the average benefit cost somewhere in the neighborhood of 65k?

Chairman Dumont: I don't believe so, but, then again, I don't have that number in front of me and again I will wait for Mr. Sorenson. \$67,000 a little bit higher

Alex Woodyard: That's a better plan than I got.

Laurie May: Hi Laurie May, finance director for the town of Hudson. All right so the total on the health insurance for all four positions is \$172,000. We are in the process of looking into getting a different insurance to reduce those costs. Dental insurance is \$8,156, again, for all four. Life disability long-term short-term and life excuse me is \$2,571. FICA, Medicare or I guess in this case would just be Medicare. Pension \$84,189. So, the total benefits for all four is \$271,521.

Alex Woodyard: Okay thank you.

Laurie May: You're welcome.

Moderator: Thank you, Laurie. Yes sir.

Rob Everett, 220 Derry Road: I have a question for the chief because the union president already said that we're understaffed for this town based on the NFPA recommendations. What would the NFPA require per truck because I know cross-staffing isn't their ideal plan and what's our ISO rating?

Chief Tice: So, sorry about that. So, our ISO rating which is an insurance rating that insurance it's set by the ISO that can it judges us on our fire services and then insurance companies can use that information to help set their rates. It's one through nine and we are currently a three. So, one is the best and we are a three which is a pretty good level for a community our size. As far as the NFPA standards they talk about four personnel per truck with an initial response time of four minutes for the first due apparatus and then nine minutes for the full first alarm which is that's the number I reference as a single family 2,000 square foot single family home would require 16 to 17 personnel within nine minutes. We will not meet that even at 14 a shift because of the if you think of the town and the road system takes a long end to get for a long time to get from one end of town to the other but that's why I'm asking we have long response times in this town. It's critical that we get people there enough people there as soon as possible to prevent more damage from happening and having more staffing would allow us to do that.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes sir.

Kevin Walsh: Thank you, Madam Chair, Moderator for your thoughtful consideration. This assumes that on day one in July 1st the personnel is going to be on board. We had some discussions at the in

the budget committee to perhaps maybe delay this a little bit so I'd like to offer an amendment. Madam Moderator, change the \$590,629 to \$295,315.

Moderator: On the amount I'm sorry again.

Kevin Walsh: \$295,315.

Motion by Kevin Walsch to amend the total sum of salary and benefits for four firefighter/AEMTs from \$590,629 to \$295,315.

Moderator: We have an amendment to change the total amount from \$590,629 down to \$295,315. Do I have a second? Okay that was seconded by Kim Rice.

Motion seconded by Kim Rice.

Kevin Walsh: Okay. My reason for doing this is to basically delay this by six months and make this effective essentially six months into the fiscal year. A couple of reasons for that is you know given the turnover in the staffing that's happened in the fire department and new hires and so forth gives them a little bit more time to be trained and before bringing on four new people. The other thing is that I've been a homeowner since 1974, been here from 1972. I've had the fire department in my house once. Thank God it's only been once and I thank for the prompt response then. I was one of the folks that did vote to recommend this article. Unfortunately, the minority is what I'm offering is perhaps some discussion around perhaps delaying this a little bit so that if this did pass the chief could start going out in probably July 1st and start advertising for positions and bringing people on in the January time frame. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Any comment, question, concern, amendments about this amendment?

Shawn Jasper: I will support the amendment, doesn't guarantee I'm going to vote for the article, but I think this is a good start. It doesn't prevent hiring earlier if funds are available because we have line item budgets so if the chief was able to hire one person earlier or any amount with the approval of the selectmen people could come on according to the ability to spend within the budget. The other interesting thing that this does is Litchfield is actually on a calendar year budget. Gives the opportunity for the Board of Selectmen to negotiate with Litchfield not starting early so that there may be some revenues coming in which could be helpful. I think it's a good starting point and I would certainly encourage those present to vote in favor of the amendment.

Moderator: Yes, sir.

Len LaFortune: I'm not sure what a six month wait would do other than not bring these people on board until another six months after that, at least. I'm not sure how long it takes to go to the fire academy, probably 18 weeks or something like that. Maybe what the budget committee should do is look at all the new funding that's coming in from all the housing that's being built, the big contraption down where the golf course used to be and that's going to be bringing in a lot of revenue. Maybe they could figure out that and even bring our taxes down. Thank you.

Deborah Putnam: I'm confused. I've been to many deliberative sessions. I don't understand is this legal to say, okay, are we going to wait six months and then enact this for an article at the reduced amount? And what message does this send out to the people that the firefighters in training now, wait a minute, which town should I go with? Which town do I trust if they're going to, wait a minute, they voted against the funding now, start July 1, and we're going to wait six months. I mean, we want to attract the best candidates out of the system and we want to assure the coverage that we don't even meet the required, whatever that terminology is, coverage at this point in time. This causes me concern. I'm

going to get emotional about this, but my son's life was saved because there was an EMT truck on site at an event that he was at. Those minutes do count.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, please.

Shawn Jasper: A couple of comments. So, this has no date specific. This is a dollar amount. It could hire two firefighters on July 1, but as I recall, and the chief will correct me if I'm wrong, but I was talking to a couple of the other members of the committee. I think it was quite a delay before you were able to get the last four on. It's not something that is necessarily easy to do. It's certainly legal because it's just a dollar amount and doesn't have a date in it, which I still think would be legal. And to the question as to whether did the budget committee look at the revenues coming in, we certainly did. That's why we're at a zero-tax increase because the overall budget is up substantially. But because we were looking at that the overall increase in the town's tax base, which is including that at a billion dollars, I think it was, coming in, we were able to stabilize the tax rate. Now this is all based on the town. Wait till next week when we go to school delivery. Totally different situation there.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, please, chief.

Chief Tice: In relation to recruitment and retention, we've been doing much better on both recruitment and retention. Right now, we currently have two open positions, which we have candidates for, and I actually expect to be at the next Board meeting to fill those two positions. It can be challenging. It is still challenging, but the hiring landscape and the fire service has gotten better. I do not anticipate whatever the start time is that we would bring on new firefighters affecting our ability to be able to attract good talent. And I might not be the smartest person in the room, but I'm smart enough to know that six months is better than no months.

Moderator: Thank you. Next, sir.

Ted Trost: Speaking to the amendment, I do support the increase in the staffing generally as long as we have the current agreement with Litchfield, which it sounds like we're locked into for a period of time. But going back to the amendment, I'm concerned that this kind of hides the real cost of these firefighters. And although I support this, I want the article to reflect the cost to the citizens of this town. Taking a cynical look at it, someone could offer an amendment that would change this to \$1,618.16, which is the cost of one day of these four firefighters. So, the warrant article would go before the voters with that amount on it. We're getting four firefighters for that amount. What the article, no matter what dollar amount we put on it, doesn't show is the full cost of this because the staffing once increased is pretty much going to stay the same. So, it's only reflecting the first year, which is legal and appropriate. But I want everybody to be aware that this is an ongoing cost and changing this dollar amount here for this amendment doesn't change the overall cost of bringing in those firefighters.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir.

Chris Landry: The previous speaker, I think that's a good point. I support the original article, but I also support the amendment. It sounds like a reasonable compromise to get everybody on board and to get us moving in the right direction to get the staffing we need. I would ask the writer of the amendment if it would be appropriate to put some language in there to make it clear that it was intention was to hire four firefighters, but this was funding for half of the year of that, just so it's clear when it goes to the voters. I'm not exactly sure what the wording would be, but I think that would be appropriate and I support the amendment if that's the case.

James Wilkins, 112 Belknap Road: As I understand it, this would be added to the default budget for next year at this rate if we pass this amendment, and if you want four firefighters, you'd have to come back and ask for two more. Is that correct?

Moderator: I believe that's what they're saying, yes.

Chairman Dumont: No.

Moderator: No? You have a point of clarification.

Chairman Dumont: So, this would fund a half year for four firefighters. Those four firefighters would be in the default next year at whatever cost it is at that time.

James Wilkins: That's two firefighters.

Chairman Dumont: Four. Four for half a year. All this amendment does is delay the time frame as to which they're hired, so the funding that's associated with the four firefighters is enough to fund them for half a year. Next year, those four positions will still exist. In the default budget, we would have to show the correct cost for those additional positions.

James Wilkins: Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you.

Brian Clarenbeck: I think if this amendment does make it more palatable to the voters and the members of the Budget Committee, I think this is a good compromise in order to get that staffing. We may have to wait a little bit longer for it, but we would potentially get that staffing. To the previous speaker's notion, I do believe that adding in some type of language where it indicates that this would cover these positions for half a year would be beneficial. And that way, nobody can claim that we were trying to slip something past people and not give the voters the full picture of what they're exactly voting for. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you.

Kevin Walsh: Thank you. If I may, maybe to try and clarify the intent of the amendment, if we would make an amendment to the amendment, if you will.

Moderator: Great, thank you.

Kevin Walsh: That's permissible at this point, where it says, which represents the cost of salary and benefits to hire four additional firefighters. After the word represents, add six months, add the words six months. So, in other words, we would read \$295,315, which represents the cost of six months of salary and benefits to hire four additional firefighters.

Motion by Kevin Walsch to amend the amendment and add "six months", to read "Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Five Hundred Ninety Thousand Six Hundred Twenty-Nine Dollars (\$590,629), which represents the cost of six months of salary and benefits to hire four additional Firefighter/AEMT's in the Fire Department".

Shawn Jasper seconded the motion.

Moderator: Seconded to the discussion to the new amendment.

Debra Putnam: I would further say that since we in this room already are confused, that it should say, which represents the cost of six months commencing a particular date. Because I think otherwise people are going to wonder again, wait a minute, what's six months? Does that start July 1, which is when our normal fiscal year starts? And what they're basically saying is, okay, we're not going to be able to fill those slots for a few months, so we'll hire them less. Because otherwise, if you leave it open and no start date and it doesn't run from six months into our fiscal cycle into the end of our fiscal cycle, then what happens when that \$295,000 runs out before the end of our fiscal cycle?

Moderator: Thank you. Sure. One moment, please.

Ted Trost: I just want to jump in real quick. I want to remind everybody, we're voting on a dollar amount here. We're not voting on the four firefighters. That even if this doesn't and the chief finds some way to hire four firefighters that doesn't cost them any additional money, there's nothing stopping him from doing it. There's no requirement that hiring firefighters goes before the voters. So, the timing of this being stated in here makes no difference.

Shawn Jasper: I would agree with that comment and point out that I think it's very important for the town to have that flexibility. They may find candidates that they want to hire in September and may then delay the other two until March. So, I think that putting a start date in is the wrong thing to do if you're going to do anything like this. And as I stated previously, this body has the ability to transfer money in if it's available. So, they would have a plan with the chief to decide when they were going to start positions. They could start them all at once in if they identify other money. So, I think having the flexibility is good, but I also think it's not realistic to think they're going to hire four on July 1st. So, I think this is a good compromise to not have the impact that it would in the first year and allow us to look as we go into the next budgets to look at the overall impact.

Moderator: Yes, sir.

Jim Wilkins: For the second time. I guess I'd rephrase my question to ask how allocating the money for two firefighters.

Moderator: Take your mask down, please.

Jim Wilkins: How allocating the money, sufficient money for two firefighters translates into a default budget position for four firefighters next year automatically.

Moderator: Okay, if I can have a response.

Chairman Dumont: As the previous speaker who stated the Board of Selectmen have the authority to create new positions. However, it's been our process in the past to bring that in front of the voters for approval. So, at any point in time, in theory, we could add new positions. What this does is saying these four positions will be funded by that dollar amount. That dollar amount only represents six months of funding. Those four positions are going to be created if this moves forward. So, those four positions therefore will roll into the default budget the following year.

Jim Wilkins: If you say so.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else?

Adam Haverstock: I'd like to move the previous question.

***Adam Haverstock made a motion to cut off debate on the amendment.
Motion seconded by Len Segal.***

Moderator: Sure, I can, as is or with amended. We still haven't voted on the amendment yet. To reduce the budget from \$590,629 to \$295,315.

Shawn Jasper: Point of order. Actually, it's the amendment, second amendment, so it's just that whatever ...

Moderator: To change, add six months.

Shawn Jasper: Yeah, so there are two amendments on the floor. We voted on the last one first, and it would be added as a full amendment.

Moderator: Thank you. Nope, nope, that's fine. All right, so the...

Adam Haverstock: Point of order, we have to take a vote on the moving the question before we move the amendment.

Moderator: Absolutely, I thank you so much. Okay, we're going to vote. If this passes, we would cut off debate on the amendment. If it doesn't pass, we'll continue the discussion. If you are in favor of cutting off debate on the amendment, please raise your voter cards.

PASSED: Motion to cut off debate on the amendment.

Moderator: Thank you. For those opposed. Thank you. Seeing none, the vote passes. The question is moved. All right, back to the second amendment. We have to vote, right? Okay, the verbiage for the second amendment on the warrant article number six, four firefighters/AEMTs, it shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$295,315, which represents six months of the cost of salary and benefits to hire firefighters. Four additional firefighters/AEMTs, in the fire department. Six months, yeah. I can't read that, sorry. Cost of six months. Moving represents six months from represents to the cost of six, four, six months of salary and benefits, correct? Okay. Yes, correct, but I had to read the whole thing. All right, all in favor? All opposed? Thank you. The vote passes.

PASSED: Motion to amend the amendment and add "six months", to read "Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Two Hundred Ninety-Five Thousand, Three Hundred Fifteen Dollars (\$295,315), which represents the cost of six months of salary and benefits to hire four additional Firefighter/AEMT's in the Fire Department".

Moderator: The new, now we're going back to amendment number one, the dollar amount, correct? Okay. Shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$295,315, which represents the cost of, for six months of salary and benefits to hire for, again, I can't read that. Yeah, thank you. Okay, shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$295,315, which represents the cost of six months of salary and benefits to hire four additional firefighters, AEMTs, in the fire department? We now vote. All in favor? Thank you. All opposed? The ayes have it.

PASSED: Shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of Two Hundred Ninety-Five Thousand, Three Hundred Fifteen Dollars (\$295,315), which represents the cost of six months of salary and benefits to hire four additional Firefighter/AEMT's in the Fire Department.

Moderator: Thank you. All right, back to the original warrant article, unless there's any more comments or questions or amendments to warrant article number six. I'm sorry, sir, please come up to the microphone.

Unidentified Voter: Point of order. The current warrant article is for six months of funding for four firefighters and not two, correct? Correct.

Moderator: Yes, sir, thank you. One question. Yes, sir, your name.

Ian Howes: It's Ian Howes, H-O-W-E-S, 2 Glenview Drive.

Moderator: And your last name spelled, I'm sorry.

Ian Howes: H-O-W-E-S as in shark or snail.

Moderator: Thank you very much. Any other comments, questions, or amendments before we vote? Seeing none, we will vote on the amended, just go to vote, it just goes to passes to the ballot as amended. And the amendment is now going to be amended article four, six rather, for hire four

firefighters, AEMTs. Shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$295,315 which represents the cost of six months of salary and benefits to hire four additional firefighter and AEMTs in the fire department. This will now move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 6 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

Chris Landry: Move to restrict consideration on articles five and six.

*Chris Landry made motion to restrict consideration on warrant articles five and six.
Chairman Dumont seconded the motion.*

Moderator: All right. At this time, I would like to take a 10-minute break.

Moderator is reminded there is a motion on the floor.

Moderator: We have a motion to reconsider, restrict reconsideration of worn articles five and six. It's been first made motion and it's been seconded. We, they moved to restrict reconsideration of articles five and six. What that does is lock those articles in. We cannot bring them up later in this meeting. If we don't do that, then someone later on today could say that I want to reconsider that and make changes to it. Restriction of reconsideration means that there will be now moved to the ballot the way they are and they cannot be brought up again in this meeting. Is that clear to everyone? Thank you. Motion made to restrict reconsideration of articles five to six. We use your red cards to cast your vote. Those in favor of reconstruction restriction, raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed? The vote is for, the vote is yes. Thank you.

PASSED: Motion to restrict consideration on warrant articles five and six.

Moderator: At this point, I'm going to take a 10-minute break. There's refreshments for sale by the women's group. I will, we'll reconvene at 11:09 a.m. resuming the meeting at article seven, Robinson Pond Improvements.

ARTICLE 07 – ROBINSON POND IMPROVEMENTS

Moderator: Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$500,000 gross appropriation for construction of Robinson Pond improvements. This project will be funded at \$250,000, 50% from the land, state land and water conservation fund grant and \$250,000, 50% from the general taxation. This project will include improvements at the boat launch. The town does not receive the grant. Only \$250,000 of the gross appropriation will be raised and appropriated for this project. This is a special warrant article per RSA 32:7 VI, reflecting an appropriation that will not lapse until the monies are expended or June 30th, 2032, whichever is the earliest.

**Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0
Recommended by the Budget Committee 8-2**

Chairman Dumont: Thank you, Madam Moderator. The town is required to comply with Federal EPA MS-4 permit requirements. 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. If you're not familiar with the MS-4, there are standards we are required to meet set by the federal government. These MS-4 permits create a cost to the town and this warrant article helps fulfill those requirements by using town and state funds instead of Hudson taxpayers shouldering the entire burden. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open Article No. 7, Robinson Pond Improvements, to questions, comments, and amendments. Would anybody like to speak on Article 7? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end discussion of Article 7 and it will move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 7 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 08 – ROUTE 102 NEW SIDEWALKS

Moderator: Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$2 million gross appropriation for the design and construction of new sidewalks along Route 102? This project will be funded by \$1,600,000 or 80% from an NHDOT Ten Year Transportation Improvement Plan (2025 to 2034) Grant and \$400,000 or (20%) from corridor funds. This is a special warrant article per RSA 32:7 VI, reflecting an appropriation that will not lapse until the monies are expended, or June 30, 2032, whichever is the earliest.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-1

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you, Madam Moderator. Okay, so the background of this is to construct new sidewalks along Derry Road to connect sidewalks from the Library Common to Alvirne High School. Currently, this project is on the DOT 10-year plan and the funding will consist of 80% from the state and 20% match from corridor funds, meaning that there is no tax impact and the project is contingent upon state funding and will not be constructed otherwise. This is something that I think we are very fortunate to have done here for a long time. We have been talking about, especially with the Planning Board and others, about sidewalks and this is a place in town where sidewalks are much, much needed. This will go, this will take a step in the right direction to getting sidewalks in the places in town that are that they are needed. It will provide safety for students going back and forth to school along Derry Road and it's very much needed. So, thank you very much. Hopefully you'll support this article.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open Article Number 8, Route 102, New Sidewalks for questions, comments, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on Article 8? Yes, ma'am. Can you stand on the X, please? And state your name.

Margaret St. John, 238 Fox Hollow.

Moderator: I'm sorry, can you?

Margaret St. John: S-T.

Moderator: No, your first name.

Margaret St. John: I'm sorry, Margaret.

Moderator: Thank you.

Margaret St. John: So, I just have one real quick question. I understand that 102 is a state road, is that correct? So, my question is, who will maintain those sidewalks, as in shoveling them and maintaining if there's any damage to them? Thank you.

Selectman Guessferd: Just to make sure I get it right, I will yield to our Development Service Director, Elvis Dhima.

Elvis Dhima: Thank you, Mr. Guessferd. Oh, it's a little too close. We will be maintaining those and we'll be plowing them, even though that's a state road.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else would like to make a comment, question, or amendment to Article 8? Seeing none, we will close this article to end discussion on warrant Article Number 8 and it will move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 8 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 09 – FIRE APPARATUS/EQUIPMENT PURCHASE

Moderator: Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$96,030 for the purpose of replacing a 2001 Ford F250 utility vehicle with said funds to be withdrawn from the Fire Apparatus Equipment Capital Reserve Fund established for this purpose?

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-0

Moderator: You don't need to reread the article. Thank you. Selectman Morin.

Selectman Morin: Background for this warrant article is requesting funding to support the replacement of utility to a 2001 Ford F250 that has reached its end of life due to the rust and mechanical issues. The proposed purchase of a 2026 Ford F250, total cost \$96,030, aligns with the department's fleet replacement program and enhances the operation flexibility for utility brush towing and plowing tasks. This vehicle will be outfitted with emergency lighting, sirens, graphics, and storage solutions and acquired through the state bid pricing due to the absence of a police package. Approval will allow the fire department to retire the aging utility to reassign the 2022 Ford F50 to utility two duties and deploy the new F250 as the shift commander vehicle, thereby extending the life of the F150. The old vehicle may be traded or reassigned or auctioned based on residual value, ensuing responsibility, asset management.

Moderator: Thank you. Does anyone wish to speak on article number nine, fire apparatus equipment purchase? For questions, comments, or amendments?

Rich Weissgarber, 21 Flying Rock Road.

Moderator: I'm sorry, your name again, please?

Rich Weissgarber: Rich Weissgarber, W-E-I-S-S-G-A-R-B-E-R.

Moderator: Thank you.

Rich Weissgarber: I just had a quick question in regards to the wording in the warrant articles. I know sometimes that's canned, so I assume raise and appropriate is a canned statement even when a tax rate impact is zero.

Moderator: Do you want a clarification?

Rich Weissgarber: Okay. Yes. Just making sure.

Moderator: Any other comments or questions or amendments to article number nine? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end the discussion on warrant article number nine, and it will move to the ballot. Thank you.

WARRANT ARTICLE 9 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 10 – DRAINAGE CAPITAL RESERVE FUND

Moderator: Warrant article 10. Good news, we're halfway there. Drainage Capital Reserve Fund. Shall the town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$50,000, which will be added to the Drainage Capital Reserve Fund previously established for this purpose.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3-1

Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-1

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: The tax impact rate for this is 0.01, it's one cent. The background, the CRF established in 2024 is used to offset the cost related to installation repairs, mining upgrades, and replacements of stormwater drains on town roads to accommodate heavy flows to help alleviate costly road damage, property damage, and is vital to improving the town's drainage infrastructure. This upgrade also is necessary for our MS-4 stormwater permitting requirements.

Moderator: Thank you, Selectman. We will now open article number 10, Drainage Capital Reserve Fund, to questions, comments, or amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article 10? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end discussion on warrant article number 10, and it will move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 10 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

James Lawrence made a motion to restrict reconsideration of warrant articles seven through ten.

Moderator: Is there a second?

Kim Rice seconded the motion.

Moderator: They've moved to restrict reconsideration of articles and it's been seconded. What this does is lock those articles in. We cannot bring them out later in the meeting. If we don't do that, then someone later today could say, I want to reconsider that and make changes to them. Restriction of reconsideration means that this will now be moved to the ballot the way they are, and they cannot be brought up again in this meeting. This is clear for everyone? Thank you. Motion made to restrict reconsideration of articles 7 through 10. You'll use your red cards to cast your vote. Those in favor of restriction, please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed? The vote passes.

PASSED: Motion to restrict reconsideration of warrant articles seven through ten.

ARTICLE 11 – PROPERTY REVALUATION CAPITAL RESERVE FUND

Moderator: Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$25,000, which will be added to the Property Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund as previously established for this purpose?

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-0

Chairman Dumont: Thank you, Madam Moderator. The article funds essential appropriations to continue funding into the property re-evaluation capital reserve fund. This capital reserve fund was established in 2008 for the purposes of conducting future property re-evaluations. This capital reserve fund currently has a balance of \$235,755. New Hampshire municipalities are required to reassess property a minimum of once every five years. Hudson's last town-wide property assessment was in

2022. The last re-evaluation cost was approximately \$175,000 from the 2021 calendar year. The town is scheduled to conduct its next reassessment no later than the 2027 property tax year. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you, Chairman. We will now open article number 11 for questions, comments, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article 11? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end discussion on warrant article number 11. It will move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 11 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 12 – DISABLED VETERAN TAX CREDIT ADJUSTMENT

Moderator: Shall the town of Hudson vote in accordance with RSA 72:27-a to modify the provision of RSA 72:35, previously adopted, for an optional tax credit of \$4,000 for a special connected total and permanent disability. If approved, this article will take effect for the final property tax bill of the 2026 property tax year.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you, Madam Moderator. Background for this article is that this proposal seeks to increase the Service-Connected Total and Permanent Disabled Veterans Tax Credit. The current property tax credit amount is \$3,000, and that was last set by the town voters in the March of 2021. There are 71 property owners receiving this credit currently. The urgency of increasing this tax credit effective for the 2026 property tax year is due to the passage of recent legislation by state legislators. That legislative action removed the requirement that municipalities were under to combine the \$600 optional veterans tax credit with the Service-Connected Total and Permanent Disabled Veterans Tax Credit. This legislation now bars municipalities from combining them both on a disabled veterans property tax bill. The warrant article requested voters approve an increase to the Service-Connected Total and Permanent Disabled Veterans Tax Credit from \$3,000 to \$4,000. The reason for this is twofold. It is intended to both make up for the loss of the Optional Veterans Tax Credit for disabled veterans, as well as recognize that it has been five years since this credit was last increased. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 12 for questions, comments, and amendments.

Daniel Barthelemy, 2 Hedgerow Drive: B-A-R-T-H-E-L-E-M-Y.

Moderator: I'm sorry, can you say that slower, please?

Daniel Barthelemy: B-A-R-T-H-E-L-E-M-Y.

Moderator: Thank you.

Daniel Barthelemy: I support article 12. This isn't an expansion of benefits, it's a correction to one. Recent state law eliminated the ability to combine the optional veterans tax credit and the permanently and totally disabled veterans tax credit, which means some of our most seriously injured veterans saw a benefit reduction. This resolves fairness and preserves the original intent of the policy, and I think that the town should support it. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Would anyone else like to speak on questions, comments, or amendments to article number 12? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end discussion on warrant article number 12, and it moves to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 12 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 13 – ESTABLISH AN EXTREME WEATHER EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND

Moderator: To see if the town will vote to establish an Extreme Weather Expendable Trust Fund per RSA 31:19-a, for the purpose of managing extreme weather events and funding unanticipated expenses, including but not limited to labor, materials, equipment, and contracted services, and to raise an appropriate \$1,000 from the general fund surplus and authorize the use transfer of the June 30, 2026 general fund balance to be put in the fund. Further to name the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from said fund. Note this is a majority rule. (Majority Vote required).

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Not Recommended by the Budget Committee 2-8

Selectman Morin: Background for this article, seeking voters approval to establish a fund that can be expanded or added to each fiscal year in conjunction with the public works account 5557. The purpose being to offset over expenditures related to extreme weather events rather than using other budget lines to cover these expenditures. If there is an excess in 5557, at the end of the year, the Board of Selectmen can vote to deposit these funds into a CFR to cover future years via transfer of unassigned funds via a warrant article. At the Selectman's meeting last week, the public works director came in and said his budget was pretty close to being expended already just due to the winter of this year. So later on in this year, if we have a flooding situation in the spring or a hurricane comes through or severe thunderstorm, that type of situation, we're going to have to find funds to have the public works come out and deal with these issues on our roads and our culverts and things to that nature. This fund is to hopefully put money ahead of time. So, if we do have these problems that the money can be drawn out of this fund and not taken from other places in the public works budget. We always hear that they take a lot of money out of paving every year to pay for things that we get behind in our paving. So, this would hopefully eliminate having to take away from our paving and we can make sure that they do the outstanding job that they always do. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 13. Establish an extreme weather expendable trust fund to questions, comments, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on the article 13? Chairman Dumont.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you, Madam Moderator. There were some concerns over the wording in article 13, which it's my understanding is why the budget committee was not able to support this. As such, I would like to offer an amendment to article 13. I propose removing from the general fund surplus, and authorize the use transfer of the June 30th, 2026 general fund balance to be put in the fund and insert the following in its place. Beginning after 1000 in parentheses and up to the word further to put into the fund with this amount to come from the June 30th, 2026 general fund unassigned balance.

Motion by Chairman Dumont to strike "from the General Fund surplus, and authorize the use/transfer of the June 30, 2026, General Fund balance to be put in the fund" and replace it with "to put into the fund, with this amount to come from the June 30, 2026, General Fund Unassigned balance."

Moderator: Do I have a second?

Kim Rice seconded the motion.

Moderator: Any comments on the amended verbiage?

James Wilkins: Do we have an estimate for what this surplus of the fund would be?

Moderator: Yeah, questions on the amendment. Only the questions on the amendment only. We're only on the amendment.

James Wilkins: But well, that is where this money is supposed to come from. That's why it's relevant to the amendment.

Moderator: But the amendment is about the verbiage, not about the money.

James Wilkins: The source of the money.

Moderator: We can we can revisit the question after the amendment is voted on.

James Wilkins: I see your point though.

Moderator: Okay, thank you. Go ahead, Mr. Jasper.

Shawn Jasper: As the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen stated, we did have some issues with the with the language. It was very unclear. It seemed to potentially authorize everything in the fund in the fund balance to go into this fund, even though it mentions a thousand dollars. It wasn't likely to happen, but it wasn't the verbiage that we normally see. They worked with the Department of Revenue Administration and came up with the new language, which I fully support and will support the amendment and the underlying article. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments, questions or about the amendment on the table? Okay, seeing none, we will go to a vote. All in favor of the amended verbiage of adding to put. Thank you. Yes. All opposed. Thank you.

PASSED: Motion to strike "from the General Fund surplus, and authorize the use/transfer of the June 30, 2026, General Fund balance to be put in the fund" and replace it with "to put into the fund, with this amount to come from the June 30, 2026, General Fund Unassigned balance."

Moderator: We're back to the original article with the amended verbiage to read to see if the town will vote to establish an extreme weather expendable trust fund per RSA 31:19-a for the purpose of managing extreme weather events and funding unanticipated expenses, including but not limited to labor materials, equipment and contracted services and to raise an appropriate \$1,000 to put into the fund with this amount to come from the June 30, 2026 general fund unassigned balance. Further to name the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from said fund. Is there any comments about the or questions? I'm recognizing Roy Sorensen.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you, Roy Sorensen, Town Administrator. I'll defer to the gentleman. Do you still have that same question? So, as an example, surplus last year was around \$250,000. So that's where that money would come from. And the board would have to vote on that to take that and that would go up in a warrant article that subsequent year. So, the voters would still be able to weigh in on it. But that's where the money would be generated from. We don't have our surplus number yet for this year's audit. We should have that within the next month.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir.

Rob Everett: I realize this is just to get the fund started, but after watching the Selectman's meeting the other day and seeing our DPW directors in the red already with like two to three months of winter left, should we increase? It's my question. That's the question.

Moderator: Any comment from the Board of Selectmen or the Roy? Actually, two of you are going to fight for this. Okay.

Chairman Dumont: I wouldn't think it's appropriate at this time to do that.

Moderator: Thank you. Thank you for clarifying. Any other questions, comments? I have one coming. Yes, sir.

Rich Weissgarber: I just wanted to clarify in relation to the previous speaker, this is FY27 budget, correct? So, this wouldn't even go on the ballot until much in the future. So, putting more money in it now is kind of a mute, I would say, right? Because we're talking about this, he was talking about, previous speaker was talking about this current season. So this funding..

Roy Sorenson: Yes, you are correct. There's a couple things here. For one, I wouldn't increase the number just because we don't have a surplus number. We'll find that out when the audit comes in. The other thing is this budget established that public works account 5557, which is extreme weather. That's not something that was in the budget previously. As the gentleman speaking here in front of us, Mr. Weissgarber mentioned, we will run the course on that as a new cost center within the budget. And then when we finish at the end of 27, we'll see how that stands.

Moderator: Great. Thank you.

Kimberly Allen, 3 Daniel Webster Drive: I just had a question for clarification. Where we change the verbiage on the warrant article, if the budget committee is now in agreement with it, will it still reflect that they are against it on the ballot?

Chairman Dumont: Each board will have an opportunity after this meeting to change or for a member of that board to make a motion to reconsider those recommendations.

Moderator: Thank you.

Moderator: I'm sorry. Could you speak that again, please? Into the microphone.

Chairman Dumont: Sorry. Each board at the end of this meeting will have an opportunity to offer changes to those recommendations if a member so chooses.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other questions, comments, or amendments to article number 13? Okay. Seeing none, the amended article of to establish to see if the town will vote to Establish an Extreme Weather Expendable Trust Fund per RSA 31:19-a for the purpose of managing extreme weather events and funding and unanticipated expenses, including but not limited to labor materials, equipment, and contracted services, and to raise an appropriate \$1,000 to put into the fund with this amount to come from the June 30, 2026 General Fund Unassigned Balance, further to name the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from said fund. We'll now move to the, we'll be moved to the ballot. Thank you.

WARRANT ARTICLE 13 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 14 – REVISE BENSON LAND CAPITAL ARESERVE FUND

Moderator: Shall the town of Hudson vote to revise the existing language of Benson Land Capital Reserve Fund previously established under the provision of RSA 35:1, thereby expanding the purpose of the fund to include the repair and maintenance of Benson Park features, notwithstanding that the all buildings and appearances located within the parcel identified as map 185, Lot 040-000. Further to designate the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from said fund. Note this will require a two-thirds vote.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Selectman Jakoby: I recognize selectman Jakoby. The capital reserve fund for purchase and renovation of 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. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 14, revised Benson Land Capital Reserve Fund to questions, comments and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak?

Harry Schibanoff, 8 Birdie Lane.

Moderator: And your last name spelled please.

Harry Schibanoff: S-C-H-I-B-A-N-O-F-F.

Moderator: Thank you.

Harry Schibanoff: I am an alternate member of the Benson Park committee, excuse me, Benson Park Advisory Committee. I am also a Trustee of Trust Funds for the town of Hudson. This amendment to this, to the existing capital reserve fund would help the committee make recommendations to the Board to improve all parts of Benson Park, not just its buildings. And that was the restriction of the old capital reserve fund. Also, as a trustee, it would make it a lot easier to release these funds to the Board of Selectmen to expend them because of the flexibility that it would afford the Trustees in doing that. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Would anyone else like to speak? Seeing none, we will move, close the warrant article to end the discussion on warrant article number 14 and it will move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 14 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 15 – RATIFICATION OF 9 INDUSTRIAL DRIVE LEASE AGREEMENT

Moderator: Shall the town of Hudson vote pursuant to RSA 41:11-a, to ratify a lease agreement between the Board of Selectmen and Drive Force CDL Academy LLC (“Drive Force”), according to which Drive Force will be leasing a portion of the property located at 9 Industrial Drive (Map 161-Lot 040 and Map 161 - Lot 039) for a commercial driving academy training ground? The initial term of this lease shall be five (5) years, and be and may be extended for one (1) additional five (5) year term (total of 10 years). Rental payments during the first year of the lease shall be \$24,000 (including taxes), and thereafter increased by 2.5% annually. Copies of the full text of the Lease Agreement are available at the Town Clerk's office.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you Madam Moderator. The background for this article, the Town of Hudson currently has a lease agreement with drive force CDL academy LLC of Manchester, New Hampshire, for the use of a Town-owned parking area for 9 Industrial Drive, otherwise known as Map 161 - Lot 040 and Map 161 - Lot 039, for commercial driver's license training purposes. The existing lease is through March 10, 2026, so it will be expiring soon. This is a revenue opportunity for the town which helps offset property taxes. An added benefit is that this is kind of a close convenient way for we've had issues in the past trying to get folks their CDL licenses who work for the town so this has the added benefit of having those town employees have a more convenient close way to who require those

CDLs to obtain them. It's this is a win-win for everybody, win for the town and it's a it's a good thing and we request your support for this.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 15, ratification of 9 Industrial Drive Lease Agreement to questions comments and amendments. Yes sir.

Rob Everett: As somebody who's had a CDL for a minute or two I can tell you there's a shortage of CDL drivers so I support this. Over the next decade they're expecting they need to replace over a million drivers and as Selectman Guessferd just spoke to, the town's already been having issues hiring people so, to me, it's like a win-win. The town gets some money and people get trained and can go into a career where they can get some money.

Moderator: Thank you for your input. Any other questions?

Chris Landry: This sounds like a great thing I support. I just had a quick question. I assume since this has been ongoing issues around liability and stuff have been worked out and will continue to be okay there. I just don't want the town to be liable if there's an accident on that property.

Elvis Dhima: Thank you and great question. They have an umbrella insurance for up to a million dollars so we're covered. If there's any issues there whatsoever with their operations or the property damage we're covered.

Moderator: Thank you for clarifying. Does anyone else like to speak on the warrant article number 15? Seeing none we will close the warrant article to end the discussion on warrant article 15 and it moves to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 15 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 16 – MODIFY HUDSON COMMUNITY TV REVOLVING FUND

Moderator: To see if the town will vote pursuant to RSA 31:95-h to modify the existing Hudson Community Television Revolving Fund established in 2015, to increase the amount of cable franchise fee revenues received from our cable franchise agreement deposited into the fund from 80% to 100%. The cable franchise agreement revenue share shall be as follows: beginning July 1st 2026 100% to the HCTV revolving fund 0% to the town general fund. Such monies in addition to any cable franchise equipment grants will be deposited into this fund and the money in the fund shall be allowed to accumulate from year to year, and shall not be considered part of the Town's General Fund balance. The town treasurer shall have custody of all monies in the fund and shall pay out the same only upon order of the board of selectmen and no further approval is required by the Board of Selectmen to expend. These funds may be expended only for purposes of community television operations including but not limited to access for public, education, or government cable facilities equipment, cable facilities labor, maintenance, renovations, or associated operating and administrative purposes. Note that a majority vote is required.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0

Selectman Jakob: The background for this is when the revolving fund for the PEG (Public, Educational, and Government) operations was established in 2015. The town voted to allocate 80% of cable franchise fee revenue to HCTV and 20% to the town's general fund. With the continued trend of cord cutting and the growing shift towards streaming as the primary way people consume content cable franchise fee revenue has declined significantly over the past three years. This article seeks to provide

financial relief to sustain the community media department's operations through FY27 and FY28. I'd like to give the floor to the Director of HCTV, Michael Johnson. Thank you.

Mike Johnson: Thank you, Selectman Jakoby, Madam Moderator. It's a little bit different being on the side of the camera for once. For those who don't know me, my name is Michael Johnson, I serve as the town's Director of Community Media. I took over our department last October. It's certainly been challenging times for the community media industry as a whole. It's no secret that people are cutting the cord and switching to streaming platforms. It is also important to recognize that Hudson Community Television is funded entirely through the franchise fee revenue. We're not funded through the general fund. Right now, we're losing about \$2,000 to \$3,000 a quarter. As you can see on the chart over there, those are numbers from FY25 to this year in FY26. And it's made it challenging on our part planning for the future of the department. This warrant article would provide significant relief for HCTV through FY27 and FY28 and allow us to remain funded through that franchise fee revenue. It is also important to recognize that non-cable subscribers get services from HCTV now. You can stream all our content at www.hudsonctv.com. And you can also watch everything on our Cablecast Screenweave app. So, if you have a Roku device, Amazon Fire TV, iOS, and Android, you can stream everything on there. I like to believe that we provide an essential service to this community for when we're there, when people can't be there. You can watch all your meetings, high school sports, and residents have the opportunity to produce their own local content on our station. So, we thank everybody for watching and thank you for your support of the Community and Media Department of HCTV. I'd be happy to take any questions about this article.

Moderator: We will now open article number 16, Modify Hudson Community TV Revolving Fund to questions, comments, or amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article number 16? Yes sir.

Mike Campbell, 6 Baltusrol Drive: I just want to rise in support of this motion. Like the director said, they provide a pivotal resource for the community. You can go back years and years of deliberative sessions to see when we had like darker hair or more hair. All the sports are streamed live. Every meeting you can watch from years and years ago. As a cord cutter, sorry, I'm back on though now. I'd like to support them in any way possible, so I hope everyone will support this one.

Moderator: Thank you. Would anyone else like to speak on this? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end the discussion on warrant article number 16 and move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 16 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

Moderator: I just want to let you know we're going to take about a 15-minute intermission here because we just received pizza. So, I'm, we will, we had a motion to restrict reconsideration in a second. Actually, it was seconded, thank you.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion to restrict reconsideration for warrant articles eleven through sixteen.

Selectman Vurgaropulos seconded the motion.

Moderator: The motion is to restrict reconsideration for articles 11 through 16. I won't read the message again to save everyone from that. You will, the motion made to restrict reconsideration of article 11 to 16. You'll use your red cards to cast your vote. Those in favor of the restriction, please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed? Thank you. The vote carries.

PASSED: Motion to restrict reconsideration for warrant articles eleven through sixteen.

Moderator: And now we will take a 15-minute intermission and we will, anybody who wants pizza can go see the juniors. Thank you

ARTICLE 17 – CHANGE PLANNING BOARD MEMBERSHIP FROM ELECTED TO APPOINTED BY PETITION

Moderator: To see if the town will vote to amend the method of selection for Planning Board members by changing Planning Board positions from elected to appointed positions identical to how the Planning Board was structured in the past. If adopted, all future Planning Board members shall be appointed by the Hudson Board of Selectmen in accordance with RSA 673:2 and RSA 673:5, with terms established pursuant to state law. Current elected members shall serve out the remainder of their elected terms, after which vacancies shall be filled by appointment by the Board of Selectmen.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3-2

Moderator: The gentleman, Michael LaCasse, is not present and he has sent a letter which I will read. Quote, good afternoon, everyone. My name is Mike LaCasse and I am in support of changing the method by which members of the Hudson Planning Board are selected from elected positions to appointments made by the Board of Selectmen. This approach provides an added layer of oversight and accountability by allowing town staff to review candidates for potential conflicts of interest and to provide informed feedback to the Board of Selectmen prior to appointment. This petition is not personal and it's not political. It is about accountability, professionalism, and protecting the town of Hudson. The Planning Board is a quasi-judicial body. Its members make decisions that affect private property rights, economic development, housing, and the long-term character of our community. With that responsibility comes an expectation of professionalism, fairness, and respect toward applicants, town staff, and the public. Unfortunately, when a Planning Board member behaves in a rude and unprofessional manner, the town has very limited ability to respond if that member is elected. Even when conducted, even when conduct undermines public confidence and creates unnecessary conflict, the town must simply wait for the next election. That is not good governance. An appointed board provides real accountability. The Board of Selectmen who are elected townwide can set expectations for conduct, performance, and training. If a member consistently fails to meet those expectations, corrective action can be taken. That protects the town, the process, and the public. Appointment also allows Hudson to build a Planning Board based on qualifications and temperament. Land use decisions are complex. They involve engineering, zoning, environmental regulations, and legal standards. Elections do not guarantee the candidates have the experience or demeanor needed for that work. Appointments allow the Selectmen to seek individuals with the right skills and the ability to conduct themselves professionally. At the end of the day, this petition is about restoring confidence in the Planning Board process and ensuring decisions are made in a respectful, professional, and accountable manner. I urge residents to support this petition, not to target individuals, but to strengthen the way Hudson governs itself. End quote. We will now open Article 17, change of Planning Board membership from elected to appointed to questions, comments, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on Article 17?

Patty Langlais, 22 Stonewood Lane: I rise in favor of this article. I've had the opportunity now to be in front of the Planning Board a few times. The last time I was went was this past month in January. I have to tell you I was horrified and I was very embarrassed. The behavior of some of the Planning Board members was completely inappropriate and extremely disrespectful to our town employees. So, I am all in favor of this because something needs to be done.

Moderator: Thank you.

Jim Wilkins: When the Continental Congress was first established, they said...

Moderator: Can you take a little step back? I think you're some feedback. There you go.

Jim Wilkins: Okay. They told us we know that democracy is not the most efficient system. It's the fairest. Be careful that you don't trade your fairness for, in general, for immediate efficiency. And I think that's what we're looking at here and in a subsequent article, that trying to undermine faith in democracy.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir.

James Crowley: I would like to speak to this petition more color article, which proposes changing Planning Board members from elected to appointed. I do not support this article. For the record, I currently serve on the Planning Board. However, the board has not authorized me to represent or speak on its behalf regarding the article 17. I speak only for myself and as a resident and voter. By way of background, I have been elected twice by Hudson voters to represent them by majority vote in both 2022 and 2025 for a three-year term. I am grateful for the trust and honor voters have given me. Our current method of electing Planning Board members ensures that every Hudson voter has a direct voice in choosing who represents them and in deciding whether to support or replace a member. A lot of what I'm hearing here that appears that we'd be better served if they brought their objections to the ethics committee that they feel it warrants that. I do respect the Board of Selectmen and the time and effort they put into managing this town. But ask yourself, do you want only five members of the Board of Selectmen to determine the qualifications, skill sets, and criteria for who is worthy to serve on the Planning Board? If residents want new Planning Board representation, that decision should remain in the hands of the voters, not a small group of officials. Your ballot is your right to choose the candidate whose background, judgment, and priorities best reflect what you believe is important for Hudson. Hudson is best served when voters directly select the individuals they believe will deliver the results they want for the community. It is also important to remember that the Planning Board is unique. Its authority is not based on personal preference or political direction. It is bound by state law, Hudson zoning ordinances, and our land use regulations. Board members must weigh both the rights of the property owners and the interests of the public in every development decision. How these standards are applied within the limits of the law can vary based on the experience and the perspective of each member. My view, the town is best served when the Planning Board includes members with a diverse mix of life experiences, professional backgrounds, and education. If residents want a vetting process, we already have one, the annual Candidate's Night at the community center. It allows voters to hear directly from candidates, ask questions, and then make an informed choice at the March election. It does help, though, if more citizens would come forward to volunteer for these boards or go for an election. I do not support giving my direct voting right and handling that authority to others. For these reasons, I will be voting against the Petition warrant Act of 17 this March. Thanks.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir.

Daniel Barthelemy: I have a question for the Board. Do you have any formal findings or documented governance issues that led to the conclusion that the Planning Board 's method of election is the issue and not disagreements with individual members?

Moderator: Any response?

Chairman Dumont: I'll state my personal opinion, not an opinion of the Board. I find it, I see that it's harder for people to step up and run for election, as you've been through that process yourself, than you would see somebody stepping up and volunteering for an appointment. You have the same people running for that elected position over and over again, and as we've seen, as a member spoke prior, disrespect and rude comments made to staff members, as well as a specific quasi-judicial process not being followed adequately, which has, in certain cases, led to appeals in court.

Daniel Barthelemy: Thank you. Thank you. I feel that before we transfer authority, did you want to go ahead and respond? Before we transfer authority from the voters, I feel that we should have evidence of a systemic problem and not just an emotional reaction to a situational one.

Moderator: Go ahead.

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you for your questions and your interest. I sit on the Planning Board. I am the selectman member of the planning board, and there's really nothing emotional about this. I mean, there can be at times, but this, what we've been seeing lately, and I will agree with this other citizen who came up earlier, the first one who spoke, Ms. Langlais, that there's been a pattern of behavior, and again, I think we're mostly just talking about, at this point, one individual, okay? There have been others over time. There have been things that have come up, but this has been a long process over the last year or so of witnessing behaviors that are continually getting worse, and is there a formal process or is there formal documentation? To send something to the ethics committee, that's a high bar, and there's very specific things that you can allege with the ethics committee. We don't have a lot of say as to when a member acts inappropriately, but when you're insulting, I mean, literally insulting the chair, you're insulting people like the Select Board member, when you're insulting town employees, okay? That's unacceptable behavior. It's unprofessional, but does it rise to the level of an ethical complaint? It's hard to get that, to raise to that bar, so that's my concern here. Now, I think what it does represent, though, a lot of times is, and one of the reasons why I was one of the three who voted for this, is that this job requires a particular set of skills, as quoted from the movie, right? Not the same set of skills, but, and it's important that board members get educated, understand what those skills are, what the knowledge base should be, and in an election, it's, you don't necessarily get that, and then some people get elected, and they may or may not have the skill set necessary on this quasi-judicial board, which, as the chairman said, you know, if things aren't done correctly, or if bias is shown in any one way, way, shape, or form, then it can affect us as a town. It can affect, it can affect, we go to court, we may lose a court case, we may have to pay fines, we may have to pay, you know, and that comes, guess where that comes from? It comes from us, so there's a lot into this thought process, and I 100% respect the democratic process, but this is a particular sort of job that requires a lot of specific knowledge, and the ability to, I'll say, to act, you know, in a logical, professional manner, so it's not necessarily just a technical skill per se, but those skills also have to involve the ability to work through an issue and come to a reasonable vote without bias, because we have to not have bias on that board. As soon as you show any sort of bias at all, it can affect the outcome down the line, so, you know, I've spoken a bit long here, but I just wanted to make sure that it was clear from somebody who's on the board as to why I'm taking the stance that I'm taking on this.

Dan Barthelemy: Thank you, Selectman. That gives me great insight. One of my concerns was that this was spoken about for ten minutes at a BOS meeting and made it on to the ballot, and I wanted to make sure that we had a greater discussion here, and that does give me great insight. Thank you.

Moderator: Response from Jakoby?

Selectman Jakoby: I just want to represent the other side as one of the people who voted in not support of this Petition warrant article. So, first, a petition warrant article, once it's submitted, has to go to the ballot. It is not up to the BOS whether it goes to the ballot or not. Anyone can create a petition warrant article. Many of you know I sponsored a petition warrant article before I was elected, and one of the Petition warrant articles I supported way back when was to have the Planning Board members elected. What I want to make clear is I want it to be your decision. It's on the ballot. It's your choice. The reason why I support the Planning Board members being elected is because they do go through training. No matter what skill set you bring to that job, you have to go through training. You have to be taught about ethics and respect and the judicial process. I understand that at times elected officials do not

represent themselves in the most professional way. We know this. We've seen it in history. We've seen it on the Board of Selectmen. We've seen it on the Planning Board, and this is over years and years and years. We all have our moments. I'm not defending anything or not. What I am defending is the right of the voter to elect their Planning Board members. I believe that is critical for the future. I think it is proven that in the past few years that we have had elected members, there have been more questions asked, more details observed, more errors caught on the plans that have come forward. Things that many of the Planning Board members had not been asking or questioning before publicly. They may have been asked in other manner, but to me, the Planning Board members that we have elected, all of us together, have been asking the questions necessary. If any elected official steps out of line, there is a chance of a lawsuit. You know, whether it's the Planning Board, the BOS, we all take an oath of office, and we all have legal responsibilities. So, I just wanted to say why I am against this petition warrant article. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes.

Garland Mann-Lamb, 10 Evergreen Drive: I just wanted to co-sign a lot of what Selectman Guessferd said. Behavior, personalities, all of that aside, I know nothing about planning. However, if I had walked into town hall yesterday, I could be on the Planning Board potentially, you know, in a couple months, and I think it is about a skill set for me personally, and I think that when voters are deciding on how they're going to vote on this, to look at it as two separate issues, right? There can be people who maybe you don't agree with, but what control do we want to have over who's on the board and the skills that they bring?

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir. Mr. Jasper.

Shawn Jasper: Start with a couple of questions. The filing period has closed, and I understand there are two seats open on the Planning Board and two candidates. Is that correct? Now, we also just heard that Planning Board members have to go through training, I was unaware of that. Is that now a statutory requirement?

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, I apologize.

Shawn Jasper: It's all right.

Selectman Jakoby: So, let me just clarify. I'm sorry. So, every elected official is given the opportunity for training and is strongly recommended, I know, by the chair and by others to go through that training. So, I apologize. It is not statutory.

Shawn Jasper: Thank you. So, with those two questions answered, I rise in support of the petitioned warrant article. I don't remember how many years ago it was, but it wasn't many that we changed from appointed by the Board of Selectmen as it had been since the 1940s to having elected. I spoke against that at the time because I was concerned of situations where we don't have enough competition. We have no competition at this time, and we have that in many cases. I understand that's actually the case on the Board of Selectmen. We have a problem, as the chairman said, with getting people to step forward. Planning Board is critical, and the behavior does matter. I served as a Selectman. I served as a Planning Board rep from the Board of Selectmen, and I know full well how important that is. You know, and you've seen cases where the Budget Committee has decided, although we had people coming forward, not to appoint for various reasons. The Board of Selectmen has that same obligation and that same ability. If somebody comes forward and they decide this person is a raving lunatic, they don't have to put them on the board. The problem is we have two people running. They have no obligation to come to candidates night, probably won't, because they don't have to tell anybody what they think. At least the Board of Selectmen has that. None of us really have a knowledge of most of the

people who are running for the board. You know, when I was a young man, and I actually started coming to town meetings with my parents probably when I was 13, you know, everybody knew everybody. That's not the case anymore. And I think if we're not going to have vigorous debates and we're not going to have people stepping forward, then although we heard many altruistic things about the idea of electing people, and I agree with those ideas, the reality is much different. And so, we need to be able to ensure that on something like the planning board that can easily get us into court, cost us a lot of money, we need to have somebody as gatekeepers. And I'm going to trust that the Board of Selectmen are the best people to do that. And so that's why I am in favor of this petition. Thank you, Madam Moderator.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes.

Kimberly Allen: I am in favor of this petition to warrant article. As a previous speaker said, they said we all have our moments, and we do. We have moments where our emotions get high, where we get upset, and sometimes we speak out of turn. But to have a public official continuously do this on a board, who sits on a board, and to make our community feel like they can't come out and speak is not okay. When you sit on a board, you are a public servant. You serve the public. You can't be belittling them. You can't be embarrassing them. That's not okay. It's also not okay to attack those that you sit with on those boards. So that's why I'm in favor of this petition warrant article, because you need to be civil. You need to be civil to those who come to you, and the lack of being civil is probably why we don't have people who want to serve on these boards, because they don't want to sit with you. They don't want to be shoulder to shoulder with you when you have to make big decisions. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you.

Rob Everett: To say that if it goes from elected to appointed, there is no vote is a fallacy. This entire constitutional republic is based on representative government. So, if we don't directly pick them, we elect people who we should pay attention to represent us and pick in our best behalf. So, we still have a vote. It's just it's a vote in a different way.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir.

Adam Haverstock: Thank you, Madam Moderator. I move the question.

*Adam Haverstock made a motion to move the question.
Chairman Dumont seconded the motion.*

Moderator: Thank you. We have just called the questions. We can't have any more debate, correct? Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you. The question has been called and has been seconded. We're not going to vote. This passes. We will cut off debate on the amendment. If it doesn't pass, we'll continue the discussion. You're in favor of cutting off debate on this amendment. Please raise your voter cards. Thank you. Any opposed? This passes. We will now move the question of the amendment to the ballot.

PASSED: Motion to move the question.

WARRANT ARTICLE 17 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 18 – DEFAULT BUDGET – BUDGET COMMITTEE DELEGATION BY PETITION

Moderator: Article 18 is another petition article. It is regarding the Default Budget, Budget Committee Delegation. This is a petition article as well. Duley note that this is a statute, the verbiage is statute, so it may not be, we will not be able to really amend it. This is so the wording will be, shall we adopt the

provisions of RSA 40:14-b to delegate the determination of the default budget to the Municipal Budget Committee, which has been adopted under RSA 32:14.

Not Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 2-3

Shawn Jasper: Thank you, Madam Moderator. I am the primary petitioner, but I've been joined by most members of the Budget Committee, not all in this. And the problem is that many years ago we adopted Senate Bill Two and we had the default. And the default in the proposed operating budget were always really worlds apart as they were intended to be. It's supposed to be difficult to operate on a default budget, and that sort of works to have people working together to get to a reasonable budget. We've seen over the years times where the default budget has been larger than the budget, and that virtually no way that that can happen if you're following the details of the law. What I've learned though is that there's nobody out there who can enforce what is on in the default. I went to the DRA and they said, well, go to the Municipal Association and ask them, oh yeah, that's going to really work well. Talk about the fox guarding the hen house. So, what the language says, and this is where we get into this issue of creep, if you will, obligations previously incurred or mandated by law. Okay, so what does that mean? You have an obligation to provide health insurance to your employees, but it doesn't mean that you have to have as many employees as you had, because there's nothing that mandates that. So, the reality is what the default law was intended to do is say, all right, if you can't afford this, then you have to figure out another way to make it work. Rather taking from someplace else or reducing your head count if you have to, because it's supposed to be something that's painful. It's an option for the voters, the taxpayers to say, we cannot afford everything that's being proposed. And therefore, we're going to go on the default. I don't like to see that as a budget committee member. I don't like to see that as when I was a member of the Board of Selectmen, but the voters should have that opportunity to actually make the decision. So, what's happened now in the towns isn't too bad. We petitioned both for the town and the school is that what's going in here, that's not a contractual obligation. You have to have it by law, but not at this particular level is workers comp insurance premiums. They've gone up, figure out how to make that work. Property liability insurance, figure out how to make that work. Health and dental premium increase. Now that's a big problem for the town. That one alone is almost a half a million dollars, but that doesn't mean, oh, well, we can just include it in the default, but that's what's happening because there is no authority. There's no obligation for the budget committee or a taxpayer to actually go to court and say, this doesn't belong in there. There's no authority. Health and dental is in there as well. Those are not contracted. The salaries levels are contractual obligations. There are many things that the law, it says contracts as used in this subdivision means contracts previously approved in the amount so approved by the legislative body. So that's what's supposed to be in here, not something that, well, it went up. Well, you know what? Electricity goes up. Do we get to put that in there? God knows this winter, everybody's heating costs are probably going to be through the roof. Does that mean you just get to put on that? No, you make your case in the original budget that is presented as to why a default budget is devastating to the town or the school district. What we've been seeing for a number of years is, yeah, we can live with that. So, who cares? Well, I care. Hopefully a lot of you care. And it appears the only way to get control of this is to have the budget committee decide what the default budget is. And so, therefore, I would encourage the voters of the town of Hudson to support this petition warrant article and to bring some sanity back into the default process. And I know many will disagree with me on this, but hopefully not many taxpayers will.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 18 to questions, comments, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article 18?

Rob Everett: As far as health insurance not being in the contract, I just want to point out one of the contracts, the blah, blah, blah, will offer members of the bargaining unit the agreed upon Cigna

Healthcare Plan. So, it is contractually voted on by the voters that way and around about way. I agree with 99% of the rest of what they said, though.

Moderator: Shawn, do you have a comment?

Shawn Jasper: To the previous speaker's comment, yes, you are contractually obligated to provide the insurance. You are not contractually obligated to provide it at a specific cost. That's what contracts are about. You're still going to have to provide it, and the governing bodies make the decision, where do we get that money to do it? Do we go back, perhaps, renegotiate the contract, or do we say, well, we've got to lay off 10 people to make this work? This is about the taxpayers. It's not about the number of employees and what we would like to see them have. I would be very happy if we never adopted a default budget again. But again, we're seeing times when the governing body doesn't really care, because if the budget committee really looks at things and makes cases, they go, we fall back on the default, which is only a few hundred thousand less, and millions and millions of dollars. So that's why we're here.

Moderator: Thank you. Yes, sir.

Chris Landry: To the previous speaker, I absolutely understand what you're saying, but I have a couple questions about how this would work. When you say that the town is contracted to provide certain benefits and stuff like that to certain employees, but they're not required to have a certain number of employees, I absolutely understand what you're saying. But if we're not basing the default budget based on current staffing, what prevents the budget committee from—I'm not saying this budget committee would do that, but some budget committee in the future might say, we're spending too much on police services. Let's cut half of the personnel in the police and make that the default budget. That seems very extreme, but I think it could happen. Now, you might say it's unlikely that voters would vote for that, but they might. Who knows? So where do you draw the line between continuing the level of service that we have and controlling the budget through that process?

Moderator: Thank you.

Shawn Jasper: If I may, thank you for that question, and that might seem like something that could happen. But don't forget, the default budget is based on the previous year's budget, not the budget committee's recommendation. So, we could cut half of the people out and put it in—that cut in our recommended budget, which then the voters here at this deliberative session could put back in or not. But in that case, the default budget would be legitimately higher than the operating budget. So we can't play with that. We can just say, look, these increases are not contractual. They're not required by law at these rates. And even that required by law is what's required, not at what level or at what expense. It gives the opportunity to manage the budget and give the voters true options. Thank you.

Moderator: Is anybody else would like to make a comment, question, or amendment to Article No. 18? Okay, seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end discussion on warrant Article 18, and it moves to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 18 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 19 – NEW TERM LENGTH FOR SUPERVISORS OF THE CHECKLIST

Moderator: This is a petition article to adopt a three-year term for supervisors of the checklist, electing each one year—each year over a three-year cycle.

Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0

Garland Mann-Lamb: I know it's—sorry. Sorry. All right, so the Supervisor of the Checklist, for those who don't know, we register voters and maintain a checklist containing the names of all qualified voters. You see a set of elections, but there's a lot that happens in between all of those. So, per State RSA 41:46-a, the supervisor position is currently elected for a term length of six years, and after the passing of House Bill 151, an amendment effective September 13, 2025, allows for the adoption of a three-year term length. So, this would bring the term into alignment with the other positions that are elected in town, except for the moderator, which we know is two years, and hopefully increase interest in the position and lessen resignations. Six years is a long time and a long commitment, so that's all I have to say.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 19, new term length for supervisors of the checklist for comments, questions, and amendments. Does anyone wish to speak on article 19?

Selectman Guessferd: Anyway, I have just one thing. I mean, we have a hard time getting people to volunteer, as you can tell, and it was said by one of the previous speakers. To require a term length of six years almost seems like an eternity, and trying to get people on board to do this for six years, we're going to be able to hopefully get more people involved, more people interested in this position if we bring it down to three years versus six. I think it kind of speaks for itself, but I just wanted to make that comment because we just have an awful hard time having people step up, and those who have, those here, and those of you out there who have, we really appreciate that. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Anybody else like to make a comment, question, or amendment to article 19? Seeing none, we will close the warrant article to end discussion on warrant article number 19, and it moves to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 19 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

ARTICLE 20 – PROTECTING THE TAX PAYER

Moderator: Do we call on this New Hampshire legislature to protect local taxpayers by ensuring adequate state revenues for essential services and by avoiding policies that shift costs onto local property taxpayers? Note that this is an advisory amendment. I call on Kathleen Meehan.

Kathleen Meehan: Thank you. This question arises because recent state budgets have reduced or eliminated.

Moderator: May I have, excuse me, may I have you walk a little bit closer to the mic?

Kathleen Meehan: Revenue, excuse me, revenue sources, forcing towns and counties to raise property taxes to maintain education, health care, county nursing homes, public safety, and infrastructure. These shifts burden working families, strain local budgets, limit flexibility, and undermine long-term community prosperity. A state budget that prevents cost shifting and restores municipal revenue sharing eases the tax burden on local property taxpayers and strengthens communities. If this article passes, it will go to the state legislature so that they know where Hudson stands on this issue. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. We will now open article number 20, protecting the taxpayer, to questions, comments, and amendments. Yes, yes ma'am.

Beverly Belus: 5 Rega Street.

Moderator: I'm sorry, your last name again, please.

Beverly Belus: Bellus.

Moderator: Thank you.

Beverly Belus: B-E-L-U-S. I'm in support of this warrant article. It supports requiring the New Hampshire legislature to protect local taxpayers, such as myself, by adequately funding essential services and preventing policies that shift the costs onto local taxpayers. So, simply said, you know, we expect the state to continue to do their share and not passing what should be their share onto us. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you.

Chris Landry: I support the intent of this. I have some questions about the wording of this. I think we have a real problem both at the federal pushing stuff down to the states and the state pushing stuff down to the towns and then claiming budget victories and lowering their budgets when the expenses are still being spent just at a different level. But I don't think this holds a lot of meat behind it, the way it's worded. For example, it says assuring adequate state revenues for essential services. What does that mean? I think we all agree that fire and police are essential services. Are we expecting the state to cover our fire and police budgets? I don't think so. That's not going to happen. I mean, they're not even covering the adequate education they claim they're covering on the education side. So, I think this is great and I think that we definitely need to push back on the state not to downshift costs to the towns, but I don't think this really says much as far as doing that. So, we should probably pass it and pass it along, but I think we should think about what we could do that's more strongly worded and be more specific about what we're trying to get the state to do or not do.

Moderator: Thank you.

James Crowley: By understanding petition warrant articles, we really can't change the language, but I support this one because I think something's better than nothing. We have to inform the state legislature. Your job is hard, but work harder because I don't know how many out here are on social security, but I am. I'm going to be taxed out of this town. I hope I can make it to the end of my Planning Board. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Anyone else like to make a comment, question, or comment?

James Wilkins: I have to wonder whether this simply changes which hand takes the money out of your wallet, whether it's the hand of the state or the hand of the town, and if it's the hand of the state, they pass it through their own control before they send part of it back. That's what bothers me about this. I'd rather see more local control.

Moderator: I'm sorry, your name again, sir?

James Wilkins: James Wilkins.

Moderator: Thank you.

James Wilkins: So where is the state going to get this money? They already canceled the interest and dividends tax. They canceled the car inspection, so their fees, their income is lower.

Moderator: Actually, that just got repealed.

James Wilkins: They don't. There's a court case on whether or not EPA is going to allow it, I know, but.

Moderator: Okay. We have a response for you. Actually, two of them.

Shawn Jasper: This was just a response to a previous speaker who said petition warrant articles cannot be amended. That's not correct. Petition warrant articles may be amended. The purpose of the petition warrant article cannot be changed.

Moderator: Thank you. Go ahead, Kevin.

Kevin Walsh: Thank you, Madam Moderator. A couple of observations about the petition warrant article. There have been representatives going before the House, standing in the well, saying excessive taxation is legal plunder. So, it makes you wonder if we have excessive taxation here, is that legal plunder? There are a bunch of bills right now. There's a tsunami of bills that are before the House and Senate this year to reduce further some of the taxes that are paid by businesses, as an example. For example, the business and enterprise tax bill reduced the tax rate 0.55% to 0.50%. That's about \$26 million. A little paper cut, if you will, look at the billion dollars that is in the state budget. There's another bill that was actually, I think, the first order of business in the House was to reconsider House Bill 503 to bring back the interest and dividend taxes to look at doing some of the business enterprise and business profit taxes. And that was voted down immediately. There's a preoccupation on Concord about taxation properties. There's at least three bills to look at taxation of what is termed luxury second homes in excess as a valuation of a million dollars. That is, I believe, House Bill 1786 and 1707. So, one of them is to put a 0.75% tax on second homes that are assessed at \$500,000 or more, and it's not occupied 183 days a year. There's another bill that is, to my thinking, is common sense. It's House Bill 1636, which directs the Department of Revenue Administration to study options for generating state revenue and directs the department to submit to certain entities in the public report dealing a menu of revenue options to raise additional state funds. So, there are a bunch of things that the legislature can do, but we as citizen taxpayers have a right and obligations to elect members of the House and Senate to do the things we want them to do, to strive to the things we want them to do. So, continuing to reduce taxes that are currently on the books is probably not a smart thing to do. In fact, there's another one, House Bill 417, to abolish the communications and services tax. Again, that's another little, little one. There's like a 25 or 26 million dollars. Most people don't pay it, but if you have a landline and, in your house, like I do, I pay the tax. There's also a constitutional amendment in the current resolution, number 18, to put a tax cap into the Constitution, which basically looks at a four-year moving average of the inflation rate not to exceed two and a half %, and that's factored in with a change of population. So, let's, in my mind, let's be serious. You look at both sides of the ledger. You continue to reduce taxes that impact the ability to have a proper funding for public education, among other critical services, service, service, service, yeah, you know, state police, the state prisons, health and human services. When is it going to end? It's going to end when we elect people to make responsible the decisions in Concord on our behalf. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments, questions, or amendments to Article 20? Seeing none, we, it's, we're on Article 20, we'll move to the ballot.

WARRANT ARTICLE 20 MOVES TO THE BALLOT

Moderator: Thank you. That is all of the articles that we will be covering today. The remaining articles are for the planning board, and that meeting will be held.

Dan Barthelemy made a motion to restrict reconsideration on seventeen through twenty. Selectman Guessferd seconded the motion.

Moderator: Okay. We have, it's been moved to restrict reconsideration from Articles 17 through 20. We, these ballots will move to the, move to the ballots as they are. They cannot be brought up again in the rest of this meeting. Motion to make, made to restrict reconsideration of Article 20 17 to 20. You'll use your red cards to cast your vote. Those in favor of restriction, please raise your cards. Thank you. Those opposed?

PASSED: Motion to restrict reconsideration on articles seventeen through twenty.

Moderator: I would like to recognize Chairman Dumont. Sorry.

Chairman Dumont: I want to start out and say I appreciate everybody coming out and participating in the SB2 process that is our local form of government. It's one of the most transparent ones in the state, as well as the country. So, I just appreciate everybody being a part of it. I also rise in recognition, as you know, yesterday was the deadline filing period. And I just wanted to give a shout out to Selectman Morin, who chose not to rerun. Might have been the smartest decision that any of us have made. So, I just wanted to give him the shout out for that. He's done a lot of hard work. He's done tremendous or has made tremendous contributions to this community. And I just wanted to point that out. So, thank you very much. [applause]

Moderator: Thank you, Chairman Dumont. Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you on your willingness to sit through all of these articles with me today. Our staff is here to do doing their job on a Saturday, and we want to thank all of them very much. I want to point out to everyone that next Saturday, February 7th at 9 a.m. here in the Community Center, we will hold the school deliberative session moderated by Paul Enderbitzen as school moderator. There will be only 12 articles. Hopefully it'll go a lot quicker. I said hope. Please also remember that March 10th is our town school election from 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. Ward one will vote at Memorial, Hudson Memorial School. Ward two will vote at Alvirne High School. The GWFC Hudson Women's Club will be holding their Candidates Night on February the 19th. Sadly, our town election is one of the least attended. Please just remind your friends, family, come out and vote. It makes a difference in how we will be going forward in the future. And your vote matters. After we convene today, please try to keep conversations quiet as the Budget Committee and the Board of Selectmen will be having their scheduled meetings as posted to look at the warrant article recommendations again before they go to the ballot. And thank you. I will now entertain a motion to adjourn this deliberative session.

***Kevin Walsh made a motion to adjourn at 1:09 p.m.
Chairman Dumont seconded the motion.
PASSED: Motion to adjourn at 1:09 p.m.***

Dillon Dumont, Chairman

Bob Guessferd, Vice-Chairman

Xen Vurgaropoulos, Selectman

Heidi Jakoby, Selectman

Dave Morin, Selectman