



HUDSON, NEW HAMPSHIRE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Minutes of the January 13, 2026 Budget Review Meeting

7:00 PM

Board of Selectmen Meeting Room, Town Hall

Attorney-Client Session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, (a) & (b) beginning at 6:30 p.m.

Regular meeting will begin immediately after Non-Public Session

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – by Chairman Dumont the meeting of January 13, 2026 at 7:10 p.m. in the Selectmen Meeting Room at Town Hall.

Chairman Dumont: I call to order the meeting of January 13th, 2026 at 7:10 p.m. and the Board of Selectmen meeting room to Town Hall to order. All the motions that were made prior tonight during the non-public session will be read into the record after the meeting. We will start out with the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

3. **ATTENDANCE**

Board of Selectmen: Dillon Dumont, Bob Guessferd, Dave Morin, Xen Vurgaropoulos and Heidi Jakoby.

Staff/Others: Town Administrator – Roy Sorenson; Police Chief – David Cayot; Patrol Officer Daniel Donahue and Canine Ice; HCTV Director – Mike Johnson; Fire Chief – Scott Tice; Development Services Director – Elvis Dhima; Planning Board Member – George Hall; Benson Park Advisory Committee Member – Susan Clement; School Board Liaison – Mike Campbell; Executive Assistant – Lorrie Weissgarber.

Chairman Dumont: So, I'm going to do things a little out of order here, I'm actually going to push Public Input beyond Recognitions so we can move some of these people along.

5. **RECOGNITIONS, NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS**

- 1) **Recognitions**

- 1) MPO Donahue and K9 Ice – Hudson Police Department
 - 10 Years of Service Recognition

Chairman Dumont: So, we're going to hear recognitions first, and we're going to start off with Master Patrol Officer Daniel Donahue, and I will turn it over to the Police Chief Cayot.

Chief Cayot: So, we wanted to have the opportunity to have Master Patrol Officer Dan Donahue and his partner K-9 Ice come in. They've been together for almost 10 years, and K-9 Ice just retired from the Police Department, so now he'll be spending the rest of his days with Master Patrolman Donahue at his house. So, we do have a proclamation.

Chairman, I didn't know if you were going to read a proclamation or if you want me to ...

Chairman Dumont: Go right ahead, sir.

Chief Cayot: All right. So honoring Master Patrol Officer Daniel Donahue and K-9 Ice. Whereas Master Patrol Officer Dan Donahue has devoted the past ten years to the Hudson Police Department's K-9 unit, demonstrating exceptional dedication, professionalism, and unwavering commitment to public safety. And whereas MPO Donahue has served as a cornerstone of the Hudson Police K-9 program, consistently displaying discipline, proficiency, and a deep understanding of K-9 handling, setting a standard of excellence for fellow officers and strengthening the operational capabilities of the department. And whereas throughout their partnership, K-9 Ice exemplified obedience, reliability, and steadfast service, establishing himself as a trusted and capable working dog who contributed significantly to the safety of both officers and residents of Hudson. And whereas MPO Donahue and K-9 Ice participated in countless deployments, searches, tracks, community demonstrations, and high-risk operations, their teamwork elevating the effectiveness of the department, enhancing its ability to

protect the community. And whereas MPO Donahue contributions extended beyond field operations, as he played a vital role in advancing the training, readiness, and reputation of the K-9 unit, while ensuring that Ice received the highest level of care, conditioning, and professional development. And whereas the partnership between MPO Donahue and K-9 Ice has represented the very best of handler K-9 dedication, both on duty and at home, and has left a lasting impact on the officers, the department, and the citizens they serve. And whereas K-9 Ice transitions into a well-deserved retirement, the Hudson Police Department expresses its deepest gratitude for his loyal service, sacrifice, and unwavering commitment to the community. Now, therefore, be it proclaimed that we, the Town of Hudson, and the Hudson Police Department, do hereby honor and recognize Master Patrol Officer Dan Donahue for his decade of outstanding service to the K-9 unit, and extend heartfelt appreciation for the distinguished career and retirement of K-9 Ice, whose contributions will be remembered with respect and gratitude for years to come. Signed today's date by the Town Administrator, myself, and the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen.

Chairman Dumont: So, I do have one other thing to read into the record before you go, if that's all right. It's just a years of service certification. So, for Daniel Donahue, the Town of Hudson Board of Selectmen would like to extend their thanks and sincere appreciation to Master Patrol Officer Daniel Donahue for his decade of outstanding service to the K-9 unit alongside retired K-9 Ice, recognizing a partnership that exemplifies dedication, professionalism, and commitment, both on duty and at home. On this date of the 13th of January, 2026. And I would remind everybody, obviously, not to approach unless accepted by Mr. Donahue, or Officer Donahue. So, if you don't mind, could I come up and shake your hand and give you this?

- 2) Detective Cassandra Avery – Hudson Police Department
 - 20 Years of Service Recognition

Chairman Dumont: Next up, we have another recognition for Detective Cassandra Avery, and I will turn that over to Chief Cayot.

Chief Cayot: Thank you. Unfortunately, Detective Avery wasn't able to be here tonight, but I would like to read a little bio on her and thank her for her 20 years of service to the Hudson Police Department. Detective Avery began her law enforcement career with the Hudson Police Department on December 18, 2005. Detective Avery graduated from the New Hampshire's 139th Police Academy. Detective Avery is currently assigned to the Detective Unit. Prior to that, she served as the School Resource Officer for the various elementary schools in Hudson. Detective Avery taught DARE to many children. She serves on the Crime Scene Unit, and she was also a cadre at the New Hampshire Police Academy. Throughout her career, she helped with assisting the Legal Division as well. Detective Avery is very loyal to the Hudson Police Department and spent time volunteering at the Red Cross Blood Drives, Salvation Army Bell Ringing, and Chad Hospital Annual Toy Drive. Detective Avery has dedicated her job and has certainly been an asset to the Hudson Police Department for over 20 years. So, we would just like to congratulate her on her 20 years, and we look forward to many more.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much, sir. The same thing. I'll just read it on the record, and I'll give this to the Chief to hand off. But for 20 years of service to Cassandra Avery, congratulations from the Town of Hudson for their commitment and truly remarkable contributions. They're extremely appreciated. Signed this day, the 13th of January, 2026. 20 years in that field is something that's obviously very much appreciated, and it's not an easy task. So, thanks for the appreciation from the Board.

Chief Cayot: Thank you.

- 3) George Hall – Planning Board
 - 25+ Years of Service Recognition

Chairman Dumont: All right. We have one more recognition for George Hall of the Planning Board for 25 years of service. Real quickly, before I turn it over to Selectman Guessferd, my interactions with George have been nothing but outstanding, so I just wanted to say that for the record, and I will turn it over to Selectman Guessferd to speak on that.

Selectman Guessford: First, I'd like to have George come forward, please. Okay. So, George, it's, I'll come over there. But I figured I'd speak here so I can see everybody. Anyway, I've served with George for the last few years on the Planning Board. Whether you agree with him or not, when he makes a decision, his decisions are well thought out. And you can understand where he's coming from. Beyond that, for anybody to serve on a board is quite a volunteer achievement, and we appreciate that very, very much. We don't ever have enough volunteers. But to volunteer and take that job for 25 years on the Planning Board, and I can't imagine how many cases and applications you've seen, but that's a thankless job, and for doing it for 25 years, I can't think that they would want to do it more than 10 years. We have some people on that board that are very dedicated. They know what they're doing, and of course, that's also the expertise that you have, that you've demonstrated during our case deliberations and that sort of thing. So, George, maybe 25 more? So, I'm going to read into the record. The Town of Hudson Board of Selectmen extends our sincere appreciation to George Hall for over 25 years of dedicated service on the Hudson Planning Board, recognizing his commitment, leadership, and lasting contributions to the town and its residents. Presented this 13th day of January, 2026 by the Hudson Board of Selectmen. Thank you. All right. See you tomorrow night, George.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you so much. George, thank you. After everybody shakes hands, you mind taking a picture with us?

George Hall: Oh, my Gosh. Go ahead.

4. PUBLIC INPUT

Chairman Dumont: That takes care of our recognitions. I'm going to go back into the normal order of business. We will now go back into item number four, which is Public Input. Does anyone in the audience wish to address the Board on any issue which the Board has control of at this time? If you do, please come on up and state your name and address for the record. I will add, if you're here for a couple of the public hearings that are in our agenda, you will have the opportunity to speak during those as well. But if you'd like, come on up and state your name and address for the record.

Judy Brouillette, 183 Highland Street: I did write it just so that it would be more efficient when I speak. So, good evening. I would like to share several comments for the Board's consideration regarding Benson Park, specifically the dog park. I previously served as a member of Benson Park Advisory Committee and acted as chair for a period of time when Mr. Madden had to step down for medical reasons. In that role, I spent considerable amount of time reviewing the history and operations of the dog park, and the information I am sharing tonight is based on the research and firsthand experiences that I had. Over time, it became apparent that the dog park was being treated differently from the rest of Benson Park. When I researched its history, I learned that the dog park was originally developed through the efforts of a volunteer group that worked with the town and formed a non-profit organization to fundraise for the fencing and initial infrastructure. At the time, it was agreed that the park would be maintained by volunteers, and a goal was to open the park without using town funds. While the goal was achieved, the plan did not adequately consider the long-term maintenance or future challenges. Eventually, the non-profit was disbanded with the town's approval, and the remaining funds were transferred to the Friends of Benson's organization. However, by that point, there was no long-term structure in place to support the ongoing upkeep. Despite this, the town proudly promotes the dog park as part of Benson Park on its website, and it remains a heavily used and well-loved community asset. Today, nearly all of the original volunteers have moved on, with one individual who generously donates time to mow and assist whenever possible. I am also a regular patron of the dog park, visiting at least five days a week, year-round, and during my time on the committee, I began noticing serious erosion issues developing over several years. After consulting with an outside landscaping company, we learned that the erosion was largely caused by water runoff resulting from the Senior Center's location, which altered the surrounding landscape and washed away all the topsoil within the dog park. During this process, it became clear that the DPW did not consider the dog park as part of Benson Park, and therefore would not perform work inside of it. I met with the town administrator at the time, Mr. Malizia, the DPW Director Jay, and former Board member Mr. Couto to clarify responsibility. All documentation I reviewed confirms that the dog park is located on Benson Park property, and that the town itself identifies it as such. Ultimately, the DPW did acknowledge the runoff issue and created a swale to help mitigate some further damage. An outside company also volunteered some labor and materials to regrade the parking area right outside the dog park to

reduce the slope and the runoff. The DPW also used its equipment to move some of the remaining soil back up the hill. Unfortunately, by that time, most of the topsoil had already been lost, leaving behind rocky, sandy ground. Despite these challenges, the community's support for the dog park remains incredibly strong. Residents from Hudson and surrounding towns regularly use the park and continue to volunteer in meaningful ways. This includes purchasing new benches within the park, managing weekly trash barrels in and out, routinely cleaning up the grounds, and many other things that have to be done. We've had Eagle Scouts come in to do projects. We've had service projects in general be done within the park, and we have people donating money so that we can just cover the waste bags that are in there. However, there are certain tasks that have become too large for the volunteers to manage alone, specifically the three seasonal mowings each year and the annual fall leaf cleanup. These are maintenance responsibilities that go well beyond the reasonable volunteer expectations. Given that the DPW equipment is already on site maintaining other areas of Benson Park, it seems both logical and reasonable for the town to include the dog park in these efforts. In closing, I respectfully request that the board's consideration of these two items. First, to have the DPW provide limited assistance to the dog park four times a year, three mowings once per month during the summer, and one fall leaf pickup once the leaves have fallen. Second, the town to allow donations and sponsorships to be specifically earmarked for the dog park, creating a dedicated fund to support the long-term maintenance and future needs. This park is deeply valued by our community, and we only want to see it continue to thrive. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you, and thank you for coming. Anybody else?

Dick McKinnon, 15 Weymouth Court: Good evening. I'm a regular visitor to the dog park, usually six to seven days a week. I agree with everything that Judy has said. At the last Benson meeting last month, I know Heidi and a couple of other superintendents were talking about the dog park. Some serious discussions on it. She had thought it would be on today's agenda, but she did qualify by saying the agenda is not out yet, so I can't guarantee it. So, something seemed to be up with, you know, we're going to talk about it tonight, but it wasn't on the agenda. If you noticed at that meeting, a couple of things, one said, you know, I'd recommend anybody who cares about the dog park to come to this meeting because something's going to happen. And then Heidi near the end said, by the way, I thought you worded it, the dog park is still open. So, it was just something that gave us, a lot of people that use a dog park, you know, what's going on. I'm thinking about closing it or what. So that's why a lot of people are here tonight to talk about it. I live at Sparkling River Condos, over 55 community. Like all the associations around us, we can't have fenced-in yards. We can't have dog runs. So, we don't have a dog park there. So, this is a place that we can bring our dogs off-leash to associate with the other dogs. And also, for somebody like me who's 76 years old, I can go and meet and shoot the bull with people for two or three hours. This past week, Sunday, I was there about 11 to 12 o'clock, about 24, 25 cars there. There were more cars there than the entire Benson's parking lot. There was another day during the week, it was about 1.30 in the afternoon. There were more cars at the dog park, and dogs, and owners, enjoying the camaraderie between each other, not talking about politics or anything, just enjoying the dog social life and getting to know each other. I strongly agree with Judy, where it's kind of sad when you see the town of Hudson Public Works 100 yards away mowing the grass, and they can't make an image to open the gate and do it once a month to mow the grass, which would probably take them maybe an hour, hour and a half to do. Same with leaves. Nathan Muir, I think the last couple of years, volunteers his truck, where we hear all the leaf blowers, the backpacks, and the big leaf vacuum trucks from the public works right next door. And then you've got two or three volunteers or Nathan trying to suck the leaves up when they can just make one pass with the public works truck, an hour of their time to do it. The dog poop bags, which a lot are used. It's kind of sad that the whole Benson Park has dog bags and dispensers. They're filled by the town. But to go 50 feet away to the dispensers in the dog park, the volunteers have to take a collection and buy the dog poop bags. I mean, something as simple as that. I'm just wondering why the public works can't come into the dog park or supply a case once a month when they're doing it for the entire Bensons, if, again, it's considered one large area. So that's the most puzzling thing for me, is that. Another thing, when a few months back, there was the Nash Casino. We had a casino night. And the profits were going to go to Bensons. And Bensons advertises, you know, Bensons, the dog park, Hudson Dog Park. So, a lot of the dog people went there because 33% of the gross profits from the table games and the flop machines go. The Friends of Benson got a check for \$162,000. They're basically one of the 800 and some odd not-for-profit organizations. \$162,000. So, I asked one of the members of the Friends of Benson and a member of the Benson Advisory Committee, you

know, why couldn't 1% of the \$162,000 be given to the dog park? You know, \$1,600. That went so far by rakes, shovels, poop bags, everything. No, I'm sorry. That's dedicated to the buildings and the maintenance. We have nothing to do with the dog park. And it's got a, you know, 1% when all that money is, I hate to say gravy money, but it's easy money for filling out a couple of forms and maybe doing solicitations. So that just puzzled me why maybe 1% or something.

Again, if it's considered the dog park part of Bensons, which apparently, you know, it's separate. So, I know this forum is no back-and-forth answering questions, where if it was on the agenda there would be, but hopefully maybe somebody hiding might have just a little something to say about it.

Chairman Dumont: I will offer just a point of clarity, and I'll give Selectman Jakoby a little bit of leeway. We don't typically do this, but Friends of Bensons Park, first off, is nothing associated with the town of Hudson. It's a separate nonprofit organization, which is why they're eligible for those funds. Nobody here on this Board, nor does anybody in the town, have control over how that money actually gets expended. There's some discrepancy over how the dog park came about, as Judy brought up. It is a conversation that Selectman Jakoby has had. It's a conversation that we will continue to have to see how we can move that forward.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to reiterate that the money that goes to the Friends of Bensons Park is for the museum. It's not for the buildings. They only are in the elephant barn, so all of the other buildings and all the other parts of the park are not part of that 503C. I know that this will be a discussion on a future agenda. Tonight, as you can see, it was a very full agenda. I think your comments and everyone's comments are important for us to have them before that conversation.

Dick McKinnon: Beautiful. Thank you for your time. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Thanks for coming.

Todd Pollack, 62 Barretts Hill Road: Good evening. I'm also here to talk about the dog park, but I'm going to skip most of what I wrote because the last two speakers were excellent about what they had to say. What I want to say is that recently I was visiting my in-laws down in the Tampa area, and I had the opportunity to see what a nice dog park can really look like. It was in Oldsmar, Florida. I brought along some pictures. If you'd like to take one and pass it around. Oh, thank you. Just to give you an idea. The park that I'm passing pictures around is meticulously maintained. It includes running water, dog washing stations, shaded seating, and even a splash pad. One thing that stood out was that the fencing displayed banners from pet-related businesses, veterinarians, groomers, pet stores, and that appeared to fund a lot of those amenities, which brings me to what I'm asking for tonight. First, I respectfully ask for clarification on what is the town's responsibility when it comes to maintaining the Hudson Dog Park. Specifically, what level of maintenance should residents reasonably expect compared to Benson Park? Second, assuming there are limits to what the town can provide, I'm asking for permission and guidance to explore corporate sponsorships or private funding, such as local pet businesses, so that residents can help bridge the gap. The goal would not be to replace the town responsibility, but to go beyond it, improving safety, cleanliness, and amenities, and ultimately creating a dog park that reflects well on Hudson. The dog park is not just a fenced-in area. It's a community space.

It supports responsible pet ownership, socialization, and quality of life for residents. With some clarity, cooperation, and support, I believe it can become something we're all proud of. And I thank you for your time this evening.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you.

Selectman Jakoby: Thank you so much.

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

Lucille Basins, non-resident from Londonderry: I just moved here from two years ago this year from New York, and I was shocked at the park here in Hudson. It's the closest one for me to come to other than Derry, but I've had interference there that it's not pleasant. I'm just shocked how the park, it looks like they just threw the fence up and said, here it is, you want the dog park. I don't see any maintenance. I think the liability, who is in charge of the liability there? If someone falls. I have fallen there because of the sharp black top pieces shoving out of the

ground. Where is the liability? Who's in charge of that? Why is there not a sign up, enter at your own risk? Has that ever been brought up?

Chairman Dumont: Typically, again, and I'll reiterate, we don't offer back and forth here. We'll take the comments under advisement, and we'll produce an answer at the following meeting or at a meeting prior.

Lucille Basins: You can't give me an answer who's in charge of liability. If someone gets injured, bitten, whatever.

Chairman Dumont: As I've stated, there's several discrepancies around that park that we're working through at this time.

Lucille Basins: So, you can't give me an answer. So, what if someone next week decides to sue the town of Hudson? Who takes care of it?

Chairman Dumont: This is not a back-and-forth forum, I'm sorry.

Lucille Basins: Thank you for your time.

Chairman Dumont: Is there anybody else that would like to come up and speak?

Melinda Guzman-Gadney, non-resident: Hi, my name is Melinda Guzman-Gadney. For me, my mother resides in Hudson, 37 Donald Road, so I'm there all the time. As a result, I also am at Benson Park, unfortunately in this cold, six to seven days a week with my Huskies. And I'm definitely no expert. I started coming to the park, I would say, about a year and a half, maybe two years, and I think that Judy and everyone else had such great points to make. I just wanted to just give my input as a member of the community. I think as many of the others have stated, just to reiterate, I think I guess the most shocking thing for me when I went there was the community. I wasn't so sure when I first went there. I was like, I'll bring my dog. It's just a dog park. There's a fence, that's all I really need. And I think the amount of residents of Hudson and also in the surrounding community, the amount of people that go there, including myself, have a community and they talk with others. And I think as various members of the community have now stated, the community and the quality of life, that's what I'm looking for, the quality of life that it provides for the community, I think, is something you can't understand unless you're part of it, at least in my personal experience. Just to give a small anecdote, I'm sorry if I get emotional. I'm a big crybaby. I was talking to one of my friends at Benson, and he is much older than me. He is probably, like, in his 70s. And he was talking to me, and I said, oh, like, is this your first dog? And he said, I've never had a dog. I retired a few years ago, and I got a dog. And he's like, I hated retirement, and I just kind of got a dog. I always kind of wanted a dog. He got a dog. He started coming to Benson, and he said, you know what? For a long time, I struggled with my mental health. And he said, you know, when I retired, it got worse. And I said, well, that's good. Like, you know, you got a dog. Like, that's great. Like, dogs do that. And he said, you know what, Melinda? He said, it's people like you and everyone at this park who, you know, had some really, really bad days. And it was in that moment that I realized, like, while there are people, as it has been stated, including myself, that go there multiple times a week who stay there for hours, even when it's cold, even when it's super-hot, A, for the dogs, I think, because I think there's a lot of responsible dog owners that go there. But I also think a big part of it is the community. And I think there are people who are, like, in their mid-20s, such as myself, and also people who are retired who got their first dog in their life who just go there, and they just appreciate the community. And I am not in any of you guys' role, and I appreciate everything you guys do. I can't imagine how much work it is that you guys do. And I think the central point is, like, as you can see, I think there are people who are just so passionate about the park. And I think that it really goes to show just the simple, like, from what we already have at Benson, I think it provides so much to people. And I just think my takeaway from the park and the year or two that I've used it is that it really is something that can benefit my sister, my mom, my cousin, all the way up to, like, my grandfather. And I think there's so much that's already there, and I think if you guys would be so kind as to just consider some of the salient points that Judy and all the others have made, I think we would all be really appreciative. And again, I'm not an expert, but from listening to the others, if it is true, like, if it is done, and if it's just, like, a few feet away, I think that it just brings so much greatness to Benson. And even, like, especially in the summer and such, I'll be there, and there'll be people that come from 20, 25 minutes away, and they'll say, hey, do you know a good place to go grab lunch? Or, like, we came here, this is great, this park is beautiful. And I think it obviously, like, if you can look at the economic part, it brings business, it brings community, I think it's great all around. But just wanted to give that little anecdote. I wasn't going to say anything, I don't have anything written,

but I think it was just so evident, the passion that people have for this park. And I know, at least for me, like, some of the greatest people I've met there, again, are like 70, 80, 60 years old, and I'm like, I just, I really, really appreciate the park, and I appreciate that it's even there in the first place. So, I would like to give my appreciation for that, and if you guys would be, again, so kind as to, like, even as Judy said, just, like, maybe, like, four mowings, like, like, in the summer, or three mowings in the summer, and the leaves, like, something as small as that would be so appreciative. So, I thank you guys for your time, and for listening to me rant and almost crying on television. Thank you so much.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you. Anybody else like to come on up and speak? Once. Going twice. All right. Not seeing anybody else, I'm going to close the public input session of tonight at 7:43 p.m. All right.

B. Nominations

- 1) Benson Park Advisory Committee – Harry Schibanoff, alternate request
 - One (1) member vacancy to expire April 2028
 - One (1) member vacancy to expire April 2028
 - One (1) member vacancy to expire April 2026
 - One (1) alternate member vacancy to expire April 2027

Chairman Dumont: Next up we have some nominations. We have a Benson Park Committee for Harry, I'm probably going to butcher this, but Shibanoff, alternate request seeking for a term to expire April of 2027. I will recognize the Benson Park Committee advisory member, Susan Clement, to speak on his behalf.

Susan Clement: Hi. I'm Susan Clement, Benson Park Advisory Committee vice chair. I'm here to talk about Harry. I do the same as you. I'm going to try it. It's Shibanoff.

Chairman Dumont: There you go.

Susan Clement: Did I do a good job?

Selectman Guessferd: You did.

Susan Clement: Okay, good. I've known Harry for a short time now, and when I met Harry, he had come back asking to volunteer with us at the Benson's Park pickups. And, you know, he has trouble now moving about. So, his, what he wanted to do as volunteer is signing people in. As I talked to him more, I had found out that Harry in the past was the chair years ago, starting a lot of the things that you see now at Benson's Park. He has a lot of history. He has a lot of information that we're seeking right now. I had talked to him several times that I would like him to come back on the board to kind of fill in some of the gaps that I don't know that I might not have. I wasn't, you know, in the committee at that point in time. He thought about it. And then he decided recently, he said I would like to come back to fill in all those little gaps that we have about the past and how things got started. And it's really interesting when I hear all the stories and how passionate people were in the beginning and starting them since park. So, I would recommend him as entering in as his request as an alternate member.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Thank you very much. And just to clarify, he's not here in the public?

Susan Clement: He is not here tonight, but asked for me to speak on his behalf.

Chairman Dumont: That's okay. He doesn't have to have any information about a dog park, does he?

Susan Clement: He has a lot. A lot. He does. So, he's like a wealth of information.

Chairman Dumont: Any questions?

Selectman Guessferd: Well, I more of a more of not really a question, but more of a statement, I guess I'll say Harry is also a, a volunteer for the elections. and every time I go there, he's there, he's a very dedicated community member, uh, who volunteers and in multiple ways. So, um, I certainly will support, you know, his nomination.

Selectman Morin: I actually believe he was on the original committee.

Susan Clement: He was. Yes. That's what I was trying to say.

Selectman Morin: So, he was part of the whole development of it.

Chairman Dumont: Any other questions, comments, no objections from me. Do we have any motions? So, typically, obviously what we'll do is we'll hear this at, at the following meeting. Um, I'll leave it up to the Board. If they, if they want to make a decision now, based on his prior expertise, um, that seems to weigh on this board before, but it's up to you guys. If you want to make a decision now, or wait till the following meeting

Selectman Guessferd: You guys want to do, I mean, I'll make a motion.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'm okay with making them. I would support this.

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Morin, to appoint Harry Shibanoff as an alternate member to the Benson Park Advisory Committee with a term to expire April 2027. Motion carried, 5-0.

2) Benson Park Advisory Committee – Matthew Pellitier, member request

- One (1) member vacancy to expire April 2028
- One (1) member vacancy to expire April 2028
- One (1) member vacancy to expire April 2026
- One (1) alternate member vacancy to expire April 2027

Susan Clement: Should I stay for the next one?

Chairman Dumont: Yes, please. Um, so next up we have another, uh, Benson Park Advisory Committee, uh, member request for Matthew Pelletier. Uh, is Matthew in the audience? He's looking for a member vacancy to expire in April of 2026. Is that correct?

Matthew Pelletier: Um, yes.

Susan Clement: Well, April...

Chairman Dumont: It's only three months.

Susan Clement: Yeah, that doesn't make sense. I don't understand.

Chairman Dumont: You know what you guys have available for member positions currently?

Susan Clement: Yes, we have the secretary member position that needs to be filled.

Chairman Dumont: Do you know what their term, what their terms are? Because typically they're staggered.

Susan Clement: It's three years.

Selectman Guessferd: These might be the start of the terms. I've seen this before where sometimes we brought it forward where these are actually the start of the terms.

Chairman Dumont: I'll try to see what I can find on it, but if you could just tell us a little bit about yourself, why you're interested in the committee, uh, and, uh, any questions from the Board.

Matthew Pelletier: Um, my name is Matt Pelletier. Um, born and raised here in Hudson. Um, I have always been an avid fan of the park. Um, I did some volunteering back in high school with the historical society, um, different things like that. And over the summer, my son, who just turned six, um, you know, wanted to volunteer, um, through his karate program that he's doing. We were looking for community events and, um, I got very, very involved with Sue over the summer and working in the park and trying to help out. And, um, when the position popped up on Facebook, I was very interested. So, uh, I'm continuing to give back to my community.

Chairman Dumont: So, from what I'm viewing online, it looks like there's actually three vacant positions. They have expiration dates of April 25. Uh, two of them are April 25 and one of them is April 26 and then typically it's three years out from there would be the new expiration date. So, it looks like the best, uh, suited ones would be if I'm just basing solely off this would be April of 28. Any, any questions from the Board?

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to comment that, um, Matthew did attend our last meeting, um, and has been engaged even before coming today. So, that was great.

Chairman Dumont: No, thank you very much for stepping up and volunteering. Every, every board is, is an asset and we need, we need people everywhere. So, thank you very much for offering your help.

Susan Clement: Can I say something as well?

Chairman Dumont: Go right ahead.

Susan Clement: Um, in, in talking with Matthew because I've had, you know, just talking and working with him, um, side by side, um, he definitely is dedicated, you know, in trying to hopefully improve the park, um, as he has kids that love the park. As, when I first moved here and the park was not here, um, I couldn't wait for it to open. And I had kids as well, um, that all their lives they have volunteered side by side with me, um, on a lot of the other, you know, things, gardening and such at the park. So, I think, you know, having an, a younger adult with a family who has lived here, has graduated from Alvin High School, he has a lot of history here and passion for our community, um, I think he would be great, um, coming in, um, on our board.

Chairman Dumont: Alright, I'd agree. And if there's any other boards you want to volunteer on, we'll gladly accept that application. I'll tell you that. Um, alright, so obviously typical with this, without prior experience, we take it under advisement, we follow it up at the, the next meeting, unless if there's a different process the board would like to follow. Not seeing anything.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, can I just ask you a question?

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby: Um, I know that the, we have a meeting this week. Yes. Um, were you hoping to have him on board as an official member?

Susan Clement: Yes.

Selectman Jakoby: For a forum or something?

Susan Clement: Yes.

Selectman Jakoby: You might want to explain to the Board what's happening.

Susan Clement: Um, so what's happening right now, um, is, um, Mr. Madden is going to be taking an absence, um, for surgery purposes and health purposes. Um, not sure when he will be able to come back. And, um, we also have another, one of our members that is usually at our meetings and he's going to be on a work hiatus for the next two months. Um, so, you know, with that, um, that kind of leaves us...

Selectman Jakoby: And, and you just had your secretary resign.

Susan Clement: We had our secretary resign. Um, so it would really put everything on my shoulders, um, which would be a lot for one person to do.

Chairman Dumont: Just to clarify, who was the secretary?

Susan Clement: It was Sarah.

Chairman Dumont: Sarah, okay.

Susan Clement: Um, but she, you know, has, has stepped down again, you know, due to work, she's traveling and so on and so forth. Um, so, it would be greatly needed if he could be on, um, for this week's meeting and, and help out.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, if, if, if not, then this week's meeting would need to be rescheduled because you would not have quorum. Correct?

Susan Clement: Well, we would have myself.

Selectman Morin: No, they could have a meeting. They just couldn't make any decisions.

Susan Clement: Well, Harry would be the alternate, so then it would be me and Nathan.

Selectman Jakoby: I don't know. I'm asking a question.

Chairman Dumont: So, I guess, so, so to clarify, because my list is, is, needs to be updated. So, you have yourself, we obviously have Harry as the alternate, you have Nathan.

Susan Clement: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: Uh, we have Jan.

Susan Clement: Jan, yep, Jan.

Chairman Dumont: Um, Jake's still there as well.

Susan Clement: He is, but he's, he'll be away.

Chairman Dumont: He's the one that's going to be away.

Susan Clement: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: So, yeah, you should be able to have a quorum, um, unless, unless, you know, for whatever reason, again, it's up to this Board how they want to handle it.

Selectman Jakoby: I personally, ask the question.

Chairman Dumont: No, I think, I think it's fair because personally, I think that it's, it's complete within our purview to take these case by case and, and to make that decision. So, um, I'll leave it up to the Board.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to appoint Matthew Pellitier as a member to the Benson Park Advisory Committee with a term to expire April 2028. Motion carried, 5-0.

Selectman Guessferd: Will you be able to make that meeting?

Matthew Pellitier: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. You have your member, you have your quorum. Thank you very much for volunteering. And I was serious. If you want to get involved in any other way, we will take it. We have openings. Thank you very much.

Matthew Pellitier: Thank you.

6. CONSENT ITEMS

Chairman Dumont: Next up, we have Consent Items. Does any member wish to remove any item for separate consideration?

Selectman Jakoby: Are we, um, taking out the donations?

Chairman Dumont: I, I would think it would be appropriate. That's where I was going to go.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep.

Chairman Dumont: Move donations.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Did we decide if we were moving solar or we're moving on?

Chairman Dumont: So, these are, these are just assessing items that are typical with consent. So, the, um, what you're talking about is a different deferral. We'll get to that after. These are fine to take up. Do we have a motion for everything except for item D?

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Morin, to approve Consent Items, 6A, B, C, E, and F. Motion carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. Discussion. Go ahead.

Selectman Morin: We received an email today, a reference to the Library's Trustees meeting place. Probably should correct that.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: It was updated on the new, on the new agenda that we received this evening.

Selectman Guessferd: Actually, it is. Yeah. The one they just gave it to us.

Selectman Morin: It's got the right one?

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah.

Selectman Morin: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: And is that reflected online? Just in case if anybody has any questions or... Perfect. We'll move on to donations. We have two donations for the fire department. I'll turn it over to Selectman Morin if he doesn't mind reading those instances, you are the liaison.

Selectman Morin: Make a motion to accept. You want to do them separately or together?

Chairman Dumont: I think you should do them separate.

Selectman Morin: Okay.

Chairman Dumont: We'll do one and two donations.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to accept the Fire Department donation from the Sparkling River Condominium Association in the amount of \$350, with the Board's thanks and appreciation. Motion carried, 5-0.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to accept the Fire Department donation of a Pet Oxygen Mask Kit from the Massachusetts Veterinary Medical Association via Hudson resident Jaye Morin, with a value of \$125, with the Board's thanks and appreciation. Motion carried, 5-0.

A. Assessing Items

- 1) Tax Deferral
- 2) Property Tax Abatement
- 3) Pro-Rated Tax Abatement
- 4) Veteran Tax Credit
- 5) Disabled Veteran Tax Credits
- 6) Solar Exemptions

B. Water/Sewer Items

- 1) Sewer Abatements

C. Licenses & Permits & Policies

- 1) Outdoor Gathering Permit – Sensory Seekers

D. Donations

- 1) Fire – Sparkling River Condominium Association - \$350
- 2) Fire – Pet Oxygen Mask Kit - \$125

E. Acceptance of Minutes

- 1) December 9, 2025

F. Calendar

01/13	7:00	Board of Selectmen	BOS Meeting Room
01/14	7:00	Planning Board	Buxton Meeting Room
01/15	7:00	Benson Park Advisory Committee	Hudson Cable Access Center
01/19		** Town Hall Closed – Martin Luther King Day **	
01/20	7:00	Municipal Utility Committee	BOS Meeting Room
01/21	6:00	Library Trustees	Hudson Cable Access Center
01/22	7:00	Zoning Board of Adjustment	Buxton Meeting Room
01/26	7:00	Sustainability Advisory Committee	Buxton Meeting Room
01/27	7:00	Board of Selectmen	BOS Meeting Room

7. **OLD BUSINESS**

5. **Amendment of Motion made on December 9, 2025 – Administration/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: Next up we have Old Business. An amendment made to a motion that was made on December 9, 2025. I apologize, I will recognize Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you. Mr. Chair. So, at the December 9th, 2025, Board of Selectmen committee meeting, we had a candidate in front of us, Ava Malley from employment with the police department. The motion passed five zero. However, we did get the job title wrong. In that she was hired as a Telecommunications Technician and not a Police Officer. Given that, I do have a recommended motion to read that into the record and to make the correction.

Chairman Dumont: I apologize for not catching that at the last meeting. Do we have any questions, comments?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: No, I was going to make the motion.

Chairman Dumont: Go right ahead.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Thank you, sir. I make a motion. Hold on, I gotta read it.

Chairman Dumont: The motion would be that the...

Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, for the Board of Selectmen to amend the Motion 1 of Item 12, passed on December 9, 2025, Board of Selectmen meeting to strike the words 'Police Officer' and insert the words 'Police Telecommunications Technician' in its place.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Sorry, it took me a second. I wrapped my head around the words.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Public Hearing: Amendment of Ambulance Fees – Fire/Decision**

Chairman Dumont: No worries. No worries at all. All right, next up for New Business. The first item will be a public hearing on the amendment of ambulance fees, and I will recognize the Fire Chief Scott Tice and Deputy Chief Enos.

Chief Tice: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good evening to the Board. This is a project that Deputy Enos has taken the lead on. He's done a lot of work on it, so I've asked him to present this to you this evening, if that's okay with the Board.

Chairman Dumont: Of course.

Deputy Chief Enos: Do you have the original motion?

Roy Sorenson: Well, no, I do not. That was for the public hearing, so this will be the motion that's read into the record.

Deputy Chief Enos: Okay.

Roy Sorenson: Do you have the ...?

Deputy Chief Enos: I don't have a copy of that, but I have all the documents that I've written up over there.

Roy Sorenson: All right, that's it. Perfect.

Deputy Chief Enos: Thank you. Good evening, everyone. So, as you recall, I came and presented to you the proposal to increase our ambulance rates, and the proposal is based upon the changes that are going on at the New Hampshire House. There was a bill passed, House Bill 245, which has set ambulance billing rates by the Governor, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. After consulting with our ambulance billing company, our best recommendation to you was to set our rates same as those, because those were vetted by those three agencies, including the Governor. Based upon that, the rate changes before you list the type of transports and then billing that we would send out. Our existing rates are to the first column, and then the proposed rates are

to the second column. The changes you see reflected are, right now, what the state average probably will be looking at the responses that they're starting to receive. Many agencies and departments are moving towards the 325, because that has been the vetted one. Our current rates were previously behind, so our increase will bring us up to the state average. The one thing I want to be clear about, though, is just because the rates are going to go up, we will not know what the funds will look like bringing in, because with these new contracts we'll have with the insurance companies, some of these contracted rates will go down in other areas. So, until we have 12 months to see what it looks like, we cannot estimate, so we have to be very conservative in presenting our numbers to you. We just want to make sure that we're clear on that. With that, does anyone have any questions to the proposed changes to our rates?

Chairman Dumont: Any questions by the Board? I got mine out last time he was here.

Selectman Jakoby: No, I'm all set.

Chairman Dumont: All right. If not, what I'm going to do at this time is I'm going to open up the public hearing session of this, so we'll give anybody who's in the audience a chance to speak, if there is anybody. So, I will open up the public hearing at 8:02 p.m. Is there anybody who would like to come forward and speak on the ambulance, the fees as amended? Going once, going twice, not seeing anybody out there. I am going to close the public hearing portion at 8:02 p.m. It was back before the Board at this time. Any questions, comments, select a guess word?

Selectman Guessford: Just a question real quick. So, I expect that we'll see you in a year after we go through this whole year, and we'll just see where it's at.

Deputy Chief Enos: These rates, from going forward, the policy that I presented a few weeks back, if you would like to see us, you absolutely can, but you'll be able to ask any time now. The town manager will know every month where this fund is revolving at and stands, because we'll all be meeting collectively. So, at any time, anybody can ask. But, yes, if you would like to see us back in one year's time, absolutely. I can tell you that, in speaking with the town administrator, he already has plans and motions to make sure that we're on top of rates throughout the community, and that includes ambulances. So, we'll be discussing this all the time. Every year, there will be a discussion on rates.

Selectman Guessford: Okay, yeah, because you're going to be looking for about a year's worth of data to kind of decide whether or not this is working or not.

Deputy Chief Enos: Correct.

Selectman Guessford: Right, okay. All right. Okay.

Chairman Dumont: Any other questions, comments, motions?

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessford, for the Board of Selectmen to hereby amend Chapter 205 Fees, moreover, § 205-5 Ambulance Fees, as presented by the Fire Department. Motion carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Thanks a lot, guys.

Deputy Chief Enos: Thank you.

B. Public Hearing: Hawker/Peddler/Vendor Licenses Update – DDS/Discussion

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up, we have a public hearing on a Hawker/Peddler/Vendor License Update, or permit, I should say. I will recognize the Development Services Director, Elvis Dhima.

Elvis Dhima: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening, everyone. As you recall, one of the things that we took action in late 2025 was a need to go over this particular procedure we have in place. We started by looking into what the state has. We have basically pretty much stripped up everything that we're doing, it's down to one big paragraph, and it basically says, you as a town, have at it. So, we crossed that out, and then we got into it. So, what you will see in the packet is the changes, and I'm going to go over a quick executive summary, and then you will see further down that we actually revamped the form completely. It's very nice. It provides all the folks with

what they need to know. It breaks it down to average Joe being able to understand what they're getting into, so you don't have to be a lawyer trying to read our ordinance, and also at the very end, a very nice required cheat sheet of what you need, what you're going to get into. With that said, in a quick executive summary, what we're going to be looking at is this will only be allowed into business and industrial zones, not residential. Board of Selectmen can waive the \$50 fee if you deem that it's good for the benefit of the community or if it's a function for the town, so we're going to have that implemented. And know that it's not a big deal, but everything matters, every little bit. You do not have to pull this permit if you're doing any activity out there that's less than seven days. So, if someone comes in and says, you know, I'm going to be doing this for a couple days, we're not going to let them go through the wringer. We also are not going to require everyone to come in and get a permit, and then after December 30th, you have to start all over again. The permit will be provided for six months, and that six months' window starts when you get the actual permit. So, that simplifies it a little bit. In addition to that, the Town Administrator's office will be responsible as the administrator for keeping track of these, who needs them, who doesn't need them, you know, when they're due, when they expire. So now we have like a point where everything goes versus before it was like that's not me, it's here. So that helps a little bit, right?

Selectman Jakoby: Yes.

Elvis Dhima: Basically, the Town Administrator's office is going to be the record keeper, which is nice. This was decided when Mr. Sorensen could not attend that meeting, so everyone obviously voted in favor of that. Subject to change. I'm just kidding. What else have we got in here? There is language about grandfather. So, the zoning administrator decides that this is an activity that was happening in the past. So, one case we have, there's a gentleman that comes in every, I think it's right before Valentine's Day. They sell flowers at the hardware store. It's been going on way before I was born. We consider that to be something that's always been there, so it's probably going to be something that's considered grandfathered. But there's language there that can say that everybody else is going to have to go through the process, you know. You need to show, you know, an industrial or commercial that is a site plan. You're going to show us exactly where you're going, how long you're going to stay there, what you're going to be doing, you know, insurance and all that. And if you're going through like a minor site plan, if you have to, so you're not going through the full blown out. But your buyers will have a chance to show up if they have a concern. So, we feel like that's a good middle ground between providing support to what they need, but also providing a means for anyone around this particular business that's going to be established for a short period of time to come in and voice their concerns. So, we think it's in a good place. It's where it needs to be. I think it's very thoroughly done. A lot of folks worked on this, and I'm here to take any feedback. This is your first public hearing about this. And if it goes well, we'll do the second one on the 27th, and after that, we'll adopt it. Now, for anyone that's lingering in the process, we're going to give them until June 30th of 2026 to basically, you know, keep their licenses if they have it. But then after June 30th, 2026, they have to comply with the new rules. So that gives everyone that's in the middle kind of six months to figure out, all right, am I going to stay here longer than six months, or do I have to, you know, go through the process now? And that's kind of basically in a nutshell. So, I'll take any questions you might have, and we'll go from there.

Chairman Dumont: I do have one thing. So, if this becomes approved after we go through our public hearings, one comment that you made that does make me take pause a little bit is so we're going to be requiring people to do a minor site plan if there's no ..

Elvis Dhima: Yes, yes, minor site plan, correct.

Chairman Dumont: I'm not going to be able to support this with that in there because I think it defeats the whole purpose of a Hawker's/Peddler's permit. It's a transient business in nature. I don't see anybody being able to afford a land surveyor and engineer to provide those types of documents with stamps. It just, for me, that's a no-go.

Elvis Dhima: So just so everyone understands, you can't override zoning rules. , you don't have to like it, I understand that, but you can't say we don't want to do that, therefore you can have these businesses go around because that compromises basically what you have in the zoning rules. So, anyone that does these still have to basically follow the zoning rules. You'll be doing that. What we did differently is that instead of going to the planning board, if you already have a site plan and you show them where you're going, you basically have a meeting with the chairman, representative by the board of selectmen and staff, and you call it a day. It's pretty

straightforward. But the minor site plan, it means that you already have a plan, and most of the commercial industrial have already had that. But you can't basically override zoning. You don't have that authority to override zoning rules. You can't say, well, I don't think it's a good idea, therefore we're just going to give that. It doesn't work that way.

Chairman Dumont: You are correct. We don't have the authority to override zoning. There's a separate process for that. However, hawker's and peddler's permits and the RSA that this is built under gives the Board of Selectmen authority to how that operates and what our expectations of that is. So, I will disagree. We can decide the process to that. What I think would be applicable would be is it an allowed use or not. I think that that, quite frankly to me, is as far as zoning should be involved with these permits. I stated that at the last meeting. I have stated that with Mr. Dhima is I hope this isn't a surprise to you over phone conversations. But I don't envision somebody who's getting, I think, what is it, six months, eight months? How long is this permit?

Elvis Dhima: Six months.

Chairman Dumont: I know I wouldn't go for a six-month permit and spend somewhere around, and this would be extremely cheap, \$2,500 to most likely \$5,000 to \$10,000 to get a six-month permit. I just wouldn't do that. And not even know if I'm going to receive that permit.

Elvis Dhima: So, if you have a site plan, if you have a site plan already and you're just simply showing in a marking that I'm going to be at this location at two parking spaces, it doesn't take \$2,500.

Chairman Dumont: I agree with that. That's not what I'm worried about.

Selectman Jakoby: Chairman, could you tell me which section and which words you would take out of this and where that would? I want to get really into exactly what would need to be removed.

Chairman Dumont: So, I'm going to turn that over to Mr. Dhima because it wasn't until his comment about needing the minor site plan did I have so much of a pause.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I want to know where that wording is and where exactly it is.

Roy Sorenson: I think it's 5B-6. 5B-6.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, so a depiction of the proposed location(s) of the site plan and duration(s) of stay to the business together with a certificate of zoning determination from the zoning administrator at the location consistent with Chapter 334, Zoning.

Selectman Jakoby: So, if 6 is deleted, that removes that requirement.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I would still think staff should be afforded the right to know where this is going so that way our departments can adequately comment on it. Police, fire, everybody else involved. Police and fire come to me just for safety reasons, but I just don't see the necessity or the need for a site plan or minor site plan for this department.

Selectman Jakoby: And my concern is the cost of such a document. You know, if it's in agreement with, you know, the location, yeah, I think this goes a step too far. I tend to agree with you. But that's really the section that would be removed. Would there be something else that would need to be entered? Because there is still, you know, zoning administrator still has to approve it.

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Selectman Jakoby: And is it simply a designation, not a zoning, a minor zoning plan, but just a plan that needs to be looked at, at just the, you know, administrative level, not at the planning board level?

Chairman Dumont: And that's more my goal is I do believe that this should be administratively, but I will stop talking.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just for my understanding, because I don't know all the zoning laws, but is there a size boundary at which a site plan is required, like the mandates when the site plan is required?

Elvis Dhima: So, it's more like the change of use. If you change something, if you're doing something different on a commercial, industrial, we need to be notified. And those changes usually happen through a minor site plan or a major site plan. Major one goes through the planning board. Minor ones go through what I just stated, which is a chairman of the planning board, represented by the board of selectmen and staff. It's pretty straightforward. The intent is to make sure that we're keeping track of what's happening out there, and we're all aware of what's happening in every property, you know, most regulated one, commercial, industrial ones. This particular one is allowed on those two areas. I don't think you can legally do it. So, I'm not going to recommend, you know, without legal opinion, to remove six, because I don't think you can do that. But if you feel like that needs to be looked at again to come back, obviously this is what this meeting is for. But I don't feel comfortable with that, because I think you're going to have a significant issue out there not regulating to who's going in and when. I think that's what you have zoning rules in place for. So, I don't agree with that assessment. I don't recommend it. But if you wish to continue this discussion, we can get a legal opinion on that matter, and then you at least understand to what your options are. But based on the discussions I've had with the chairman of the planning board and staff when we went over this, it doesn't look like you can override that. But maybe something has changed between then and now. I don't know. I can go back and ask for that, but I'm pretty confident that you're not going to be able to do that.

Selectman Jakoby: We didn't do this before.

Chairman Dumont: One part that I would agree with that on is no matter if we make any changes here, I think what would be fair would be to move the public hearing. You have a fresh new form.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Just real quick, like for example, how do you site plan a food truck?

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Elvis Dhima: So, a food truck that comes in for six months, if they have commercial or industrial, they'll have a plan that basically says this is where the building is, this is where the parking is. So, they come in, and they just mark up in yellow, I'm going to be sitting right here. They tell us about it. We let the abutters know if there's a problem or not, and that's the end of it. They go to a meeting at 5 o'clock. So, Selectman Guessford will be there with Mr. Malley and staff, they go over it. If anyone shows up and says, I have a concern with this, they hear it. If no one shows up and they don't have a concern, they might approve it that night. That's the end of it. That's the entire process. Now, if someone comes out and says, I'm selling the same thing down the road, this is going to impact me. I don't think this is right, it could be elevated to full site plan. Now, everyone in the planning board gets to provide feedback on that. That's how it works. And I think it's pretty straightforward. Now, there is a process, though, still. You can't just sign off saying this is all set, there's no impact, because everything we do has a consequence, right? And we want to make sure that while we drive everyone to come here, we don't want to push anyone that's already established here. You're losing that mechanism by not getting public input anymore into what's going on out there.

Chairman Dumont: Well, I'll stop right there. Public input is not there so somebody can advocate that their business is more important than somebody else's. That's not what should be considered under public input, and that's not what should be considered here. Everybody, regardless of location, if that's your property, you have the right to put on there what you believe is fit. To your point, you can, and to Mr. Dhima's point, create an area where food trucks go on a site plan. Site plans, the best way that I can explain it to you is the difference between residential and the commercial use. Commercial uses, you tend to have a site plan, and you definitely can allocate areas for that specific use.

Selectman Morin: So, my question is, you've got a food truck coming in, they don't own the property. Isn't it the property's owner's responsibility to do the ...? So, we're going to have to have these businesses come in and do a site plan?

Elvis Dhima: No. You have to have these businesses basically have a letter from the owner saying that they're basically agreeing that I can do this. That's it. So basically, they come in with this plan that hopefully is already on record. So, most of the plans, commercial, industrial, is already out there. And basically say, I've been authorized by the owner to apply on this behalf. It can be either the applicant or the agent for the owner. And then they say,

this is what I'm trying to do. This is when I'm going to do it. And this is where I'm going to be located conducting that business.

Selectman Guessferd: And that's how that goes. And you have permission from that owner.

Elvis Dhima: That is correct.

Selectman Guessferd: So yeah, I was a little confused as well. Exactly had the same question.

Selectman Morin: My problem is if they deny it, then we have to bring the business in because it's their property. This guy can't argue that property because it's not his. So that makes no sense to me.

Chairman Dumont: And I would tend to believe, out of being fair, that the property owner would give that authority to that person moving forward. It's no skin off his back to give him that authority and to let him move forward. What I have a problem with is the cost associated, the time frame. I just view this as a simplified process that is not permanent. Site plans, minor site plans, minor site plans in particular, are used for small changes of use on an existing site plan. I don't look at this as a change of use, especially if it's only going to be there for six months. I look at it as a transient nature, a temporary structure.

Selectman Guessferd: Well, I was kind of on that same vein as Selectman Morin, just trying to understand who would be submitting the site plan. And it sounds like it's the actual hawker or peddler with a letter from the owner. But it sounds like there's some – and I'll make my second, I guess. It sounds like there's some disagreement on the legality of this, is what you're saying. I think maybe before we move forward with this, we run this by legal.

Chairman Dumont: I think that that would be appropriate to make sure that everybody's comfortable. And I don't want to put – and I'm not looking for, you know, Mr. Dhima. He did exactly what we asked of him to do. Obviously, it's our job to say whether we're for or against that. So, nothing against him or the fact that he may or may not recommend what I'm offering by any means. I did have my own conversations with LeFevre about this, just to get a feel of it before I did this. So, I'm comfortable, but I think it would be wise for everybody to possibly get something in writing.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to say the reason – my concern is, to what you said, this is transient nature. And these permits come through us anyway for approval. Maybe they – we pull them out of consent once this policy goes in, so that if there is a neighbor or – because that's my issue, because the public can come and argue us about this here, because it's our authority for a hawker/peddler permit is the way it stands now.

Elvis Dhima: No, I ...

Selectman Jakoby: That's what's in our consent.

Elvis Dhima: But you have to comply with the zoning rules that are in place.

Selectman Jakoby: I'm not arguing the zoning. I'm arguing this policy.

Elvis Dhima: No, but you're getting into now notifying – what you're saying is notify the folks, if that's required by a minor site plan or a major site plan, which you don't do. Now you're spilling into different territory, which is not your jurisdiction. What I'm saying is keeping it apples to the apples. So – well, it is. You would have to notify someone.

Selectman Jakoby: No, I'm saying that if we don't do the minor site plan, I don't know if that's going to happen.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, I don't think you can.

Selectman Jakoby: Wait, wait.

Elvis Dhima: So that's why I'm sticking to – go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby: Let me just say, if we are legally able and this Board decides to remove the minor site plan part, I want the public to know there would still be an opportunity for the public to address any of these permits because they come through us in our consent items. That's all I wanted to say.

Chairman Dumont: And to clarify that, I will take that one step further. I'm not advocating for a public notice to go out to every item that's on the consent calendar. I would implore everybody who's in the public to please pay

attention to the Board of Selectmen meeting and our agenda, and they're more than welcome at any meeting to come forward and speak on anything we have in front of us.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to defer making a decision until the January 27, 2026 Board of Selectmen meeting.

Chairman Dumont: Seconded by Selectman Jakoby. Do we have any other discussion?

Roy Sorenson: Defer the discussion? So not to accept – this is the first public hearing?

Chairman Dumont: Correct.

Selectman Guessferd: Defer the public hearing as well until we have a legal – Satisfied.

Selectman Morin: To amend it to say the first public hearing also.

Chairman Dumont: So let me do it this way just because of what would be proper. Are you okay with rescinding your motion currently?

Selectman Morin: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: Are you okay with it?

Selectman Jakoby: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: I'm open for further discussion without a motion on the floor. I understand we would have to repost. It's my belief that because of the public hearing that's in front of us, we should afford the public the right to view this final document two times. How does everybody feel about that? So, with that, I would defer both the document and the public hearing.

Selectman Morin: I'll make that motion.

Chairman Dumont: The only reason why I ask is I wanted to make sure that Mr. Sorenson was on board because technically during a motion, right, it's live on the floor, the discussion of the Board, and then we make a vote. So, what would be proper now is to make sure we get discussion from Mr. Dhima and Mr. Sorenson.

Selectman Jakoby: Just a point of clarification.

Chairman Dumont: Yes.

Selectman Jakoby: If there's anyone here for this public hearing, should we allow them to be heard?

Chairman Dumont: I would be fine with that.

Roy Sorenson: You do have a public hearing, you can.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah.

Chairman Dumont: I would be fine with that.

Selectman Jakoby: I think that's the one reason to do the public hearing, to get the feedback on what is currently here in case someone's here. And I don't know if there is.

Chairman Dumont: I think that's a fine suggestion. So, let's go right ahead and at this time, if there's nothing further, Mr. Dhima.

Elvis Dhima: We're good.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. I will open up the public hearing on the wonderful discussion of a Hawker/Peddler/Vendor license at 8:23 p.m. Is there anybody in the audience that wants to speak on this? Not seeing anybody jumping for joy. I will close at 8:23 p.m. Open and close. We had a motion to defer.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to defer both the document and the public hearing until the January 27, 2026 Board of Selectmen meeting. Motin carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Motion to defer by Selectman Morin and seconded by Selectman Jacoby. Any further discussion? All those in favor?

Board: Aye.

Chairman Dumont: All those opposed? Motion carries 5-0. That will be deferred until our January 27th meeting. All right. Give me one second to catch up here.

C. Public Hearing: Solar Exemption Proposed Cap – Assessing/Discussion

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up, we have a public hearing on our Solar Exemption cap. Mr. Michaud was not able to be here tonight, so I will recognize Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, in your packet, you can see the public notice. Mr. Michaud was tasked with creating the new ordinance, which is under the purview of the Board for this matter. We've had legal review on that before and it's stated as such. Understanding that, you can see the new language that would fall under Chapter 306, Article 11. I will focus on just the primary at hand of what you might see in here, but, you know, property tax exemptions shall be in the amount not to exceed \$20,000. This is part of the directive, as I mentioned, to the Chief Assessor. I think he's providing that here tonight. There's no action tonight other than this is a public hearing. You can give the public a chance to speak once you open that. The formal action will take place at the next meeting, and that will be the second public hearing, and then I believe it's the Chief Assessor's motion to adopt.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Any questions or comments? With that, I will open up the public hearing for the solar exemption proposed cap at 8:25 p.m. Is there anybody in the audience that would like to speak on this? Come on up. State your name and address for the recorder.

Craig and Deborah Putnam, 59 Rangers Drive: I'd like to begin by reading into the record a statement I made at the November 25th BOS meeting, just to provide some context for my further comments. We installed a solar array on our property in 2015 and have been receiving the solar tax exemption since it was instituted in December of that year. As recipients of that exemption, we, of course, were very interested to see that the Board of Selectmen is considering possibly modifying it. We are here tonight to provide you with our perspective on this matter. Our array was installed and went live in the fall of 2015. We would have made the investment had we thought the exemption was unlikely to happen. Maybe, maybe not. It's hard to say now. But it certainly would have made it less likely that we would proceed with the project. We understand the issues of continuing with the 100 percent exemption, particularly given the possibility of rooftop installations on enormous corporate-owned buildings. But eliminating the exemption entirely would be overcompensating. Most of the 250-ish solar installations in town are on residential properties. I'm sure most of those property owners would not be at all happy to have the exemption eliminated. I think it's likely that many of those residential property owners might not have proceeded with investing in a solar installation knowing their property taxes would go up. So, our suggestion to the BOS is the following. If you feel the town must move away from the 100 percent exemption, then thread the needle by capping the exemption amount at a value that will cover the typical residential array. I'm sure Mr. Michaud can advise on a proper value for a cap, one that won't harm residents who likely made financial decisions based on, at least in part, on the existence of the exemption. But that cap value would very likely be low enough that a large corporation wouldn't be bothered to file for the exemption. Thank you for your time and the opportunity to provide input on this matter. Please feel free to ask if you have any questions. And that ends my previous statement. Since then, communications with Mr. Michaud have indicated that a \$20,000 cap on the solar exemption amount would provide protection for the investments of all of the existing residential solar installations in town. Setting a cap at that amount on the solar property tax exemption would be a simple and straightforward position for the BOS to adopt. It sounds like that's where the BOS is going, so I'm delighted to hear that. But life is rarely simple and straightforward. We are faced with House Bill 1002, which, if enacted by the state legislature, would eliminate the solar property tax exemptions statewide, so much for local control and decision-making. HB 1002 was introduced last week on the 7th and referred to the House Committee on Science, Technology, and Energy. A public hearing is scheduled for January 20th at 3 p.m. in GP 229. Following the hearing, the bill will be debated, potentially amended, and voted on by the committee, then the full House,

and potentially the Senate, with a full legislative session likely running until sometime in June. So, at this point, we don't know whether any local decision by the Hudson BOS will be overridden or not, and we may not know for a while. Despite this uncertainty, my recommendation, however, is that the BOS should put a stake in the ground on this matter, and I would encourage them to enact a cap of \$20,000. And again, I'm delighted to hear that is where you're at. This would send a message to the property owners who have invested in solar that the town has their back. It would also send a message to the state legislature that the town of Hudson values local control. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much.

Deb Putnam: Any questions?

Chairman Dumont: I'm not seeing any. Thank you very much for your time. Anybody else wish to speak on this? No, go ahead. Finally, somebody excited to come up and talk. That's good.

Becky Odierna, 152 Dracut Road: I was also here at the November meeting. I didn't write down my statement to reread, but I just wanted to make it clear that I totally support the cap of \$20,000. I do not support completely abolishing the tax-exempt credit altogether. I do think you need to protect local residents like myself who invested and have not seen returns on their investment yet and invested because of this exemption. And I also agree that it would make a great statement to the state of New Hampshire that local municipalities should be in control of these types of, I guess, yeah, issues. And I think that you guys should move forward with this vote regardless of what's going on at the state legislature. Thank you.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you. Next up.

Susan Chouinard, 118 Dracut Road: I found this the other day when I was going through some of my information, and it's my permanent application for property tax exemption for solar energy exemption at 100%. And that was done and signed by Roger Coutu, who was the selectman and the other guys as well. I know his name. I couldn't read the rest of them. But it says all set on the other side. Somebody wrote in a sticky note. So, it's all set back in March of 2019, and that's when I must have had my solar put in. But it says permanent application for property tax exemptions. And that to me said that I permanently should be exempt from having my taxes go up because I have solar. And that's all I wanted to say about it. And I have the paperwork right here.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Anybody else wanting to come up and speak? Not seeing anybody else. I will close the public hearing at 8:32 p.m. Thank you for everybody who came to speak on that. Again, there will be two public hearings on this. The other one will be on the 27th of January before a decision is made.

Selectman Guessferd: I'm wondering, you know, we talked, you made a good point about sending a message to the state. Would it maybe go further to actually write a letter in non-support of that bill, you know, on behalf of the citizens of Hudson and our change? I don't know. I'm just throwing it out there for the Board to discuss.

Chairman Dumont: I would say that the Board of Selectmen has taken positions on different items throughout the course of time. You do have New Hampshire Municipal Association available who has a lobbyist that goes up there. So, there's a couple different avenues, but I don't think it would be out of line for the Board of Selectmen to do that if that's what they chose.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I would support that if you wanted to make a motion.

Selectman Guessferd: As long as I'm not writing it. I'd probably write it wrong. Yeah, I'll make a motion to send a letter to the state legislature in non-support of the 100% exemption, denial, whatever they're calling this House bill. What is it?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: 1002.

Chairman Dumont: So, we have a motion by Selectman Guessferd to submit a letter in opposition.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Second.

Chairman Dumont: Seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos. I have one point of discussion. I will be abstaining from this, obviously, as many of you know. I'm a part of that legislature and will have two bites of that apple, so I don't think that it's fair for me to send that letter along.

Selectman Morin: My only comment is solar is a great thing. They've had since it started to get the money. What about all the other people that do stuff to save energy in their house and they get nothing? That's my only concern. Solar is a great thing, I get it. But everybody else, they change their windows, they insulate their houses, but they get nothing. And they're doing the same thing, and that cost is right up there in some of these projects related to the solar.

Selectman Jakoby: So, right now the state does give money towards those things, that you can get actually an energy assessment and they will fund quite a bit of different types of energy savings. So, anyone who's looking into any of that needs to go to ...

Chairman Dumont: So really quick, before we go any further with this discussion, because I believe it's outside the motion that's been made, we have a motion on the floor, we have a second. If there's no further discussion on that.

Selectman Jakoby: Can I comment on the motion?

Chairman Dumont: On the motion.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, I'll comment on the motion. My comment on the motion is that I think the point here is that we want to keep local control of this decision, whether it's – for whatever it is, it's the local control in this particular motion that I'm concerned about.

Selectman Guessferd: That's the rationale.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, it's not necessarily the solar. It's to keep local control. So that's why I'm in support of this motion.

Chairman Dumont: Okay. So, we have a motion, we have a second. We've had discussion. Anything further?

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to send a letter to the state legislature, on behalf of the Board of Selectmen, in opposition of House Bill 1002. Motion carried, 4-0-1. Dumont abstaining.

Chairman Dumont: Just some clarity to offer while we're still on this topic. Obviously – and this is just information-based, but the first thing that I would offer is that anybody who is concerned about this, along with the letter, to please reach out to your state representatives. Hudson is fortunate enough to have six of them. We have good representation up there, and I can speak for myself and the others that I talk to that we all pay attention to the emails that come through and respond as we can. Outside of that, one thing that I would just offer, too, is obviously the authority to grant that exemption came from the state. So, I just wanted to make sure that everybody was aware that that authority does lie with the state. We are what's called – well, I do like the name. I didn't create it, but we are a Dillon's Rule state, where it is state authority over municipal authority, and that's just the hierarchy of things that it comes down. We're not a home rule state such as Massachusetts, where the municipality governs. So, I just wanted to throw that out there for clarification.

Roy Sorenson: That would be a live-free-or-die state.

Chairman Dumont: Exactly. That is right, it's in our Constitution. All right. Any other questions or comments about that? All right. With that, we will move on.

D. 2027 statistical Revaluation Bid Award – Assessing/Decision

We do have an item on here of the statistical re-evaluation bid award. However, like I stated, Mr. Michaud is not here, so I'm going to lay that on the table for this one. We'll take that up at the next meeting as long as nobody objects to that.

Selectman Jakoby: That's appropriate.

Selectman Guessferd: We have time.

E. NHDOT – Dissolving the Circumferential Highway Layout – *Administration/Discussion*

Chairman Dumont: We have time. All right. So, we will move on to the New Hampshire DOT, Circumferential Highway. I will recognize Mr. Sorenson to introduce.

Roy Sorenson: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, tonight we have DOT with us. We have Bill Oldenburg and Eric Sargent. They're going to talk about the Circumferential Highway. Not that quite easy for me to say. We also have Bill Cass, who is the DOT Commissioner, as well. I'm going to turn it over to them. They'll walk you through the presentation. So, there's a couple things involved here. There's property, and then there's property with buildings on it. So, I think that's going to be part of the discussion tonight. I think you folks were in Litchfield last night. Does that sound right? Okay. So, they've also met with Litchfield at this point, because you know it obviously would affect them. With that, Bill, like I said, you can run it from the mouse if you want. Just use the wheel. There you go. It's all yours. Turn it over to you. Go ahead.

Bill Oldenburg: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, thank you for giving us the opportunity tonight to speak. So, dissolving the Circumferential Highway layout, what does that mean? So, if you haven't been around for the last 50 years, you may not know what the Circumferential Highway is. So back in the 50s and 60s, there was a thought about creating a loop road around Hudson, basically tied in to what is now the existing exit 2 off the Everett Turnpike, come across the Merrimack River. And it was built, ends at 3A in Hudson. The continuation was to go straight across 3A, heading east, up along, going over Kimball Hill Road to 111, basically right about where Benson's Park is, and then continuing north of Lake Alvirne High School, across 102, across into Litchfield, across 3A, across the Merrimack River, to tie into a new interchange at exit 9, which still doesn't exist. And so that's sort of the layout. That's the plan that was used in the 1993 public hearing. Those are the words of what I just spoke about where it is. So, a little bit of the background. Try to condense the last 50 years in three slides. So, like I said, the project was envisioned in the 1950s, 1960s. Work actually began in earnest on the design of the project back in the 1980s. In 1988, the department held an official public hearing and then reconvened, took some of the comments from the original public hearing, reconvened a second public hearing in 1993. A report of the commissioner was developed and a finding of necessity were approved. So, what does that mean? Let me explain the legalities a little bit of what we do when we have a public hearing. A little bit different than the public hearings you just held. Our public hearings are steeped in state law, federal law, and give us the ability to lay out a highway, ultimately acquire property using eminent domain if necessary. So that's why it's a very legal process that we go through. So, we have a public hearing, and that plan basically lays out a highway and where we're going to build that highway. We have the public hearing. We take comment. We take questions. And then we develop what is called the report of the commissioner. That report addresses all the comments that were received and then goes through, and we have what is called a finding of necessity meeting. So, are we going to find that this highway is necessary for the public good? Because this was an interstate-style highway and controlled access, so there were interchanges, four lanes, two lanes in each direction with interchanges, the public hearing and the whole process is overseen by a special committee, which is made up of three executive counselors. So those three executive counselors review the public hearing, review the report of the commissioner, and they run the finding of necessity. And all those three were done, and they were approved. So that basically meant we could continue with the design and we could acquire property necessary for the road, and that sort of solidified the highway layout. Per the plan, we could build a highway on that location. It doesn't go away. It doesn't expire. So that process was sort of set in law, if you will. Then the following year, we finalized the final environmental impact statement because once we had the layout, we could finalize the plans, we could determine the environmental impacts. The following year, in November of 94, the EPA issued basically their intent to veto the project, summarize the wetland impacts, the environmental impacts were too great in the southern section, also divided wildlife corridors with the road, sort of bisecting the ability for wildlife to get from the east side of Hudson towards the Merrimack River. Through the large area, which was forested at the time, where the highway was going to go. So, we were sort of at an impasse. We did meet. It actually was elevated to the governor's office, and the governor met with the EPA, and the result of that was that they came to agreement that the full

Circumferential Highway would not be built. But because most of the environmental impacts were in the southern section, they said if you want to, you could pursue and investigate just constructing the northern section. So basically from 111 to the north through Litchfield into Merrimack. We did do that. We did have meetings and discussed a supplemental EIS. So, because we weren't building the whole project that the final EIS was for, we were truncating it. We would have to do a supplemental environmental impact statement just for the section we were planning to build. We did do that. A draft EIS, supplemental EIS was drafted, it was delivered to stakeholders in 2004. No action was taken as a part of that. We didn't hold public hearings. We didn't finalize the impact statement, and it didn't garner a lot of support from anyone. It didn't complete the purpose of the project, which was to get traffic around Hudson. It sort of dumped it in the middle. And so, we met with the towns in 2007, had a meeting, and basic agreement was that the Circumferential Highway was never going to be built at that time. The following year in 2008, the project was removed from the state 10-year plan. And that's sort of, for us, that's sort of where it ended. I know in recent years, over the last decade or so, the town has shown interest in creating a more local road, a boulevard along the corridor in the southern section. We also know that with the grant and with also the study that was in the previous 10-year plan, we didn't get a lot of public support for that. So, what we would like to do before I do that, so before we stopped work on the project, we did acquire quite a bit of property. We acquired 59 parcels along the entire corridor, 19 of which were improved. So, by improved, we mean they're, in most cases, they're homes, condos, duplexes. So, there were 19 improved properties. Total assessed value of everything basically coming from the town tax rolls is about \$23 million. In the town of Hudson, we had acquired 30 parcels. We had acquired basically the entire southern segment corridor. Seven of those are improved homes. All seven of those were on an alternative corridor, Wason Road homes and Mark Street, and then one up on 3A on Webster Street. They were not directly in the corridor, they were outside. We have been, we acquired them almost over 30 years ago, and we've been managing them, being landlords, for over 30 years. As I like to say, we are really good at designing and constructing roads and bridges. Being landlords are not really in our wheelhouse, and we would like to, one of the things that we'd like to do is free ourselves of especially those tenant-owned properties, or tenant properties. So, dissolving the highway layout, what does that mean? What does that do? It would officially end the project. It would take any commitments that we made in the report of the commissioner and in those conditions that we met with the public hearings 30 years ago and remove them. It would also take any existing concerns about, are they ever going to build this road? Is this road ever going to be built in my backyard? It sort of takes that away. I will be perfectly honest with you. At this point, the public hearing was 30 years ago. We could never build that road without redesigning it and going through the whole process over again because while the layout doesn't end legally and from a public support and public input standpoint, we could never build that road without basically starting over. We just can't say that that highway layout 30 years ago is good. We can build that road. So, this is really, I don't want to say a paperwork exercise to dissolve it, but what we're intent to do is basically kill a project that's been dead for 30 years.

Chairman Dumont: If I may, a quick question on that point. As you spoke about, so Hudson attempted to revitalize a portion of his local boulevard. My understanding, obviously, was starting from scratch. The feasibility study that was on the 10-year plan, would that have been part of that start-over process?

Bill Oldenburg: Yes. So, if the town was interested in continuing with that project or redoing the boulevard, you'd have to do the same thing. You'd have to hold public hearings. You would have to do an environmental impact study. You would have to go through that whole process all over again. You couldn't use the documentation or the layout that was built because that layout was for the full Circumferential Highway, and that is not the project that you were building.

Chairman Dumont: No, that's fair. It's been a conversation that's been ongoing here at the local level for quite a while, so I just wanted to clarify for anybody that's paying attention to this that that was the intent of staff when they brought forward the Warrant article for the feasibility study was to start that process over and try to move the project forward with the understanding that they had those steps to go through. Nobody believed that it would just go through as if it was 30 years ago, so I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

Bill Oldenburg: And so, by dissolving the layout, all that really does is it takes the highway location out of it. The property that we own, we still own, and it's still there. It's just it would remove the, this property is slated to have

the road built on it. That moniker would be gone, so it would just be state-owned property. And by dissolving the layout, it would allow us to dispose of the properties that we've acquired as part of that. What our next steps are is we met with, tonight is the last town official meeting that we have, so tonight is Hudson. We met with, I'm sorry, I had that wrong. Litchfield was in December 8th, and last week we met with Merrimack. Our intent is to hold a public informational meeting to allow the public to come in, basically listen to a dry dissertation of the last 50 years like tonight, and give them the opportunity to weigh in on the intent. We're looking to plan it because it's locally centralized and probably the biggest player is in Hudson somewhere, so at some point we'd like maybe a recommendation as to where you think it might be appropriate. We have no idea whether it would be four people that are interested or 400 people, so I don't really know. You could offer your opinion on how many people might show up to this. I'm not sure, but if you have a location, that would be great. After all this is said and done, because the three special committee members, executive counselors, sort of created the layout and approved the layout, we would do a governor-council resolution notifying the executive council that we are officially dissolving the highway layout. There's no real process for doing it besides this. So that would then dissolve the layout.

Chairman Dumont: Real quickly on that, just for location, so where executive council tends to have their transportation meetings and where we have our larger meetings is the Community Center on Lions Ave. If you want to connect with Mr. Sorensen, that would be my recommendation, unless if anybody has a better one. There's a chance that you said that only four people or fewer show up, but this topic you might find you get a bigger crowd just based on the amount of conversations we've had over the recent years.

Bill Oldenburg: Perfect. Thank you. So, the real intent tonight is just to say we're going to dissolve the layout. That doesn't change property ownership or the property that we've acquired, but the real intent is, like I said, we really don't want to be landlords anymore, so part of this is we'd like to dispose of the homes. So, there's two processes that I want to lay out. The first is unimproved property disposal, which is vacant land. There's a lot of vacant land. So once the layout is dissolved, we won't begin this process until that is done, which if we had the public info meeting in March or end of February, we could do that as soon as the next Executive Council, getting on the next Executive Council agenda. So, this could maybe start in March or April-ish, so to give you sort of a timeline of when this process would start. One of the first things we would do is complete a market analysis or sort of an appraisal on each property. We would use real estate experts that would review the parcel for buildable lot size, review zoning, site plan approval, determine what the highest and best use of the property is, and determine a fair market value cost of that parcel, what we could consider making or selling it for at a fair market value. We would have to go to a long-range committee approval, so property is considered a state asset, so it's controlled by the state. And to dispose of a state asset, we have a legislative committee. It's the Long-Range Planning and Utilization Committee. I think that's somewhat close. We call it Long-Range. And so, we have to bring these parcels to them to get approval to sell. We would do that and then offer the properties first to the town and then to the New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority, and the sale would be at fair market value. Now I know that you may or may not be interested in some or all or a few of the parcels, so if you are, we understand that there's warrant articles, there's town meetings that have to approve all that. We're more than willing to work with you on that process. We can go as fast or as slow as you need us to, but all we'd ask is that we can work with Mr. Sorensen on what properties you're interested in and what you aren't so that we know how to prioritize our process up to that point. So, if you're not interested in a parcel and New Hampshire Housing Finance isn't, we would then market the parcel through a real estate agent for sale, and all sales are approved by the Governor and Executive Council. And then after they approve it, we would close just like any other real estate transaction. So that would be the unimproved property. So that's the vacant land. We've gone through a little bit different process for the occupied rental properties that we own. So, in Hudson, there's seven properties that we own and that we currently rent out. In November of last year, we did reach out to all the tenants, informing them that we were going to terminate all leases the end of May of 2026. We gave them a six-month notice that we were terminating the leases. We also let them know that if they were interested, they may have the opportunity to purchase the residence they currently rent. And in December of last year, we did send a letter to the town. I know it's in your packet. And to the Housing Finance Authority, inquiring if they were interested, if you folks were interested, and in the occupied properties, so the ones that have tenants in it right now. We did, yesterday, receive long-range committee approval to sell all those occupied homes. And after that, after this process, we do plan, because all these homes are not in the corridor, we feel confident we can sell these without having the

highway layout dissolved, so we can start this process right away. So, we complete a market analysis or appraisal on each of the properties to determine the fair market value. If the town or the Finance Authority isn't interested, we're giving the tenants the first right of refusal, if they're interested and they qualify, to purchase the homes that they're in. We have some very long-term tenants who've been in the homes, so I know Eric has been in contact with a few that are interested. If none of that pans out, we would then market the homes through a real estate agent. Again, Governor and Council would need to approve each sale, and then we would close on the property like any other. So that's sort of the property disposal part of it. I do have contact information for Eric and I. And in the back is a listing of each of the properties that we currently own. I will say the vacant properties, that's the tax-assessed value from your tax cards, and then equalized using the equalization ratio that the Department of, I forget who, determines. But we currently don't pay tax on the state-owned land, the vacant land. We do pay tax on the homes. So, if there's a tenant in them and they're occupied, we do pay property tax on that. So, it's quite a bit of value that's really untapped for the town. And in the back, tried our best to use old tax maps from when the properties were acquired. They may not match exactly the tax maps of today because this is the actual properties that we acquired and the tax maps at the time. That's why they're all fuzzy and gray and look like a third grader did it. And all the properties. So, you can sort of see in here, this is 111 where Benson's is. It's right out in here. So you can see that we purchased most of the corridor for the south and through here. And you can also see that dashed in was the alternative corridor where the homes on Wason and Mark Street are also shown. The other is four on Wason. And then it ties in at 3A right there. So, that's all we really have. Do you have any questions, comments?

Chairman Dumont: So, I have a couple questions that I may not be able to answer, but I'll shoot them out there. So, I get the process. I understand it without the support. Obviously, this is the proper way to go about it, and I'd rather see the properties go back on the tax rolls than just sit there and sit vacant. Ultimately, I'm a little disappointed only because Hudson has a major traffic problem, as you stated with Route 2 dumping off directly into Hudson and really nowhere else to go. Can you speak to, I mean, do you believe that had this been built out, that it would have alleviated the traffic that we're seeing in Hudson? Is that even something you can speak to?

Bill Oldenburg: I mean, the intent of the project was to take those folks that, you know, so today I drove down Route 102 through that line of traffic all the way from Exit 4 all the way down basically to Town Hall. It would have given those folks an opportunity that not have to do that. They could have come down the turnpike, got off, and then found the road closest to their home or where their destination was. And, you know, the same thing for, you know, the Exit 2 area. It would allow those folks that work down in Massachusetts come up and not have to travel, you know, through Nashua, you know, across going through downtown Hudson really. So, would it have alleviated the traffic in sort of the outlying areas? Probably not. It might have drawn more traffic to those areas like the Alvirne High School area and that, you know, because that's where everybody was going to go. But, you know, down in this area, I would have thought it probably would have had a benefit for, you know, for the central area of Hudson.

Selectman Morin: I think the telephone pole on Lowell Road answers that question. If that road was there, everybody could have went around.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I can definitely see, and to his point obviously, wouldn't it, you know, you have an exit off of it, obviously you can have an impact there as well. I think that the bulk of our traffic concerns would have been alleviated through that personally being in the central part of Hudson. That's where we see most of that complaint and the south end. So, that's all that I have. I was just curious about that. Any other questions or comments? Obviously, you're not looking for any kind of answer tonight.

Selectman Guessford: It may be kind of a ridiculous question. So, a lot of the property, the unimproved property is, you know, some of the properties are listed as, you know, streets. You know, like Central Street. I mean, these things would still end up being state owned. Or how does that work? I mean, there are taxes associated with all of those, and obviously there are roads. I mean, there are existing roads that aren't going to go away. So, what happens with the ones that are listed on the list of all the properties that are just street roads, essentially? A lot of acreage associated with those, obviously, you know, because of the length of the roads and things like that.

Bill Oldenburg: So, most of those have frontage on a side road. So, some of the harder ones, if they have frontage, some of the harder ones are, you know, the main corridor, I forget what the number is, is 232 Lowell Road. That goes from 3A up to Musquash.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. On a list of properties, I just see, you know, when you have the table with the list of properties, you know, you've got, like, Trigate Road, we've got Speare Road, we've got – and there's no property numbers associated with those.

Bill Oldenburg: Well, so what we used was – those are right off the tax card for address.

Chairman Dumont: So, just to clarify, those aren't actually the road. Those are mapping lots off of that road. So, to his point, they're not – you know, it's not Speare Road that they own.

Selectman Guessferd: Right. It's just – it looks weird.

Chairman Dumont: They own 19 acres off of it, and the reason why they only have a mapping lot is it's not – it's vacant. They don't have a designation for an address.

Selectman Guessferd: Right, right, right. Yeah. Okay. So that's what I thought. I just wanted to clarify.

Chairman Dumont: Correct. You had me wondering there for a second because I was thinking, crap, we might have a bigger problem.

Selectman Guessferd: I didn't think so. I just wanted to make sure I was clear.

Chairman Dumont: That's fair.

Roy Sorenson: Bill, can you just explain the NHHFA? Tell us a little bit more about that.

Eric Sargent: Yeah, so it's – our practice is to notify New Hampshire Housing. Obviously, housing is a big issue in the state of New Hampshire, and it's a practice of the department to notify New Hampshire Housing. They do have statute where they can reach out to any state agency to acquire about surplus land. So, the department makes it a practice to reach out to them as well to let them know that there's a parcel of land that we're getting ready to sell and give them an opportunity to acquire that, to potentially acquire and then work with a developer or finance it through New Hampshire Housing to create more housing opportunities for future residents of the state.

Bill Oldenburg: We did reach out to them, and they were not interested in any of the occupied buildings, and I know that request was to the town.

Eric Sargent: Yeah, so we've reached out to each municipality as we're required by law. We've heard from Litchfield, we've heard from Merrimack that they're not interested, and as Bill has just said, New Hampshire Housing is also not interested in the improved properties. So, we've sent a letter to the town of Hudson, and we would appreciate a formal response to give your intent as well if you have any interest in that. The reason, as Bill stated earlier, we gave the tenants a six-month notice of their lease being terminated. We wanted to give them the opportunity to secure financing. It's not the department's desire to displace any of these tenants. We want to work with them to give them an opportunity to acquire these homes. So, the sooner we get the responses from the municipalities and from New Hampshire Housing, we can start working with the tenants to get them the opportunity well in advance of their lease being terminated to acquire the houses.

Roy Sorenson: So that's the urgency behind this. You want the town to deal with that first, the improved lots, I guess you'd call it, so we would need to come to a conclusion.

Chairman Dumont: That was the next thing. I have a separate question, but I'll state my opinion on that very clearly. Similar to DOT, I don't believe Hudson should be in the landlord business. So, I personally would have no problem saying that it's not an interest of mine, but I'll leave it up to the Board to make a formal decision. I did just have one question about the unimproved. So, you said the New Hampshire Housing Authority didn't have any interest in the improved. Did they give you any response of the unimproved?

Eric Sargent: They may have some interest, yes. I mean, they will evaluate what properties. We have not notified the intent of those properties yet. We're waiting for the project to be dissolved before we start acting on those.

Typically, larger tracts of land, certainly in an area where housing is needed, they certainly have some interest. So, it's quite possible they would be interested as well.

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, Board members, is anybody comfortable throwing their opinion out there, or do they need some time to think about this?

Selectman Jakoby: I personally need some time to think about it and really review it. I have some questions about a bunch of things, not for them but for us.

Chairman Dumont: May I ask, is anybody comfortable with giving them an opinion on the improved lots? To me, that one seems simple, but that's just me.

Selectman Morin: I would make a motion that we don't have any interest in the improved lots. We're not landlords.

Chairman Dumont: If you don't mind. So before, I just want to kind of take a straw poll of everybody. Selectman Jakoby, is that something that you would need more time on as well?

Selectman Jakoby: I guess part of it is just as we look at – I mean, I don't want to be a landlord, but is any of that – I don't think there's any property there that's necessarily a good location for anything we want to do. Because we could tear down what's there and do whatever. So that's just me thinking out of the box. But I don't think so, because Wason is not a good access. Mark Street, I'm not familiar with that, but those are both 0.2 acres each, so that's not a large piece of property. So, if I think out loud, if you're asking me, so then unless I'm missing something, there's nothing significant here except for Webster. That's a single-family residence. It's only 1.3, though. So, I'm not seeing any reason to move forward. So, I wanted to raise that.

Chairman Dumont: No, that's fair. I mean, I did consider the same thing. Obviously, we're going through a process right now with our Town Hall Advisory Committee, and that was a recommendation to look at possible properties, so I don't – I think that's appropriate. I didn't see any of the seven in question here, at least for them tonight. That would be appropriate personally for that.

Selectman Jakoby: Right, because of the size and what's on it.

Chairman Dumont: Location. Availability of infrastructure.

Selectman Jakoby: That's the conversation I wanted to have. Yeah. So, I'm good.

Chairman Dumont: Okay.

Selectman Guessford: Looking at the maps and the property designations, it's not Watson Road, it's Wason Road. Wason Road. Elementary. There's a bunch of them that say Wason Road. That's right. But I'm kind of on the same page as far as the improved properties. I really don't see us having an interest in those, you know, as far as being landlords or managing those in any way, shape, or form. But, you know, there's always – I mean, I know you have a legitimate point, but my first reaction to this is, you know, improved properties, there's houses existing there, there's people living in them. Right. We give them an opportunity to buy them. Like you, give them the opportunity to buy them. Kind of my opinion as well.

Chairman Dumont: I agree.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I'm in the same wheelhouse. I don't think any of these really – obviously I think we all pop to the same thing, right, the town hall. But I don't think any of these really fit the bill for location and size-wise that we would need. I would like more time to evaluate the unimproved to see if there's any liability in any of those locations.

Chairman Dumont: So, Selectman-Morin had a motion to create a formal recommendation on the improved lots.

Selectman Guessford: Right, yes. I'll second that.

Chairman Dumont: So that recommendation would be that this time Hudson has no interest in the improved lots that New Hampshire DOT is proposing. So, motion by Selectman-Morin. I have a second.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, for the Town of Hudson to decline any interest in the improved lots the New Hampshire DOT is proposing from the disbandment of Circumferential Highway, as recommended by the Board of Selectmen. Motion carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Hopefully that's quick enough for you, at least on that part.

Roy Sorenson: What I'll do to formalize that, I'll send you a letter recognizing the motion they took here tonight, all right, and even a copy of the minutes, and then that's it. It's on the record, okay?

Bill Oldenburg: That'd be perfect. Thank you very much. I would comment that the unimproved properties, the vacant properties that are adjoined Litchfield, when we were at Litchfield, they did mention saying it would probably be good for Litchfield and Hudson to get together. What are you going to do with your side of the line?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: What are you doing?

Bill Oldenburg: Well, it was more of a compatible type of thing.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, there's a couple that straddle the boundaries, right?

Roy Sorenson: I did have the talent administrator, Kim Kline, reach out to me today via email on that. So, I think I will reach back out to them and we'll work through that.

Bill Oldenburg: The Wason thing kills me because 25 years ago I worked on the interchange right there, right at Wason Road and 3A.

Selectman Guessferd: I was like, I don't know where Watson Street is.

Chairman Dumont: All right, do you have anything else for us at this time? Thank you very much.

Selectman Guessferd: Thanks a lot for coming down.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. Appreciate the presentation.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Thank you, gentlemen.

F. Transition to Central Square Pro Suite – Police/Decision

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up, we have a transition to Central Square Pro Suite. I will recognize the Police Chief, Cayot.

Chief Cayot: Thank you, Chairman. So going back to when we were doing our budgeting a couple months ago, everyone will probably remember that one of my outside budget requests was Pro Suite, upgrading our current IMC records management system to Pro Suite. Since then, a few things have changed and an opportunity has arisen which will allow us to get into Pro Suite right now at a much more affordable rate than when I presented that. And by that, what the deal is right now is for the first year, it would actually be the exact same price we're paying for our current IMC. So, we're supposed to renew in June of this year our IMC. That cost would go to the first year of IMC. And then I had provided some information that shows how it kind of steps up over the next several years. So, for the first year, we would pay exactly what we'd be paying for IMC. The next year, we'd be paying \$8,619 more than we would be paying if we stayed with IMC. That's with the anticipated increases in IMC. And then by the third year, we're paying the \$17,000 extra over what IMC would cost. It's obviously given us the new upgraded system. It's getting rid of IMC, which is antiquated, and they're not updated anymore. The reason I'm bringing this to you now is because this came about they're looking to do a consortium. It's actually being run by Hillsborough PD. They still jump on to the sheriff's hub that they're building. But what it looks like is Central Square was like, hey, we're already building this hub. If we can get these other people to jump on now, why not get them locked in so now they're paying these fees as they go. So, they waived the fee of transferring all our data and then gave us the IMC cost. That's how we're going from the \$126,000-ish that I requested, the outside budget request, to first year being the cost of IMC.

Selectman Guessferd: Thank you for explaining that, yes.

Chief Cayot: Because transferring the information from IMC, I want to say, if I remember correctly, was about an \$80,000 to \$90,000 charge.

Selectman Jakoby: Yep, that's what you said.

Chief Cayot: And then the rest of it was the increase over IMC.

Selectman Guessford: Yeah, I think that piece is important so people understand that that's because, yeah, they'll remember it as a higher dollar amount.

Chief Cayot: So, when I talked to the guy from Central Square today, because the town administrator had asked me, can you find out a time frame on this? Unfortunately, I don't have a great answer because with Hillsborough running this consortium, when Hillsborough decides they're going to sign, they're going to go with whoever is ready to go. And then if you're not on board with that, everyone who got on board with them gets this deal. If not, it's going to be whatever the going deal is after that. Hillsborough is ready to go as soon as possible. Have they signed yet? No. Are they going to wait six months, a year? Absolutely not.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I think this is incredible. You said that there were a lot of moving parts and you didn't know how it was going to come down. So, this is really coming very much in our favor. So, I'm very thankful for that and I'm very supportive of this.

Chairman Dumont: Any other questions or comments? If none, I do have just one question. It just relates to around timing. How do you feel if we were to wait until after elections or something like this, budget and everything?

Chief Cayot: I haven't gotten the Hillsborough chief to give me a definitive answer, but my guess is they are not going to be waiting that long. They have pretty much every other agency in this group is ready to go now based on the fact that their costs are staying the exact same. Obviously, I'm bringing it to you because I put it in as a budget request that was taken out, so I thought in full transparency, bringing it to you was the appropriate way to do this even though there's no cost for that first year. But that's why they're all ready to go and they're kind of waiting on us to see if we're jumping on or if they're going to go without us.

Chairman Dumont: No, that's fair, and I really do appreciate the process that you're going through with that. That was just the initial question. Mr. Sorenson?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, so just a couple things. You currently budgeted the IMC for this year and every year thereafter, right?

Chief Cayot: Mm-hmm.

Roy Sorenson: Okay. The budget committee reduced the request to \$1.00. They did not take it out of the FY27 budget. If my memory serves me correctly, and you, Selectman Vurgaropoulos, correct me if I'm wrong, member Walsh mentioned that while they liked the idea of it, they didn't like the cost of it, and I think the Chief's done his due diligence here in trying to spread it out and move it forward. But I think it's important to note that it was reduced to \$1.00. It's still in the budget, and that was, I think, the intent of the budget committee at that time.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, that's what the intent was. Everybody wants it, like I think we all do, and they just were having a hard time finding a way to cut the fat, and unfortunately that's what landed there. But they didn't want to abolish it, so they just dropped it to \$1.00 so that it had a fighting chance in case a miracle arises. So that's where we're at with that.

Chairman Dumont: So, with that, obviously, so the remainder of this year you're able to cover the cost because it's obviously the same. Going forward, how do you plan on covering that cost, you know, figuring for the \$1.00 obviously only being in that line item?

Chief Cayot: Correct. So out of the size of my budget for the year two, I do believe I could find the \$8,619 to cover that second year's cost. Then obviously I would come to you and bring through the budget process again trying to get that additional \$17,000 for that third year.

Chairman Dumont: That's fair. I just wanted to make sure that obviously that wasn't lost on the public where that funding is going to be coming from.

Chief Cayot: Obviously if that was denied and we had signed on to this, I would have to find it somewhere in my budget just because IMC will still be there and we'll still have that information available, but as we move to this, that's where all our new records are going to be going.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah. I mean my view would be once we hit \$28,000, it's just included in your budget. I don't think you would necessarily need to within the guidelines that we give you for that year, right? It would be like next year's budget process. That's the way I look at it. I mean it's \$17,000. I don't want to say only, it's \$17,000, but you would have to manage that either way within your budget request.

Chief Cayot: Yes.

Chairman Dumont: I agree, and I would hope for anybody paying attention I'd like to see maybe a possible amendment made at the deliberative session where we could affect that change a little bit quicker.

Selectman Jacoby: I was thinking the same thing.

Chairman Dumont: That could work.

Selectman Jakoby: To be able to put this back into the budget at the deliberative session. Also, would this then become part of the new default budget moving forward as a contract?

Roy Sorenson: Well, no. Okay. Not for, no, it wouldn't, in fact, it wouldn't be part of it at all.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay.

Roy Sorenson: It'd have to pass this year.

Selectman Jakoby: No, I meant in the future.

Roy Sorenson: As long as the budget that it's in passes. If it's amended on the floor this year and the budget passes, yes.

Selectman Jakoby: Then it becomes part of the, that's what I'm saying, just to clarify.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. Any other questions or comments? No. Motions?

Selectman Guessferd made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to accept the Police Department's recommendation to transition from Central Square IMC to Central Square Pro Suite. Motin carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Do we have any discussion? I just want to add, I do really appreciate the chief continuing to work on this and advocating what's best for the department, hopefully create things more efficient and a benefit to everybody. Thank you.

Chief Cayot: I appreciate the opportunity to bring this back to you.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Absolutely. Thanks for the hard work.

G. Sidewalk Expendable Trust Fund – DDS/Decision

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up, we have the Sidewalk Expendable Trust Fund, and I will recognize Mr. Dhima.

Elvis Dhima: Another denial tonight, probably.

Chairman Dumont: Back in the hot seat.

Elvis Dhima: The way the night is going. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You've been great. I'm just kidding.

Chairman Dumont: You've got everything you wanted.

Elvis Dhima: I'm kidding.

Chairman Dumont: It's all good.

Elvis Dhima: Let me wipe my tears real quick, and then we can start again.

Chairman Dumont: We're going to live in debate.

Elvis Dhima: So, this is another good one, right? So, as you probably know, Mr. Selectman Guessferd can talk to this. There's been a couple cases where the planning board has dealt with development that come with the sidewalks. Sidewalks don't make any sense because they're not connected to anything else. We don't maintain them along the main corridors. So, the question has always become, if you provide relief, we should get something back to basically provide the means for the town to maintain what we already have there. As you all know, we have corridor funds that we basically utilize for new roads, create capacity, capability, safety, things of that sort. But you cannot use that money for repairs, things of that sort. They're very specific. This is basically going to allow us to basically provide the means for a developer that needs relief by the planning board to give some money that's related to the sidewalks for the town to put that money anywhere else along the main corridors to fix sidewalks, repair them, or even equipment related to repairing those things, like a Bobcat that does the snow blowing, things of that sort. So, it went to the planning board. We got feedback from them. It passed 7-0. And basically, it's in front of you for a recommendation to set it up. And basically, the idea is, instead of asking the taxpayers every year \$50,000 for something like this, maybe there's a way where it's a win-win between the town and the developer coming in, and we can basically set this up exactly the same way as we have the main corridors when people put in for the impact fees, and we take them out. The way it will work out is, planning board recommends it to the board of selection for expenditure, and eventually you are the agent that actually does the expenditure, with obviously the staff recommendation. So, public works will be coming in saying we need to fix this segment along Lowell Road. We have X amount available. We'd like to do it. Go to the planning board. They say, yep, it's fine. It's in line to what we established. Board of Selectmen, then they go over it, approves it, and then they go from there. It's a good mechanism. I think it's going to provide a lot of relief moving forward. We haven't built any new sidewalks except the ones that we've done through federal or state projects. We haven't maintained it. There's calls coming in at public works about, hey, there's X, Y, and Z, especially this year now with the frost and the winter we've been having starting so early. So, I think it's going to be time for us to start putting some money into the sidewalks. And where that's going to come from is from the paving program. So, you're going to see a bit of public works dip into the paving because that's basically the piggy bank to do that. If you're okay with that, you can put this off next year. If you're not okay with that, you can move it forward for this ballot. And that's where we're at.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: So, this is in the event that they were saying sidewalks, but it becomes not feasible. Like the corridor fund, it's like kind of another tax on the developer. And it comes in to us as a fund that we can use to repair everything else.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, so basically the way it will work is a developer comes in and they require the planning board to waive basically that sidewalk requirement because it's geometry doesn't work. You know, it's not connected to anything else. And then the planning board ultimately has a final decision to make to do it or not. But then if they don't, if they provide relief, the applicant can say, I'm willing to basically give you up to 50% of the cost of that sidewalk that I want to build to put it in a special fund. It allows the planning board a mechanism to accept this money and pull it into an account. And then if public works comes in and says we can use some of this money that we just got to fix X, Y, and Z segment on Lowell Road, 111 and 102, they come here and then you approve it. But it's a win-win. Right now it's very difficult, and it's been done, but it's very difficult for the planning board, it appears, to justify not doing a sidewalk without getting anything back. Because basically you're removing something that's required without getting anything back. It feels like it's somewhere in the middle where everyone can live with. It has to be reasonable, obviously, so I think the cost will be somewhere between 50% to 75% of that original cost of the sidewalk. It'll be established through a regular engineering estimate that the developer's engineer presents to the staff, and we approve it. And then we recommend it to the planning board. Does that answer the question?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah. No, thank you. It does.

Chairman Dumont: Briefly, I guess I'll say my piece. I agree with everything Mr. Dhima has said and the intent behind it, outside of the fact that I am not in favor of additional fees. I'm sorry to say that only goes down to the end consumer. So, everything that we add ultimately creates a cost and then creates things that drives it up in the long run. While his interpretation of the corridor funds and how they can be used is correct, I'm a firm believer that that's something that should be changed and something to be looked at. I think that those corridor funds should be and be able to be used for maintenance and upkeep as traffic grows, which is what they're for, or as things are utilized more. There's wear and tear and maintenance that comes along with that. I just don't like the idea of adding another fund or another fee onto local development. Outside of that, even if I was to get behind this, I think it's just a little too late in the year. The Budget Committee has already held their meeting on the warrant articles. They've already made their recommendations. I think it's something that we look at for next year.

Selectman Morin: I'm good with the maintenance and all that. My problem is the building of the new sidewalks. And the Budget Committee, not Budget Committee, they're all the same. Planning Board has had a lot of discussion. We need sidewalks, we need sidewalks, but nobody's taken into the fact that the cost that it's going to be to the town. Right now, we have two machines. With what we got, it takes three days. Okay? How are we going to take care of that? And what gets me the most is you got all these sidewalks that are going to be out in different places if they can build them. They're not going to get cleared. The roads are thinner. People are walking on the roads. So where is there a... I think the town needs to make some type of... The residents got to take care of their sidewalks. I mean, a lot of cities do that. You got a shovel in front of your property. And if you don't, then we have to attach some type of monetary fine. Because we keep adding sidewalks, we're going to add personnel. What have we gone through this year for a budget? They don't want personnel. They don't want their taxes going up. So, we're building sidewalks, then they're going to sit there in winter for no reason because nobody's going to be able to walk on them because they won't be cleared. It makes no sense.

Elvis Dhima: And we tell everyone up front about that. We have told the Planning Board. And unless there's a change on the rules, there's nothing we can do about it. We have to live with what we have. But I want everyone to know that only the main corridors, when it comes to sidewalks, are getting plowed, anything adjacent to them. We don't do anything else.

Selectman Morin: But that's my point. Here we are telling people, you got to build a sidewalk. Building a sidewalk you can't use.

Elvis Dhima: But no one is maintaining it. We don't maintain them. We don't plow them. We tell everyone that's adjacent to them, you want to do something, have at it. The biggest concern we have at Public Works and Engineering is if there's a repair needed and some of these developers are getting there.

Selectman Morin: And I agree with that.

Elvis Dhima: We can't even replace. No, but I'm talking about even the ones that you're saying are out. Like the ones on the main corridor is like, fine, we're going to have to address those because there's a lot of traffic. But you still have like a legal obligation because it's within your right of way for the sidewalks that are in the middle of nowhere. So, at some point they're going to say there's a sidewalk there. What, are you going to rip them out? Because you either fix them or you rip them. I'm just saying. Not a bad idea. You know, is that, do we do the grass sidewalk, as they call them now?

Roy Sorenson: Walking path.

Elvis Dhima: The walking path. Anyway, it's becoming a thing, right? I mean, is it cheaper just to rip them out? Loam and seed it? I don't know. But the main thing we're focusing on is the main corridors.

Selectman Morin: And I understand that. But that's my point, though. Why are we charging these guys for sidewalk fees if they're not even going to be able to be used? It makes no sense.

Elvis Dhima: So, we won't charge anyone, and it's not a fee.

Selectman Morin: I said that wrong.

Elvis Dhima: No, no, I totally get it. I just want everyone to know no one is fine, like no one is, the expectations by the current rules we have in place is they're still going to be required to do a sidewalk. But if you can make your case that it doesn't make any sense and you should probably relieve, it gives you a way out without making the planning board saying, like, we just waived \$200,000 worth of requirement. And then that's being used for a good cause, right, fixing other stuff. So, I don't know. I don't make the rules when it comes to planning or zoning for that matter. These are things that have already been in place. That can be brought back either by this Board or another Board to the planning board to discuss. I think ultimately it's their decision, their rules. We have brought this up. We have mentioned it and get it. But some people feel like it's something that brings value to a community or to a neighborhood that's relatively new. I don't know. I don't know what to tell you. I don't have a sidewalk where I live. And I'm okay with it. I walk on the road. But then again, mine is a dead end. So it's a little different than through. I don't know. I don't know what the right answer is. What I'm trying to do is move forward with providing a mechanism for both the town, developer, the planning board, and the Board of Selectmen to see if we can, if something good can come out of this. And I think them taking that equation out.

Chairman Dumont: Let's move on to the next question.

Selectman Jakoby: I have a few thoughts around this. One, I'm not sure that this is actually saying that we're building more sidewalks. It's saying that this fund can be used if we need to fix a sidewalk that's existing.

Elvis Dhima: Maintain it, yes.

Selectman Jakoby: I mean, part of planning is to decide where we have sidewalks, where we need sidewalks, and where we don't need sidewalks. So, it's still, this gives us the opportunity as in your department in planning to plan for where the sidewalk should be. And then this way, if we have a developer or someone that needs a major exception and it makes sense, it gives the planning board a place for them to put some funds. It's not gonna be the total amount. What continues to happen, this has been raised for many years, even before I was elected when I was speaking at planning board meetings about sidewalks and things. The question was, if corridor funds can't be used, we can't recoup any of that. If we could recoup it, where would it go? So, this just establishes a place for it to go. Possibly, depending upon who's on the planning board, no money would ever end up in here. I mean, this doesn't say we are automatically gonna charge any developer any of this. This is just saying that this establishes a location for the money if the planning board comes across a major project where sidewalks don't make sense, but it's a major difference, that it might be a way to resolve something with some funding going towards the community to maintain the current sidewalks. So, I don't see this as adding sidewalks.

Selectman Morin: There's three words right in this thing. It says planning, design, and construction.

Selectman Jakoby: Well, then you can delete that, too.

Selectman Morin: Well, I just wanted to get out to the public that that's what it says.

Selectman Jakoby: Right, but what I just said is that as the planning, as this department, and planning, you would plan for where those sidewalks are, and it's not saying that we're putting in more sidewalks. It says we can.

Chairman Dumont: Hold on, all right. Fair point. I'm gonna bring that back around. One, I've never seen a government entity who's able to charge money not charge money. I'm just gonna throw that out there right now. I don't care at any level. So, where there's a will, there's a way, and trust me, they will charge money, and they will ask for it, and it will increase the cost of development on any level. The way that the ordinances and the planning regulations read right now is typically sidewalks are proposed for new roadways that are built. However, on basic subdivisions, this planning board frequently asks for a 50-foot-wide sidewalk or a 100-foot-wide sidewalk in front of that or right of way for a sidewalk to be built in front of that singular home, which is where this had come up, I would imagine, the majority of the conversation, and I don't think it's right to then say, okay, well, this is something that we want, so we're not getting it away around. I don't know what it is to ask people to offer a monetary value of it to satisfy a vote. So, I can't support this because you could do that with any issue in the town that it has. This year, it's sidewalks. In 10 years, what am I going to say, that I have an issue somewhere? Let's bring up Town Hall. We have an issue with Town Hall. Should I then be going to everybody that comes in front of planning, zoning, conservation, or whatever and say, I don't have ability to get you on this one, but you should allocate some money to this fund over here, and we'll be good to go. I just can't get behind it. I do believe that

any measure to improve the corridors is something that needs to be looked at through our corridor and impact funds, and I understand, and I agree with Mr. Dhima, that it's not worded that way currently. I think that there might be other avenues. I just can't support this. Either way, I definitely can't support it for March.

Selectman Vugaropoulos: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's funny. I'm like on a little roller coaster in my head, right? I was like, oh, that's great, and then I'm like, oh, that's not so great, so I'm going to call myself on the fence at the moment. I like the concept. I like the idea of it, of being able to make repairs with outside of the corridor fund where we're more restricted. What worries me is this becoming an enabling article for the planning board to just wave everything under the sun. That's what worries me. Will it happen? I can't tell. I don't know what they're going to do, but this is exactly that, right? They have a conversation, and they're like, hey, it's good. We need to get this over here. We can just wave that, and it becomes a revenue generator at that point, right? Because now they're waving everything. Do they have the right to wave it? Yes, they have the right to wave it if they can justify it, but I'm a little wary about that.

Elvis Dhima: I think everyone has a very valid point here, and I don't think there's a perfect scenario how you look at this. I think this came about, there was cases at the planning board when even a developer said, I'm willing to put something forward if I get this because I don't think it makes sense. Basically, we don't have the mechanism to accept anything right now.

Chairman Dumont: See, that's my prime example. Okay, so you guys aren't in favor of the project, so I'm willing to offer some money over here to do that. That doesn't sound right to me.

Elvis Dhima: No, no.

Chairman Dumont: I know that your intention is not that. I'm not painting that picture at all, but it just doesn't seem proper. I'm not painting the picture. Mr. Dhima's doing that. What I'm painting the picture of is the fact that if somebody wants to offer it, they can offer a donation to the Town of Hudson if they so choose.

Elvis Dhima: My comment was related to something about the sidewalk being basically waived or taken off. I think it's a disservice to not provide the ability for someone that's basically going to be, probably get relief for a sidewalk because it says, no, we don't see the need for it. We put the sidewalk. I think there's a cost there because just asking for relief doesn't mean you're going to get it. So, I think it has come up. I think it was legit from the planning board. If you guys don't want to support it, if you don't want to support it later, it doesn't matter. But the intention here is to provide a mechanism if someone chooses to go this way. Someone can say, I want to build a sidewalk. Or someone can say, I don't want to build a sidewalk and I'm not willing to pay for any of the relief. You still have the option. It's still a free country. When this came to us, we felt like this was some kind of a middle ground. But if this doesn't go anywhere, it's fine. It doesn't change anything as far as the planning board goes. Just so everyone understands. It doesn't change anything. People still can go in. They can ask for relief if they're not going to get it. But if someone says, I wish we could have had a mechanism, we're going to say, we did, and you didn't go through. That's the end of it. So that's kind of what you're deciding tonight. That's all.

Selectman Morin: I just don't understand because you just said something. Well, I can build a sidewalk or I can't. Well, the focus has been on building sidewalks so people had a place to walk safely. And now we're saying, well, if you give us some money, we'll waive it for you. And I don't like that either. And that's what I'm seeing. And my point is, again, we're building sidewalks that nobody's ever going to be able to walk on in the wintertime. And it's ridiculous.

Elvis Dhima: I think that is for another discussion, I guess, removing the sidewalk.

Selectman Morin: But it's not because it's related to this because it says design, plan, and construction.

Elvis Dhima: Well, design, plan, and construction for a repair. I get it. For a repair, not new. So, for a new construction on 102, I think you can probably use 401.

Selectman Morin: I don't argue with 102 or Lowell Road.

Elvis Dhima: No, I'm just saying you still need to design a plan even when you do repair, depending on what the repair is. So, I think that's what he's referring to.

Selectman Morin: I understand what it refers to. But I've been in this town long enough in politics and dealt with it all my time here. And I know how that works. Oh, it says it now. But later on, oh, you know.

Chairman Dumont: All right, Selectman Jacoby, and then I'm going to ask you about your final comments. We're going to go to motions.

Selectman Jakoby: I think your point is well taken, Chairman Dumont. So, you're saying that if the developer wanted to, they could just make a donation. And then we would set up a new fund or a place for sidewalk money to go. I just want to take that the next step for the public.

Chairman Dumont: Donations go to a specific area, obviously the general fund, if I'm not mistaken. And then it would be up to this Board how to utilize the general fund to offset taxes in future year, which may come from maintenance and upkeep of certain areas. The board has that within their purview. Out of all my years of going through land use, it always seemed more appropriate that if the applicant provides that as a mechanism, that's the better way to do it, instead of the Board providing that as a mechanism.

Selectman Jakoby: Instead of having a specific this warrant, you're saying it's better to just have a direct donation.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, because I think that just like everything else, I think this is just, in my opinion, this is just another fee that will eventually just become the norm, and I'm not in favor of that.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to clarify that, because I think that's a fair point, is that the planning board is saying they don't have a mechanism, and you're saying there is a mechanism. So, I'm just trying to clarify that.

Chairman Dumont: To be clear, it's not a mechanism per se. Anybody has the ability to make a donation to the town of Hudson and to say what they would intend that that go to, and then it would be up to this board as to how that money's utilized. So, I'm not advocating for people just to come in and offer donations in lieu of an approval either. I'm just saying I don't like the idea of creating another process.

Selectman Jakoby: Just to follow up on that, so there have been previous projects where there were donations put into the approval.

Chairman Dumont: Yep.

Selectman Jakoby: So, can't, if this doesn't go through, can't the planning board put in a donation built into the approval like we did for other projects?

Chairman Dumont: My understanding is if that, and this is, I guess, the problem, is anything that's acceptable to the applicant can really be put into the approval I just don't like the idea of someone feeling Obligated. Obligated, yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I can understand why this is, you're against this, and my second question is just that are we past the time or is this even possible to go in tonight for the public to know?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Isn't today the last day?

Roy Sorenson: No, so, because we have more time.

Chairman Dumont: I think we're too far gone, but that's okay.

Roy Sorenson: So yeah, you'd have to put a dollar value on it. You'd have to, so where that money would come from to establish the fund, you'd have to demonstrate that as well.

Selectman Guessferd: Do we have to? Do we have to put money?

Selectman Jakoby: Do we have to put a dollar value on it?

Roy Sorenson: Absolutely. It's an expendable trust fund.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, so it's not just establishing it.

Roy Sorenson: It's a monetary warrant article.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. Well, for that reason alone, I don't want to ...

Roy Sorenson: And then if you do that, then the board would have to vote on it, and then it's got to go back to the budget committee. You'd have to have a public hearing, and all that has to take place before the deliberative.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. Then I also agree with the chairman that it is not timely for us to do this this year.

Chairman Dumont: Do we have any final comments?

Selectman Guessferd: I've been sitting here listening to all the comments, Mr. Chair. All right. And as the planning board hangs on, I figured I would just weigh in a little bit. I don't want to throw fire on this. More wood on the fire here. I don't want to make, I don't want to expand the conversation much longer. Everyone's points are well made. I've sat through too many of these planning board applications where this has come up and where developers have offered, within the current set of rules that are out there, to me it made some sense. I voted for this. It was seven to zero, right, for the planning board. So, I voted for this because I think there's, I think the money can be used for other parts of sidewalks, crosswalks, repair, maintenance. And other places. I do agree, there's a lot of sidewalks to nowhere. And maintaining those sidewalks can be costly. I do think, though, for those, and I don't think we should be forcing developers, you know, strong-arming them. But if they're willing to go ahead and provide some funds in whatever amount, in my mind, okay, let's take those funds and let's use them for something productive. Taking the ability to have to take money out of, for example, the paving budget. Instead, we've got a place to pull money from that we can use for those purposes and not more stress the paving budget and the DPW budget. So, I mean, we can debate it and argue it probably for the next three or four hours, I don't care. But that's my opinion. These are my opinions. I'm going to vote for this. If we have a motion and a second. I mean, because I think it's something that's worthwhile. It's certainly not a perfect solution. I agree. But the other points are well taken. That's where I'm standing on this.

Chairman Dumont: All right, so everybody's had a chance to make motions. I'd like to move this thing forward one way or the other. So, do we have a motion?

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, not to forward the motion to move the Sidewalk Expendable Trust Fund as a warrant article to the March 2026 ballot, as recommended by the Development Services Director, the Director of Public Works, and the Planning Board. Motion carried, 4-1. Guessferd opposing.

Selectman Morin: This isn't your usual night.

Chairman Dumont: He got lucky too many times in a row.

Elvis Dhima: Just so we're talking about this, this was something that came up because it appeared from planning of board members there was a need for it, so it wasn't from staff. It was a lot of effort put into this, and it's feeling like a waste of time now. But either way, we'll bring it back. It's done. It's over, and there's no other way to go back to this.

Selectman Guessferd: So, let's move forward.

Chairman Dumont: Next.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Just real quick. I wouldn't say it's a waste of time. What I would like to see is bring it back, but it needs to be reworked, like just a little more definition in some areas, a little more clarity. I will not, but the planning board can. No, I'm not saying you, but I'm saying the Warren article, which was presented, could use some TLC.

Selectman Jakoby: And then plenty of time for it to go through the proper process.

H. Land Purchase for Hudson Conservation Commission – DDS/Decision

Chairman Dumont: All right. So, we're moving on to item H, Land Purchase for Hudson Conservation Commission. Mr. Dhima, this should be hopefully an easier one for you.

Elvis Dhima: We'll see. So, this one was a nice partnership, if you want to call it that, between a developer and the town and the Conservation Commission. It was basically an opportunity to carve out about 15 acres that can

now be utilized. It's adjacent to Rangers Drive Forest, which is nice. And basically, the developer went back and forth on what they thought they can get away, like what did you get out of the 15 acres. The Conservation Commission was very interested. He went through the process. It's ready to go. We were waiting for some testing out there on Barrett's Hill. Everything came out good. We're going through the deed search right now. So, if it gets approved tonight, we can move forward with closing this. The nice thing about this one is it's a nice piece of state-owned property that goes from Barrett's Hill to the back. And the developer created an easement for us to basically cut through to this property we're going to purchase tonight, hopefully. And that creates a connection from Rangers Drive all the way down to Barrett's Hill, which is nice, and all the way through. There's a power line going through there, which doesn't really matter to us. But the nice thing about this is it's going to be adjacent to an existing conservation facility already. It comes, obviously, recommended by the Conservation Commission and myself. It's ready to go. So, the way it works is it's their own money. It doesn't impact the taxpayer. And for purchasing of land, they need your green light. So that's why we're here tonight, to ask to basically approve this purchase and we can move forward and authorize Mr. Sorensen to sign off on any paperwork. That's probably due by the end of the month.

Chairman Dumont: The only question that I had was concerning the \$2,500 for closing fees. How did you come to that dollar amount?

Elvis Dhima: I just put it in there flat because I think our attorneys are going to have a fee. So, I don't know what the closing fees are, but our attorneys are working, obviously, on doing the paperwork. So usually that's about \$1,000 to \$1,500. So, I just put it out there.

Chairman Dumont: That's all right. Go ahead.

Elvis Dhima: Basically, what that means is that if there's any closing fee, I don't want anyone to think that we're paying for it. There's still going to be conservation paying out of it. So, I just put that flat fee in there because I didn't want to be like any of the other closing fees without giving you an idea. In the past, it's kind of along those lines. It could be a little higher or less. I don't know. It's usually at the very end. But it's coming out of the Conservation Commission.

Chairman Dumont: And the only reason why I ask is because I didn't know if, due to, obviously, the amount, it seems like obviously there was a good deal in discounting that for the town of Hudson with the amount of land that's there. I didn't know if we were covering some of the closing costs for the seller. Obviously, it's our attorney drafting everything up.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah. I would just say attorney fees and that's about it.

Chairman Dumont: You probably have your transfer of state, your transfer of tax.

Elvis Dhima: Yeah, deed research, making sure there's nothing in the deed, things of that sort. So, I feel like it will probably be around \$1,500, but I just don't want to get approval and come back later and be like, I didn't love the tax.

Chairman Dumont: Oh, that's kind of exactly what I'm asking. I didn't know if you thought that would be enough when you're figuring in the state tax and records and attorney.

Elvis Dhima: If it's a little bit more, it's okay. If you think it's adequate to go up to \$3,000 or \$4,000, it's fine. It doesn't matter. That's why I have it up to that.

Chairman Dumont: You've dealt with the town attorney on that more than I have, so I just wanted to throw it out there.

Selectman Guessferd: That's all. Yeah. You just negotiate with them. If it looks like it's going to be more, just tell them \$2,500. That's it.

Elvis Dhima: We're done. And you'd be like, do it yourself, Elvis. See how good you are.

Selectman Guessferd: I'll just check.

Elvis Dhima: Come on.

Selectman Guessferd: Use your skills, man.

Elvis Dhima: I know, right?

Selectman Guessferd: You're a silver-tongued devil.

Elvis Dhima: If it's something minor, I think the biggest thing is the cost of the land. I think if it's any soft cost beyond \$2,500, I'm in a conservation commission approval at that point, so I think we'll go with that.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to approve the purchase of MAP 159, Lot 28, consisting of approximately 15 acres, for an amount not to exceed \$90,000 and up to \$2,500 for closing fees, utilizing funds from the Conservation Commission Cash Flow Account, 20-3916-2701-000-753, as recommended by the Conservation Commission and the Development Services Director. Further to authorize the Town Administrator to sign all documents necessary to complete the purchase. Motion carried, 5-0.

Selectman Jakoby: I just want to say this is excellent, and I appreciate the Conservation Commission and all your work on making this happen.

Elvis Dhima: I think it was a good deal.

Selectman Jakoby: And the planning board as well.

Elvis Dhima: It was a good deal. I think it was one of those nice beautiful relationships between everybody.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, it said planning board did a subdivision?

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, did we? Oh, that's right, we did. They brought it to us. Yeah. Okay. It was quick.

Elvis Dhima: It's was nice. It was a good addition. Thank you, guys. Have a great night.

I. Policy Sub-Committee – Administration/Decision

Chairman Dumont: Next up, we have the Policy Sub-Committee. I will turn it over to Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, item 8-I, I believe. Yep. H-I. We're only on I. I feel like we've been here. We should be on like.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Well, we got the whole alphabet tonight.

Roy Sorenson: But anyways, we have two policies here that we had previously brought to the Board. This will be a second read. I'll walk through them. The first one, and these are in your packet. I will say that the second item, which we're calling policy HCM 001, you have separately because we missed one area on that. And when we get to that, I'll let Director Johnson talk about that. All right. So, we have policy, and then just Roman Noble policy V117L, earn time. This will be the second read. I just want to point out that the committee since looked at this again, and I don't think the Board is going to have any issues with this, but if you go to page three of that policy, the red on the bottom is something that the Board adopted when we discussed it for the first read. The red at the top, which would be the third paragraph down, is language we added because I believe this discussion has come up numerous times regarding the two-week notice for your earn time when an employee either resigns, is terminated, or leaves, or whatever it might be that displaces their employment. So that language you can see in red if you would want to discuss that, we're open to do that. Other than that, I would say myself, Selectman Jacoby, and Selectman Vurgaropoulos can address any concerns.

Chairman Dumont: My only question is, and so I get the check is withheld. My initial concern was, well, would there be enough? But I guess if it's for 40 hours, the check would be paid out for 40 hours.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah. So, we looked at that. It should cover the difference. Yep.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Any other questions, comments? Motion?

Selectman Jakoby made a motion seconded by selectman Vurgaropoulos, for the Board of Selectmen to hereby adopt policy VII-L, Earned Time, upon the second reading as recommended by the Policy Subcommittee. Motion carried 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: Any discussion?

Selectman Guessferd: Additional comment.

Chairman Dumont: Go ahead.

Selectman Guessferd: Did you want to say something? Or, do you want me to? Today we got an e-mail. I got an e-mail.

Mike Campbell: That's for the next policy.

Selectman Guessferd: Oh, okay. This is for the earned.

Chairman Dumont: This is just earned time.

Selectman Guessferd: Just earned. I thought we were doing both.

Chairman Dumont: No, no.

Selectman Guessferd: I'm good.

Chairman Dumont: I'll let Mr. Sorensen touch on this one as well, and then I'll give it to Selectman.

Roy Sorenson: Second item, this is a new policy. This was brought to your attention previously by Selectman Johnson. Hey, I'm making you a Selectman.

Mike Johnson: I got a new job. Let's go.

Selectman Morin: Yeah, it pays a lot better, too.

Roy Sorenson: Director Johnson at the November 10th, 2025 meeting relates to the underwriting policy and how this will help support the financial aspects of some of the struggles he's having now. As I mentioned, this came separately, so do not look at the one that's in the packet. And I will turn it over to Mr. Johnson for any questions.

Mike Johnson: Perfect. All right. So good evening, everybody. We're back here tonight for the second read of our underwriting policy. As many of you know, this has gone through our Cable Utility Advisory Committee. And Mike Campbell might be a better person to speak on this, but it went to the school district for legal advice and how it pertains just to school district broadcast, not to the broad policy. And then it went to this Board and the policy subcommittee. Some revisions we made at the policy subcommittee level the last time. We changed the timeline. So initially I had proposed January through December. It's now in the fiscal year, so you're going from July to June. If a business, we also added on the underwriting timeline, if a business starts after the start of the fiscal year, we're going to discount that rate. So, it's in writing in that aspect. I'd be happy to take any questions about any of the work we did in developing the policy.

Chairman Dumont: Questions, comments from the Board? Selectman Guessferd did you have something to add?

Selectman Guessferd: On this one? Would you mind if our school board rep had a mention?

Mike Campbell: Yesterday at the Cable Committee we were discussing the additional guidelines. It says sponsorships that promote drugs, gambling, alcohol, tobacco, or firearms are prohibited. There was some discussion about firearms. Director Johnson reached out to the school board, the school district. We mentioned that we wouldn't feel comfortable with firearms being an underwriting of school events. We went out to our legal team. There was discussion about how the uniforms policy doesn't allow certain items in schools. So, we thought we would be uncomfortable with that. We just suggested that underwriting for school-related items, we wouldn't feel comfortable with that. We had a vote. We didn't want to regulate any other underwriting. And I just wanted to make that clear, that we were just saying in school-related items. When you see, like, sporting teams, it's the same policy. So, we just wanted to say that we didn't want to influence any other, like, underwriting.

Selectman Guessferd: But at the same time, I think it was, I think Chair Dionne made the comment that she didn't want also to say that they had requested, you know, this. They had requested that firearms be eliminated. I guess they just want to make sure that they're clear on that. So, and not that it's a problem. But they didn't actually

make a request. They just said they wanted to be consistent with policy, that's all. With school policy, that's all. And she just wanted to make sure that we said something at the meeting tonight to reflect that. That's all.

Chairman Dumont: So, there's no formal position from the school board then?

Selectman Guessferd: No, no formal position, no.

Mike Campbell: For school-related, we took a vote for school-related underwriting. We requested, as with our policy, with other...

Selectman Guessferd: School policies.

Mike Campbell: Yeah, school policies, I guess it would be, that we request to not have firearms. But it's the same as drugs, gambling, alcohol. We wouldn't have advertising, like, graduation's not brought to you by Draft Kings. It's that sort of situation.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, I just, it's just a note. It's all it is, it's just a note. All right.

Roy Sorenson: So real quick. The policy states that it's prohibited. Did you, what, are we backing up to the HCTV or Cable Utility Committee meeting?

Mike Johnson: Yeah, so let me back up a little bit further. So, I took this to the Cable Utility Advisory Committee first. Those regulations I took based off of other stations' underwriting policies just around the country. The firearms was the big topic of contention from our board. At that meeting, it was decided upon that we would reach out to the school district and the school board for their opinion, and we would essentially go with that. Now, the rationale behind keeping it as the overall policy, that's something that would be on our end, not the school district or the school board. And I do want to thank the school board for their work on this with us. It can be tough where theoretically you could have this, but then a lot of our broadcasting is school district broadcasting. So, I think it makes sense to keep it under that blanket still. That being said, it is something we could potentially revisit when we do look at this again for another read with the board.

Roy Sorenson: So, the policy states right now that it is prohibited.

Mike Johnson: Yes.

Roy Sorenson: That's what the Board's looking at tonight, notwithstanding what the school said or did.

Selectman Guessferd: Right, notwithstanding that, yeah. It wasn't their request to put it in. It was already in.

Chairman Dumont: So, I'm going to go back to raising hands, Selectman Vurgaropoulos, Selectman Jakoby, and then Selectman Guessferd if he has anything else to add.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Yeah, I just want to say thank you for the follow-up on that because I was at that meeting with Mike, and it was a topic of discussion. I would have liked to have seen it changed a little bit to accommodate that. Like I said, it's going to be fractional because the big portion of it is school. But maybe next time we revisit it.

Selectman Jakoby: I commend you on making the statement so that it is easier for you to manage, so that this is consistent with the school, so that anything that's being underwritten can fulfill both sides. So, I think for a starting of a program, this makes sense to keep it consistent and to have it be more simple in its implementation. And it can always be revisited.

Mike Johnson: I think that's the main thing with the underwriting policy. It's going to be a living, breathing thing as the years go on with us. So, we'll keep developing it. Like I said, I really appreciated the input from the Cable Utility Advisory Committee, the school board, and everyone who was involved, policy subcommittee.

Chairman Dumont: So, I guess I'm going to be the one to throw a wrench at it. I don't have a problem with – Granite State Gun Range, we'll use them as an example, because the first one that comes to mind is a local business in the town of Hudson. I don't see why they should be prohibited from being able to advertise. An advertisement is not conducive of condoning any type of specific behavior whatsoever. And I don't think that we can hide things from people and just pretend like they're not there. That's my first takeoff. The other ones, I

mean, obviously, especially drugs and tobacco, that's been prohibited for advertising for obviously a significant amount of time.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Thank you, Chairman. I don't disagree with you. I agree with, like, you can put whatever you want in the dark, but it's still going to be there. But I don't disagree with, okay, this is a good starting point. I would definitely like to revisit that. I wanted to make one correction. We have to be careful when we talk about this policy. It's not advertisement. There's no legal advertisement on HGTV.

Chairman Dumont: It's underwriting. It's underwriting. Which actually kind of makes me feel even stronger about what I said.

Selectman Jakoby: I'm just going to make one other comment. I think as we're better able to define your programming and what opportunities you would have that aren't school-related, because it's a big number of views that you're committing to, and if the school can't be one of those views, then you still have to fulfill that number. And I'm not sure how, if that's, you have the ability to do that currently. So that was my other reason for thinking this is a good starting point. Because if you can't do it for the school, then where would all those things go? Well, it would underwrite our meetings.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I would think so. Ultimately, obviously, HGTV's policy is within the Board of Selectmen's purview.

Selectman Jakoby: So, we could change it now.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, let's start with this. It's late enough. What else?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Just got one comment. Mike, what I would do as we kick this off, we're talking about do it a different way you could do it. Maybe this, beginning of this policy, you keep a separate documentation of the viewership and the type of media. Because you've got to think about it, when we're talking about the last hike, why can't you say thank you? It's outdoorsy, it's in that same vein. You know what I mean? But maybe grabbing those data points, so that when we bring it back next year, we can really look at it, and see what your opportunities were. And the opportunity will still be there, but maybe if we rewrite it, or we do the tiers, or something like that, you can define what they're going to be getting a little more better.

Mike Johnson: Absolutely, absolutely. And a lot of, you know, obviously this is kind of geared towards live events. We do a lot of stuff that we record that gets a lot of views, like our news program, Hudson Happenings. That's content that gets a lot of engagement. So that will all be included in this, absolutely.

Chairman Dumont: Anything that I'll add to that is obviously underwriting. I would just, anybody, including the school board, I would think that, just to take it into consideration, that it might be wise to advocate for education under businesses that promote safety, rather than ignore it.

Selectman Jakoby: Right.

Chairman Dumont: But, with that, I will end my rant. Motions, comments, questions?

Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, that the Board of Selection hereby adopts Policy HCM-001, Community Media Underwriting Policy, upon this second reading, as recommended by the Policy Sub-Committee. Motion carried, 5-0.

Chairman Dumont: All right. Thank you, everyone, very much.

Roy Sorenson: Thanks, Mike.

J. Warrant Article Speaker Designation – Administration/Discussion

Chairman Dumont: All right. Next up, we have Warrant Article Speaker Designation. All right. Turn it over to Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Item 8J, you'll see it in your packet. Myself and the Chair met, which is typical of what you've done every year, and kind of assigned, I guess, the warrant articles. They're open for discussion.

You'll see on the left-hand side, the green check means that the Budget Committee voted in favor. The red X means they did not. As I mentioned, you see the names in the place per the warrant articles. And with that, I'll turn it over to the Board for discussion.

Chairman Dumont: So quickly, there was an odd number here, and I felt as though it was best to obviously try to make sure that they were evened out as much as possible. I believe it looks like everybody is ending up with three. I will say the reason why you see myself only on two of them is I took myself off of one of the police hires, which I voted in opposition. And I'm trying to find that one.

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, the prosecutor. Number five.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, number five. And I put in Selectman Vurgaropoulos, who voted in the affirmative. I just thought it would look better in the public eye to have somebody present that, that voted in favor of it.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: So, this is the presentation at the deliberative session, correct? Yeah, so what you'll do is step up, read it out, and then correct.

Chairman Dumont: Correct. We'll have the warrant articles typed out for you, as we've done in the past. You'll get a little packet, and you'll get up as the number is called and introduce it to the public.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: All right.

Selectman Guessford: Yeah, it's pretty ...

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I just haven't done it. I just want to make sure.

Selectman Guessford: Yeah, yeah, it's pretty straightforward.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Get up, read the article, sit back down.

Selectman Guessford: Then you'll get attacked.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: If they have questions, sit back up.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, yeah, I mean, most likely questions will be answered by department heads. If you have insight to that, obviously, you're more than welcome to speak to it.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: So, it's pretty much just reading the article.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, for the most part. I mean, you can speak to the conversations we had, information.

Roy Sorenson: So, one of the things we'll do, too, is what we did similarly with the Budget Committee, is we'll have the actual warrant article language, and we'll have the background. And we'll put that up as well. That should hit on everything. But then, yeah, I think, as the Chair mentioned, if it's a technical ask of whatever the project might be, that would be the department heads the best answer to that.

Chairman Dumont: Is everybody good? All right, I don't think we need a motion for that one. We'll just move on.

K. Designation of Selectman to Post Town Warrant – Administration/Decision

Chairman Dumont: Next up will be the designation of Selectman to post a town warrant. I will turn it over to Mr. Sorenson. But really quickly, I did hear somebody already volunteer for that earlier.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, I was just going to make a motion.

Chairman Dumont: Speed it right up. Go ahead.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to designate Selectman Guessford to post the Fiscal Year 2027 Town Warrant and budget on or before Monday, January 26, 2026. Motion carried, 5-0.

L. Petition Warrant Article: Planning Board – Elected to Appointed – Administration/Decision

Chairman Dumont: All right, next up we have our petition warrant article from the planning board. Moving the petition moves it from an elected to an appointed position. And I will turn it over to Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: So, this is a, we've received, I believe, four petition warrant articles. This is one of them. And this is to move that the members of the planning board to be appointed versus elected as they currently are now. There's two motions in here for the Board to vote on, whether you're in favor or not in favor. And, again, I will leave it to the Board for discussion.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Okay, I'm not in favor of this. Basically, I feel like this is, I have a lot of opinions about it, but I'm just going to keep it simple. I feel like this is taking away the rights of the residents to vote for who they want in office. That's my simple answer.

Selectman Guessferd: There's positives and negatives to this, right? On one hand, yeah, you're giving the citizens the right. On the other hand, I think the argument that's been made before, I think, was it three years ago we changed it over? Something like that, three or four years ago?

Selectman Jakoby: It passed.

Selectman Guessferd: And it passed. The idea before was this takes a certain skill set. And that's one thing, right? So that would give us some ability to put people in place that have that certain skill set. On the other side, on that side as well, is that you could also say actually the opposite argument would be, well, we don't want to be stacking the board, right? Appointing people depending upon where a board is. And there's all kinds of arguments, positive and negative. Quite frankly, I'm kind of on the fence on this one. I'd like to see the citizens decide in the end. I was thinking maybe being on the board, being the board rep myself, maybe to abstain, but I'll probably take a stand one way or the other. There's arguments on both sides of this that are worthy to think about. There's good points on both sides.

Selectman Jakoby: So, this is going forward no matter what because it's a warrant article.

Selectman Guessferd: Right.

Selectman Jakoby: So, it's just a matter of whether the words say we support it.

Chairman Dumont: Right.

Selectman Jakoby: It's going to be a split vote probably.

Chairman Dumont: It'll be a recommendation or it's not a recommendation.

Selectman Jakoby: Okay. We don't usually do it one way or the other. Okay. Just checking because it's really just semantics on what's going to show up on the ballot.

Chairman Dumont: There is a bill this year that will actually change that way. It will give both options. It won't just list you on either side, but that's not enacted yet.

Selectman Jakoby: Oh, that's cool.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: I like that better.

Chairman Dumont: There's also a bill that removes the recommendation.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I was going to say there's a whole other bill.

Chairman Dumont: That's a whole other question.

Selectman Jakoby: Either of those would be helpful. So, it's really a question of whether I would want to do the motion to not recommend, but if the majority are recommending, I'd just rather know if it's 3-2 or whatever that we do it based on that personally.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah. I'll just give my quick two cents, which is I was opposed in the beginning. I came on the planning board 10 years ago as an appointed member. I also was the first elected member of the planning board. I've run through both processes. I just firmly believe that I'm not a fan of land-use boards, quasi-judicial boards being elected at this level. The reason why is not necessarily the voters, it's the politicizing that happens around it. I think that you need a very level-headed, unbiased mindset that is tied to the regulations, not necessarily to some speech that you've given. While everybody is more than welcome to say their piece, those boards in particular have a hard time. You look at the Board of Selectmen, people are looking specifically for our opinion. It's just a different animal in my view.

Selectman Jakoby: My opinion is that it should be an elected position. I was fully part of the petition warrant that originally changed it, so my position is there. I don't need to explain it. Like I said, if we're three to recommend and two not to, that's why I don't want to make the motion to not recommend.

Chairman Dumont: I would suggest make a motion. We'll know a lot quicker.

Selectman Jakoby: All right. I'll make a motion. I'll make a motion. I'll make a motion to not recommend the petition warrant article to adopt the provision of RSA 4014-B to delegate the determination of the... No, that's the wrong one. I have the wrong one. I'm going to read it again.

Selectman Guessferd: That's all right.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to not recommend the petition warrant article 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. Motion failed, 2-3. Dumont, Guessferd and Morin opposed.

Chairman Dumont: So, the motion fails. The prevailing motion now, someone would need that to read that into the record. It's how I would do it. I guess you could interpret that as it just automatically goes to recommended, but I think it would be more appropriate to do a motion.

Selectman Jakoby: You have to do a motion.

Chairman Dumont: I've seen votes go both ways, but I agree with that stance.

Selectman Jakoby: I would prefer it.

Chairman Dumont: So, that motion failed. Do we have a motion to recommend on the floor? The motion would be to recommend the petition warrant article to see if the town will vote to amend the methods of selection for planning board members by changing planning board positions from elected to appointed.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Chairman Dumont, for the Board of Selectmen to recommend the petition warrant article 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. Motion carried, 3-2. Jakoby and Vurgaropoulos opposed.

Chairman Dumont: All right, moving on.

M. Petition Warrant Article: Default Budget – Budget Committee Delegation – Administration/Decision

Roy Sorenson: Okay, next is a citizen's petition regarding the default budget, and this is to delegate the determination of the default budget to the Municipal Budget Committee, and this would be adopted under RSA, actually, I'm sorry, RSA 40-14B.

Chairman Dumont: All right, I'll speak. I think the process that we have now is working. I understand the aggravation behind taxes. Like anybody, we all live here, we all feel it, but I think that the Budget Committee in control of both of these articles can possibly be a little self-serving. All right, that was my two cents.

Selectman Jakoby: I want to say that I support this going to the citizens because I believe that whether the Budget Committee does it or we do it, it should still be the same number, so I would like to know what the citizens decide, so I would be in support of this going forward.

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to not recommend the petition warrant article to 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. Motion carried, 3-2. Jakoby and Vurgaropoulos opposed.

Motion to not recommend the petition warrant article to adopt provisions of RSA 40-14B to delegate the determination of the default budget to the Municipal Budget Committee, which has been adopted under RSA 32-14.

Chairman Dumont: And point of clarification, correct me if I'm wrong, but this is obviously only pertaining to the town side. The school board will be taking up theirs as well?

Mike Campbell: The school board has already voted on it.

N. Petition Warrant Article: Supervisors of the Checklist – Term Length Change – Administration/Decision

Roy Sorenson: So, item 8N, this is a petition warrant article, Supervisors of the Checklist to change their term length. Currently it is six years. This would be to move it to three years, and I've had discussions with the Supervisors of the Checklist who are doing a great job. I think obviously six years is daunting to anyone that wants to sign up for anything, so I think this will actually help. We don't have an issue now. We actually have a great group that's there, but perhaps into the future as well.

Chairman Dumont: I agree, and as you all remember, they gave a position on that, and I couldn't agree more. Mr. Campbell, did you have something to add?

Mike Campbell: Yeah, I was just wondering, all the positions I know of are mostly three years, right? Is this the only one that's...

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, so state legislation actually had it pegged out for six years, and there was an amendment to that legislation either last year or the year prior that allowed for this to change to the three year, and the argument at the state house was made almost identical, was that it's hard to find volunteers now, let alone tell someone they have to commit for six years.

Mike Campbell: Everything else in the town seems like three.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I think that three is definitely more appropriate.

Mike Campbell: Sorry, that's what I would have just asked in two weeks on Saturday.

Selectman Guessferd: There you go. Saves a question.

Roy Sorenson: So, this came in late, so it's 8N. And if one of the Board members wants to entertain the motion, it's going to be, if you go to page two, you'll see it in the blue box. That's where you'll find the motion.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I think my ears were hearing something different while I was looking for something, and I was like, what am I looking for?

Chairman Dumont: Why don't you, you want to read that motion into the record, Mr. Sorenson?

Roy Sorenson: Yeah, so this would be, this is Petition Warren article to, for a new term length to Supervisors of the Checklist, to adopt a three-year term for supervisors of the checklist, electing one each year over a three-year cycle.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Morin, for a new term length to Supervisors of the Checklist, to adopt a three-year term for Supervisors of the Checklist, electing one each year over a three-year cycle. Motion carried, 5-0.

O. Petition Warrant Article: Protecting the Taxpayer – Administration/Decision

Chairman Dumont: All right, next up is the petition warrant article Protecting the Taxpayer, Mr. Sorenson.

Roy Sorenson: 80, Protecting the Taxpayer. The motion would read as follows. And, I'm sorry, do we call on the 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? You can kind of see there's an explanation underneath that would probably offer you more guidance than I could on this one. And I'll turn it over to the Board.

Chairman Dumont: Basically, this is a resolution of the Board. I'm calling on the Board of Selectman to offer a resolution, which is just a formal statement, kind of similar to what we did earlier on different legislation, affirming a position. That's all it does.

Selectman Jakoby: So, it moves it forward, and then if it passes, we make a statement? Is it advisory?

Chairman Dumont: It's just advisory, right? That's all it is. It's advisory.

Selectman Jakoby: Yeah, okay.

Chairman Dumont: It's asking us to make a formal statement of, in their opinion, ensuring adequate state revenues for essential services by avoiding policies that shift costs onto local taxpayers. Where's the will of the Board? Motions, comments, questions?

Selectman Guessford: I don't know what to think.

Selectman Jakoby: Everybody's still looking at it.

Selectman Guessford: So, reading it and digesting it. I read it earlier, and I, yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: I think that's what I ask my elected officials to do regularly.

Chairman Dumont: I would agree, yeah.

Selectman Jakoby: So, I don't have any issue with it.

Chairman Dumont: Yeah, I don't. It's very broad in the fact that, yeah, I would agree. I don't think anybody wants costs shifted down onto their tax.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to recommend the petition warrant article titled Protecting the Taxpayer. Motion carried, 5-0.

Roy Sorenson: Place as many calls as you can to your state reps and let them know how you feel.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: Dillon, I'm calling you later.

Chairman Dumont: Feel free. Anytime you want.

Selectman Guessford: Send them an email.

P. Petition Warrant Article Placeholder – Administrator/Decision

Chairman Dumont: All right, so we had a placeholder. I don't believe we needed it. So, with that, we are moving on to selecting liaison reports, and I will turn it over to Selectman Vurgaropoulos.

9. SELECTMEN LIAISON REPORTS/OTHER REMARKS

Selectman Vurgaropoulos: I don't got much. You know, we've been real busy trying to wrap up this budget stuff, so that's still in motion. Hopefully we get a good budget out of this and the voters approve it. Working with from the Cable Committee, we've been working with HGTV, Mike Johnson, to sort of find the policy that we just did tonight, and that's pretty much all I got going on.

Selectman Morin: ConCom met last night. It's their first meeting of the year. Basically, they spent almost all the meeting putting together a work plan for the year, what they were going to do with all the conservation areas in town. The second thing I got, do we have a status of the furnace over there at Hills Library? Because the school board had to meet in their building, and I noticed the library committee doesn't meet in their own building anymore.

Roy Sorenson: Yep, so I can answer that question. So, it wasn't necessarily the furnaces. It was the oil tank. The oil fill is on the outside, as you know. Unfortunately, the fill cap was destroyed, and that was earlier in the year. Subsequent to that, the oil company, I won't mention who they are, did not refill the oil tank, so therefore the sludge at the bottom of the tank was brought into the furnace, hence rendering the furnace useless, no heat. We've since done some work. I've worked with the library on this to, A, identify to make sure, well, number one, we're going to change the oil provider. That's number one. Number two, DPW secured the area so that doesn't happen again. And number three, I believe the heat should be back on. One of the things we did have to look at, though, was do a tank inspection as well because no one's going to come out. A new provider will not come out unless it's passed, and then we'll have a better solution in the spring to make sure that the plows don't get it again. So, I believe the heat's back on, but I'm pretty confident that it is at this point.

Selectman Jakoby: I just wanted to let everyone know that this is the 100th anniversary year for Benson Park being open. They're using the year of 1926 as its beginning, so you'll hear much more about a number of events from the Benson Park Committee as well as the Friends of Benson Park. So, there'll be celebrations and things. Sustainability Committee did do their Christmas Lake collection, and I know that at our next meeting we should have the charter to be reviewed from sustainability. I also just wanted to comment. As many people know, I was the original sponsor of the warrant article requesting public input at all meetings. I do want to thank the planning board for allowing public input for three months. I was just very disappointed that they decided not to continue with public input at the planning board. I wanted to let the public know that if you have public input for the planning board that you're not able to give there, as I did previously, you can always come here as there is a liaison present here to hear your comments. So, I just want to circle that around. So, thank you.

Selectman Guessferd: Yeah, the planning board is actually going to be meeting tomorrow night. I do hope the heat is on over because I think we're actually going to be meeting in a larger room. You're over there tomorrow? I believe so. Check the website, but we have three cases tomorrow night, and all of them are relatively, you know, there's public interest from butters and folks. So, we expect to have a little larger crowd. We want to make sure we don't exceed room standards, so we will be doing that tomorrow night. One thing I do want to make clear, I made the same comment last week at the planning board meeting. I think we need to clarify public input is part of the planning board. It's not general public input, but it's public input on each application is encouraged and allowed. So, I just want to make sure that that's very clear.

Selectman Jakoby: Can you just clarify? It's a public hearing on each plan.

Selectman Guessferd: And it's input.

Selectman Jakoby: Yes, but it's a public hearing versus general public input.

Selectman Guessferd: Right.

Selectman Jakoby: I just want people to know that it is a public hearing.

Selectman Guessferd: Right, but I also want them to understand that when somebody says public input isn't allowed, that's not the case. It's a public hearing, yes.

Chairman Dumont: We're not doing a back-and-forth Selectman Guessferd, this is your time.

Selectman Guessferd: I just wanted to make that comment. So, it's out there as well as your comments, Selectman Jakoby. Rec department, there's a couple things on the rec. So there's a new basketball league for 19 to 30-year-olds because we have the senior league and we have the kids leagues. So, they decided to fill in the gap. It's the first year. It was such popular registration and it filled up in 48 hours. The season's going to begin in February, so stay tuned for that. Comedy show, we now have another comedy show scheduled for the 21st of February. So, get your tickets because they go fast. And the only other thing, library, really wasn't much. At the

December meeting, they held their holiday gatherings and thanked the employees. It was nice to actually stop by there. It was a nice little get-together there. There really hasn't been anything more. I know we are going to engage in more discussions on the library, on the Hills building. And beyond that, I think that's about all I got. Thank you very much.

Chairman Dumont: Mine's relatively simple outside of normal day-to-day stuff here with Mr. Sorenson. I was attending the ZBA training that was offered from New Hampshire Municipal Association at last Thursday's meeting. It's extremely informative. It was recorded, I would ask people who are not familiar with the process to take a look at it. Potential newcomers, if anybody's interested in volunteering, also worthwhile training session. And a good, healthy amount of information on RSA, the Right-to-Know law, 91A, which covers pretty much just every board, not only the zoning. Very informative. Very happy that they offered their time to come here. And we get that as being part of the New Hampshire Municipal Association. So, I just wanted to put that out there. That's all that I have. I'll turn it over to Mr. Sorenson.

10. REMARKS BY TOWN ADMINISTRATOR

Roy Sorenson: What item are we on?

Chairman Dumont: Remember the furnace?

Roy Sorenson: Getting late. Well, speaking of – well, I can't say. But Santa did a really good job this Christmas and holiday season. I thought – I think in general, everything this town does for the standpoint to support the community during the holiday season is fantastic, particularly around the Christmas season. Here's myself. Here's Roger telling me how much he misses Steve. And we had a good day there. And I did not know this, but apparently Chief Cahill has a fan club over at the Senior Center. Director Twardosky will be in for the next meeting. I'm going to have him come in and do a winter operations update, as I think everybody here knows. Not surprised. It's been a busy winter season, a lot of pesky storms, long-duration storms, ice storms, which seems to be the trend these days. So, I asked him to put together a presentation. He'll be in here in two weeks. The fire department, the work over at Central Fire is well underway. You can see the new floor drains are in place. They still have to seal the floors with epoxy sealant. They're going to wait, obviously, for the weather on that. And then you can see some of the HVAC work that's done. This is still ongoing. It's not complete yet, but talking to Deputy Chief Paquette, to date the work has been done professionally, and they're happy with what they've seen so far. Speaking of Director Johnson, who was here earlier tonight, we talked about this at the last meeting. This is a recognition for his group for several awards that they won at the Alliance for Community Media Northeast Northeaster Awards. You can kind of see they had two first-place awards, two third-place awards, and obviously they did some of this with the Historical Society as well and the Alvern JROTC program as well. So, congrats to them. They still received some awards, despite the fact that the Development Services Director was in one of those, and they were still able to secure that. So good for them. This was interesting. We got a call regarding the Boston Post Cane, and we chatted with Laurie Saad. You can see her standing next to the chairman here. She mentioned that her dad was turning 100 and was asking about that, and while he didn't qualify necessarily for that, we said, hey, this is a special occasion. Why don't you bring him in, and we'll certainly honor him because anyone that gets to 100 that's a local resident, that's certainly something that should be recognized. So, we had him in, and here he is here. This is Ferris. He was a funny guy, great guy. I mean, if you talked to him, you wouldn't think he was 100 by any means. So good for him, and as I mentioned, we did read a proclamation, and it was kind of quite an event. Very colorful person.

Selectman Guessferd: Did he tell you the secret to his longevity.

Roy Sorenson: You know what? I'll let the Chairman answer that if he wants to, but we'll just leave it at that. Just an update. I brought this back before. So, the annual report, some of the things we're doing, they're in the process. Again, we're trying to trim it down a little bit. So, anything that we take out that's not in there, as an example, deliberative minutes, we'll push those back up to the website. We'll put something in the report like a QR code that you can grab there. That's going to help us save paper. It's going to help us trim down the report and make it more efficient, I would say, in how it reads. I want to thank the Blue Ribbon Committee for what they did. They did finish that process and helped out with developing what I'm going to call the first version. I think we take this a step further next year, but given the timeline, we're in pretty good shape. The financial software, as you know, we had it in. I pushed through the Budget Committee to pull it out. I think what we're going to need

to do here is set up a working group. I'll come back to the Board with ideas on that, maybe a select Board member, it may be a Budget Committee member, staff members, because we're going to have to go out for an RFP/Q, which means we're going to be interviewing companies and at that point get some solid pricing in. As I mentioned, the \$175 was due south of what this is probably going to cost. So I want to make sure we're all on the same page. If we bring something of high value to a warrant article at this time next year. Website is proposed to go live in February. They're pushing everything over, and we're hoping to have that going. I think it's going to be more towards the end of February, but the new platform will be up, and at that point, we'll be able to actually push some other things there and kind of rebuild it the way we want. The intent here is that the new website's, again, more efficient, better, user-friendly, and not as clunky as what we have now. Insurance. This is interesting, and I don't know, Mr. Campbell, if you want to speak to this or if you've heard anything about this, but we met with the schools earlier this year. We talked about health insurance, right? We're in HealthTrust. The schools are in School Care. And potentially going out again to receive bids. Can we save money on our health insurance and how that might work? I think the schools are going to take that approach too. I'm not going to put you on the spot if you don't want to answer to it. I did talk to Dr. Moulis and the business administrator, Jenny Graves, on this. I think if they're interested in doing this, we may combine forces, and this is unofficial at this time, and see what we can come up with. Again, this would be another RFP process, so stay tuned on that.

Mike Campbell: I can chime in just a little bit. We've received a lot of comments about health insurance. I'm sure everybody knows health insurance costs. School Care hit us with a bill. I thought we have made it clear, the board has made it clear, but I guess we haven't. I want the public to know we are searching for other options. It's just we can't switch in this budget. I wish we could, but it takes longer than that, and I'm sure Mr. Sorenson has said that. We love the conversations, from what I've heard from Dr. Moulis and Ms. Graves, that love the conversations with you guys.

Roy Sorenson: I think we're going to reconvene after the deliberative, that group, myself, Laurie May, Jenny Graves, and Dr. Moulis, and talk about the best approach here. Come back to this Board, it would also go back to the school board. If we partner in with this, we mutually agree to go out there, and then we would start an RFP process and see what might come in.

Mike Campbell: Even if we don't partner together, we're going to be hearing from other vendors.

Roy Sorenson: Exactly. We're going to get some information. Deferred compensation, as you know, the state came in previously. We also heard from another group, which is the Professional Firefighter, Police Officer, and Public Employee Tax Deferment Retirement Plan. We're waiting on a little bit more information from them, and then that working group will come back to the board. I think at that point, it's just an administrative decision for the board. Deferred compensation is voluntary. The town does not pay into it. All we do is administer it. Whatever is going to work best for the employees, they're going to get the best return on their dollar pre-tax, obviously, to take advantage of it. We have employees on this committee as well, as I mentioned. We have Matt Flint from PD, and we actually added Corey Girard from FIRE as well to participate in this. We'll have something within the next two to three meetings on that as well. One more item. We are closed next Monday, Martin Luther King Day. If everyone's aware of that. With that, I think that's all I got.

Chairman Dumont: Thank you very much. I will turn it over to our school board liaison, Mr. Campbell.

11. REMARKS BY SCHOOL BOARD

Mike Campbell: I had three pages, but I guess I'm probably going to be cut for time. I'm not quite there. No, I'm kidding. Again, like Mr. Sorenson just said, Monday is off for the school, so I hope everyone has a good three-day weekend. Tomorrow is 8th grade information night at Alvirne High School. It starts at 5:30 p.m., so if you have an incoming freshman, current 8th graders, come and learn about scheduling and programming. I believe there's also something at 7:30 for sophomores and current freshmen, sophomores and juniors. This is a couple weeks away, but I hope everyone marks your calendar for January 28th. That's our Alvirne CTE Open House. It's an annual event that, honestly, it gets packed. The parking lot is packed. I feel like if anyone here has been there, it's a very popular event. You can explore the CTE. We'll have CTE ambassadors giving tours. All the teachers will

be there to answer any questions. I saw on the flyer there are door prizes this year, so I hope everyone comes out, and that will be all for me. Thank you very much.

Chairman Dumont: All right, that ends our...

Selectman Jakoby: Could you just mention the deliberative dates just for the public?

Chairman Dumont: The town deliberative is the 20...

Roy Sorenson: 31st.

Chairman Dumont: 31st, I apologize. Saturday the 31st, and the schools is the following Saturday.

Roy Sorenson: All at the community center at 9 a.m. start.

Selectman Jakoby: Just letting everybody know.

Chairman Dumont: All righty, so with that, that wraps up our reports. We're going to move on to motions that were made during the nonpublic session, and I will turn it over to Mr. Sorenson to start with number two.

12. MOTIONS MADE IN NONPUBLIC

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to accept the resignation of firefighter paramedic Gerald Boudeau, effective 0800 January 22, 2026. Motion carried, 5-0.

Selectman Vurgaropoulos made a motion, seconded by Selectman Jakoby, to terminate the employment of Trinity Santana from the position of HCTV videographer, effective January 13, 2026, as recommended by the Director of Community Media. Motion carried, 5-0.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by Selectman Vurgaropoulos, to terminate the employment of Daniel Thiebaud as the town accountant, effective January 13, 2026, as recommended by the Town Administrator. Motion carried 5-0.

Selectman Jakoby made a motion, seconded by selectman Guessferd, to appoint James T. Lockwood to the position of Town Accountant, with effective date and terms of salary to be negotiated by the Town Administrator, as advised by the Board of Selectmen, and through the signatory of the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, provided all pre-employment screening checks are satisfactory. Motion carried, 5-0.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Selectman Morin made a motion, seconded by Selectman Guessferd, to adjourn at 10:47 p.m. Motion carried, 5-0.

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

Dillon Dumont, Chairman

Bob Guessferd, Vice-Chairman

Xen Vurgaropoulos, Selectman

Heidi Jakoby, Selectman

Dave Morin, Selectman