

**TOWN OF HUDSON
ANNUAL TOWN MEETING
Deliberative Session
February 5, 2011**

1. CALL TO ORDER BY THE MODERATOR.

Town Moderator Paul Inderbitzen called this Deliberative Session to order at 9:03 a.m., on February 5, 2009, at the Hudson Community Center, with approximately 117 persons in attendance at that time.

2. POSTING OF THE COLORS

The Hudson Police Department's Color Guard posted the colors.

3. NATIONAL ANTHEM

Detective Police Officer Charles Dyac sang the National Anthem.

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Board of Selectmen Chairman Kenneth Massey led the assembly in pledging allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

5. REMARKS BY THE MODERATOR

Moderator Inderbitzen reviewed the procedures by which he would run this meeting, noting that copies of the procedure summary were available at the back of the room. He said he would have each article presented by a selectman, or by a member of the Budget Committee in the case of the budget, with brief remarks, after which he would open the article to the floor for questions, comments, or amendments—noting that he would start with Article 7, as the first six articles pertained to the election of officers or to zoning amendments and could not be changed on the floor, as this meeting did not have the authority to make changes in those articles, which had been discussed and finalized at two public hearings by the Planning Board. He clarified that the body could change the numbers in or wording of the remaining articles, or change the intent a bit, but could not change the subject matter, noting that the only motions he would take would be motions to amend, which would require a second. He said he would close the article after any such discussion was concluded, as the articles must appear on the ballot and there would be no need for the body to vote on each article. He then explained that any votes would be made by registered citizens holding up the colored voting cards issued to them when they registered. He stated that anyone with questions could call for a point of order or call for a question, if it were unclear as to what the body was doing. He also noted that any requests for secret ballot would have to be signed by five registered voters.

6. INTRODUCTION OF THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Moderator Inderbitzen asked Board of Selectman Chairman Ken Massey to introduce the members of the Hudson Board of Selectmen, including Richard J. Maddox, Shawn Jasper, Roger Coutu, and Ben Nadeau, as well as Town Administrator Steve Malizia and Finance Director Kathy Carpentier, also seated at the head table. He noted that Town Attorney Steve Buckley was seated in the front row, adding that Police Chief Jason Lavoie, Police Department Executive Secretary Dorothy Carey, and Fire Captain Shawn Murray also were present.

7. INTRODUCTION OF BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Moderator Inderbitzen asked Budget Committee Chairman Norman Martin to introduce the members of the Budget Committee, and Mr. Martin introduced Vice-Chairman Jon Maltz, Clerk Susan Guraino, Ted Luszey, Steve Nute, Michael Buczynski, Joyce Goodwin, Charlotte Schweiss, and Laura Bisson (School Board Representative).

8. INTRODUCTION OF STAFF/OTHERS/SEATING OF NON-RESIDENTS

Moderator Inderbitzen stated that there also were nonresident staff members on hand to answer any questions that might arise, as well as Town Clerk Patti Barry and Recorder J. Bradford Seabury, together with the Hudson Community Television group—noting that the meeting would be broadcast live and then rebroadcast a number of times so that all voters would have a chance to see what was being discussed.

9. DELIBERATIVE SESSION OF TOWN MEETING

Moderator Inderbitzen read aloud through the introductory text of the Town Warrant, noting that Article 1 pertained to election of Town Officers and Articles 2 through 6 were zoning amendments, which would not be dealt with at this meeting but would be decided by the voters at that Town Election on March 8th. He then proceeded to Article 7, which he read aloud.

Article 7 — Ratification of Multi-Year Contract negotiated between the Town of Hudson Board of Selectmen and the Hudson Police, Fire and Town Supervisors Association for Wage and Benefit Increases.

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to approve the cost items included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Town of Hudson Board of Selectmen and the Hudson Police, Fire and Town Supervisors Association, which call for the following increase in salaries and benefits:

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Amount</i> | <i>COLA %</i> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| <i>7/1/11 – 6/30/12</i> | <i>\$507</i> | <i>0.0%</i> |
| <i>7/1/12 – 6/30/13</i> | <i>\$66,250</i> | <i>2.0%</i> |
| <i>7/1/13 – 6/30/14</i> | <i>\$79,665</i> | <i>3.0%</i> |

and further to raise and appropriate the sum of \$507 for the 2011-2012 Fiscal Year, said sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those paid in the prior Fiscal Year? (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget.)

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0)

(Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-2).

Selectman Jasper presented the article, explaining that this contract covered the 27 members of the bargaining unit that constituted the second-tier employees of the Town, and he then provided details of the basic provisions of the contract.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any comments.

No comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 7 and proceed to Article 8, which he read aloud.

Article 8 — Wage and Benefit Increase for Full Time Employees of Rodgers Memorial Library

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$12,374 which represents a 3% increase in wage and benefits for the nine full-time employees of the Rodgers Memorial Library? (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget.)

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0)

(Recommended by the Budget Committee 6-5)

Selectman Jasper presented the article, noting that this covered the employees of the library, who had not had a raise since July 2008, saying it added a tenth of one cent to the tax rate.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any comments.

Ms. Connie Owen, 3 Bruce Street, Chairman of the Library Trustees, spoke in favor, discussing the high qualifications of the library personnel and noting that many of them earned up to 24% less than other Town staff.

Ms. Jennifer Chafe, 72 Pelham Road, spoke in support as a patron of the library, speaking of the value of the library and the helpfulness of the employees.

No other comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 8, and he then moved on to Article 9, which he read aloud.

Article 9 — Wage and Benefit Increase for Town Clerk/Tax Collector

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$1,867, which represents a 3.0% increase in wages and benefits for the Town Clerk/Tax Collector? (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget).

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0)

(Recommended by the Budget Committee 9-2).

Selectman Nadeau presented the article, noting that the last increase for this item was in March of 2007, saying the increase would be less than one cent on the tax rate.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any comments.

Mr. Stuart Schneiderman, 2 Library Street, asked if the Town Clerk currently earned \$62,233. Selectman Nadeau said the current salary was \$52,403, and this raise would bring it to \$53,975. Finance Director Carpentier noted that there were also taxes and benefits. Selectman Nadeau confirmed that the total, including taxes and benefits, would be \$63,079. Mr. Schneiderman commented that the average salary in the state of New Hampshire was \$43,000, give or take.

No other comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 9, and he then moved on to Article 10, which he read aloud.

Article 10 — Fact Finder's Report for Hudson Support Staff Union

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to implement the recommendations contained in the Fact Finder's Report in the matter of fact-finding between the Town of Hudson and the Hudson Support Staff Union Local 1801 dated January 3, 2011 which calls for the following increases in salary and benefits:

| <i>Year</i> | <i>Amount</i> | <i>COLA %</i> |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| <i>7/1/10 – 6/30/11</i> | <i>\$0</i> | <i>0.0%</i> |
| <i>7/1/11 – 6/30/12</i> | <i>\$25,564</i> | <i>3.0%</i> |
| <i>7/1/12 – 6/30/13</i> | <i>\$31,355</i> | <i>3.0%</i> |

and further to raise and appropriate the sum of \$25,564 for the 2011-2012 Fiscal Year, said sum representing the additional costs attributable to the increase in salaries and benefits over those paid in the prior Fiscal Year? (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget.)

(Not Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-1)

(Not Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0).

Selectman Massey presented the article, saying the Board of Selectmen had been working this year to put fiscal controls on employee benefits, but the fact finder had not seen the Board's position on this matter, so the health benefits of this plan would be different from those presented for the supervisors' organization and had a higher increase than the Board had supported for other employees.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any comments.

Mr. Jim Barnes, 3 McKinney Drive, noted that the period of time was different than for the previously discussed group. Selectman Massey explained that the Selectmen had not had a contract for this year, so the contract started in June 2010, and was different from the others.

Mr. John Knowles, 51 Quail Run Road, asked if he were correct in saying that the Fact Finder was not aware of the Board of Selectmen's attempts. Selectman Massey demurred, saying the Fact Finder was aware but had seen fit not to make this contract in compliance.

No other comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 10, and he then moved on to Article 11, which he read aloud.

Article 11 — Operating Budget

Shall the Town of Hudson raise and appropriate as an operating budget, not including appropriations by special warrant articles and other appropriations voted separately, the amount set forth on the budget posted with the Warrant or as amended by vote of the first session, for the purposes set forth therein, totaling \$28,223,641? Should this article be defeated, the operating budget shall be \$28,383,705, which is the same as last year, with certain adjustments required by previous action of the Town of Hudson or by law; or the governing body may hold one special meeting, in accordance with RSA 40:13, X and XVI, to take up the issue of a revised operating budget only.

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0)

(Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0)

Budget Committee Chairman Norman Martin made the presentation, speaking in support and highlighting some areas of the budget, including removal of the nonunion employee raises being put into the budget so as to keep the management team above the salaries of the assigned employees; he said the Budget Committee had felt that amount (\$32,516) was not seen by the voters when included in the operating budget and had removed it, recommending that the Board of Selectmen bring it forward as a warrant article, which the Budget Committee would support—adding, however, that he had not seen such an article come forward. Addressing the Fire Department budget, he reported that the Budget Committee had been informed that the Selectmen had removed \$100,000 from the Fire Department's Administration budget, and the Budget Committee had wanted to reinstate that value but the Fire Chief had presented four new plans to the Board of Selectmen, who had added only \$2,982 back into the budget. Addressing the library budget, he said \$21,416 had been cut from the Library budget to control costs—adding that the Budget Committee had removed two vacant part-time positions, as that money had been used to give additional hours to other employees, and some Budget Committee members had not felt that was the way a budget should operate. He noted that the heating budget for the former Hills Memorial Library building had also been reduced, with the Budget Committee feeling that the Library Trustees should bring forth a warrant article concerning upkeep of that building—adding that no such warrant article had been brought forward.

Selectman Coutu then presented the Board of Selectmen's view of the budget, speaking of the difficulties of predicting a year and a half ahead of time what the actual costs would be, and commenting on the large number of unknowns, such as how many ambulance calls there might be or what emergencies might affect the Police Department or the Fire Department. He described the process used, involving extensive interviews with department heads, saying the department heads had been asked to flat-line their budgets and come in separately to discuss any desired increases. He said the original proposals would have resulted in a tax increase, but the Board of Selectmen had agreed to sit in a long meeting and reduce the budget to the point that there would be no increases, with the result that they had produced a budget that was \$160,000 less than last year's budget, and he asked for support.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any question, comments, or amendments.

Mr. Howard Dilworth, 15 Sycamore Street, noted that the proposed budget was \$20,200,000 and change, while the default was \$23,383,000; he asked what was in the default budget that was not in the operating budget. Selectman Massey asked Finance Director Carpentier to explain, and Ms. Carpentier said they had backed out one-time expenses from last year's budget, which she detailed, and then added in contracted increases, including the new water and sewer costs.

Mr. Dilworth said those changes would also be reflected in the operating budget—adding that he had been told last year that there were four positions in the default budget that were not in the operating budget. Ms. Carpentier said the difference was primarily in the new \$524,000 increase in the sewer cost, which had not been in last year's budget. Mr. Dilworth said that was also in the operating budget, so it was a wash; Ms. Carpentier responded that the default budget could not be compared with the proposed operating budget. Selectman Massey noted that there was \$100,000 cut from the Fire Department in the operating budget that was not in the default budget, along with several other cuts, including a Police Department position.

Selectman Massey offered an amendment, striking the amount of \$28,223,641 on Line 4, and inserting in its place the sum of \$28,256,157, an increase of \$32,516. Selectman Jasper seconded the motion. Selectman Massey explained that this was for raises of the management team, which had not had an increase in the past two years; he explained that the Board of Selectmen felt the managers should get more money than the people working in their departments, under them—explaining that the differences had been compressed over the past few years because of reductions by the Budget Committee. He spoke of the high quality of performance by the Department of Public Works, noting that Hudson's Police Department was one of only seven in the state accredited by a national agency. He noted the services performed by the Town Clerk's office. He said the Board of Selectmen had felt it was better to approach this as a two-step process, noting that the only difference between the Board of Selectmen and the Budget Committee on this was the process itself, not the amount of money involved. He explained that having the increase as a warrant article meant that it was subject to the "No Means No" law, so that defeat of the warrant article would prevent the Board of Selectmen from properly rewarding its management team. He said the budgetary layout clearly showed where the money was, saying he anticipated having a separate line item in each department in the future, so it would be an open figure. Even with this increase, he noted, the operating budget would still be \$100,000 under the default budget.

Selectman Jasper, speaking on his second, spoke in favor of the amendment, noting that the Budget Committee was not opposed to the numbers but was opposed to the process. He recalled that a previously approved advisory article passed in Town Meeting back in the 1990s had stated that employee increases should come forward as a separate warrant article; comparing the current process under the Senate Bill 2 form of government against the one that had been used in Town Meeting days, he said the Town salaries were kept under control, and there was no intention of seeing salaries skyrocket, but the Selectmen felt there had to be a delta between the salaries of managers and employees, saying it was not practical under the SB2 form of government to maintain the older approach, and stating that the salaries paid to Hudson department heads were well under the average salaries paid in other communities. Noting that a recent newspaper comment had said that some of the department heads would get a 10% raise, he said this was not true, adding that the average was under 2.75% but a few were up to 7.7% because they currently were way out of whack, but others were 1% and 2%—adding that the Budget Committee looked at those numbers and had line-item control of the applicable items, which that committee did not have with respect to a separate warrant article.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor for discussion of the amendment.

Ms. Charlotte Schweiss, 28 David Drive, a member of the Budget Committee, spoke in opposition, saying the right of the voters to make a decision could not be taken away. She said the recommendation of the Budget Committee was to put it on a separate warrant article, but the Board of Selectmen had chosen not to do that. She said what the Selectmen had said had a lot of truth, but they had not mentioned that these personnel would get their raises, no matter what the voters voted, as the Selectmen would be able to find the \$32,000 in the budget—contending that there was no "No Means No" when it came to the operating budget.

Mr. Thaddeus Luszy, 32 Cathedral Lane, a member of the Budget Committee, spoke in opposition, saying his way of thinking was that the voters were placing a value on the services that they were getting when they voted warrant articles down. He claimed the Town's salaries were bumping up against a top line, stating that 64 houses in this town had gone through foreclosure in the past year and spending needed to be contained.

Mr. Howard Dilworth, 15 Sycamore Street, spoke in opposition, saying he was tired of hearing people say they were underpaid, adding that they should be thankful to have a job. He said the Selectmen could find the money in the budget and did not need this.

Ms. Lisa Nute, 5 Buswell Street, spoke in favor, noting that it would be her raise. She said she had bills to pay, had three children in college through the next few years, and wanted the voters to know that any changes in technology and other improvements made by her organization had been in the interests of the taxpayer, saying

she and her group had saved the Town \$75,000, which more than covered this increase. She concluded by noting that “finding money in the budget” meant taking it out of the bottom line.

Mr. Timothy Quinn, 1 Fuller Drive, identified himself as the chairman of the Conservation Commission, stating that he had to interface with many of these department heads and the quality of service obtained from these people was absolutely outstanding, adding that he was wholeheartedly in favor.

Mr. Leo Bernard, 3 Bungalow Avenue, said he thought the Board of Selectmen was doing the best it could and this should go through.

Selectman Maddox, responding to a comment made by a previous speaker, said there had not been any discussion among the Selectmen that had already decided this, saying they were just trying to keep good people in service for the town, and this was to ensure that the department heads were compensated in a manner that the officers would not be making more money than the chiefs.

Mr. John Knowles, 51 Quail Run Road, said it was odd to hear the claim that the Selectmen could find the money somewhere, saying this budget had been gone through by the Budget Committee, and the Budget committee had voted 11 to zero to support the budget—and that to say the Selectmen could find the money meant that the Budget Committee had missed something. He said the point was to look at the actual expenditure and see whether it was needed.

Selectman Massey reiterated that there was no disagreement between the Selectmen and the Budget Committee that this money was needed. He noted that the Budget Committee who had spoken had not said that they had previously supported putting this in the operating budget. He said the Board of Selectmen was simply trying to ensure that there was not a comparison between the salaries of the managers and the salary of the people reporting to them. He said he had not participated in any conversations with other members of the Board about what would be done if this money were not put in the budget, noting that this budget process had started in June of 2010 to determine what would be spent in June of 2012. He said the department heads had not said this needed to be done, but it was the Board of Selectmen that had initiated this action, to determine what was the right thing to do for the Town and its employees.

Mr. Michael Buczynski, 14 Oban Drive, also a member of the Budget Committee, said he did not think that anyone disagreed that the departments were doing a good job, but it came down to the process. He said the Board of Selectmen had chosen not to come forward with a warrant article. He said he believed the department heads would be given a raise if it were needed, and all the Budget Committee had wanted to do was to let the voters decide, and he then expressed himself as believing that this time should have been used to discuss a warrant article, not the operating budget.

Ms. Charlotte Schweiss, 28 David Drive, speaking for a second time, said her wording maybe was not proper, but the way a budget was done in this town was gross budgeting, meaning that the highest amount and benefits for a position were presented, which meant that extra money was available if that person left and a person was hired for less money. She said there was money that was left over, so the Selectmen probably would be able to find the money. She said she did not believe that it had anything to do with compression, as it was the same problem as three years ago. She said she believed the voters should have the choice, repeating that there was money left over.

Selectman Jasper said the description of budgeting that had just been presented was the most irresponsible way to do it, saying what the Board of Selectmen continuously did was budget according to its needs, and that any money left over went back to the taxpayer to offset taxes. He said left-over money occasionally was used, such as for roads, roofs, or buildings, but the citizens were alerted of such instances. He said the Board of Selectmen could have said they would just take the money and do it, but they had not—adding that they could not do it on July 1, because they would not know where the savings for the following year would be. He pointed out that the Town right now was already at the limit of its current budget for fuel costs, and the Selectmen most likely would have to take most of the dollars they could find to put into fuel to keep plowing and maintaining the roads. He said the way to look at this was to ask if these increases were responsible and needed—adding that he believed they were.

Mr. Stuart Schneiderman, 2 Library Street, said salary compression was a human resource issue, leading to low morale and low productivity, so he was in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Howard Dilworth, 15 Sycamore Street, asked how much money was left in the general fund as of last June 30th that was not expended. Selectman Jasper responded that there was \$300,000, with much of that being the Bensons fund, noting that most of that went back into surplus—adding, however, that last year did not at all look like this year. Mr. Dilworth said what should be looked at was historical trends, saying he was told last year that the left-over money was \$350,000, as it had been the year before. He said at \$28,000,000, he felt the money could be found somewhere else. If compressing was such an issue, he said, maybe the voters should vote against the supervisors' contracts, as that seemed to be creating the compression.

Selectmen Coutu referenced his past experience, saying he resented being told by members of the Budget Committee that the Selectmen were going to give the raises whether they were approved or not, but now they were saying this was all part of a sinister plot. He said the Board of Selectmen had produced a budget that would lower the tax rate, saying the people who performed these services had been vetted and had been deemed, after three years, of being deserving of something—noting that it was an adjusted increase, not ten percent. He contended that these people had earned this increase, and the Board of Selectmen felt it was necessary to provide for these people—adding that, in the union negotiations the Selectmen had tried to get the employees to concede some of the insurance costs, and they had done so, and the minimal initial savings would have an overall significant impact in the costs to the Town. If this article were voted down, he continued, he would not support paying it out of other funds.

Mr. Gary Rodgers, 16 Mountain View Drive, said he thought the biggest problem was that the Selectmen had been given a chance to put this in a warrant article, saying the voters had spoken twice in the past two years not to give a raise, so he was opposed.

No one else coming forward, Moderator Inderbitzen asked for a vote on the amendment. Viewing the cards raised by those who were in favor and then those who were in opposition, he said the AYES had it, and the budget was now \$28,256,157.

Moderator Inderbitzen than called a brief recess at 10:36 a.m., calling the meeting back to order at 10:55 a.m., noting that Article 11, as amended, was still under discussion.

Ms. Connie Owens, 3 Bruce Street, moved to increase Department 5060, Line Item 102, *Part-time Salaries*, by the amount of \$10,605 for a part-time Library Assistant/Tech Service position, and Line Item 108, *Taxes*, for \$811, for a total increase of \$11,416. Selectmen Jasper seconded the motion.

Speaking to her amendment, Ms. Owens said the Library Trustees had submitted a budget showing a decrease, but salaries and benefits pushed that up to slightly more than a 1% increase—adding, however, that it was currently 90% lower than last year's budget, as the Trustees had intended to forgo a position but were now moving to have that added back in. She said the total would be 1% less than last year's budget. She discussed the reasons for the change, saying an estimated \$18,000 of revenue would more than offset this position.

Mr. Shawn Jasper, 83 Old Derry Road, standing at the public microphone, noted that the Board of Selectmen did not have oversight of the Library budget. He said he was in favor—commenting that now the money mattered, because it was being moved to other places. He said the bottom line was how many hours of staff time the Library had available, saying they did not need the staff time but the issue was where the money was, and he felt the library needed to be supported.

Mr. Howard Dilworth, 15 Sycamore Street, spoke in opposition, saying the Library budget was \$980,000, and the library should work with what it had and do what it could. He said he was in the library frequently, and it was amazing how nonresidents came in to use the computers as guests.

Ms. Maryann Knowles, 51 Quail Run Drive, noting that she was formerly a Library Trustee, said she had been heartened by the response to the new library and she felt it deserved the support it had been getting. She noted that people previously had said no one would use the library, but people were using it, noting that the Web site visitors in July 2008 were 62,518 at the Hills Library, but had risen to 120,498 at the Rodgers Library in 2009 and were 160,805 in 2010. She said tech people were needed to help encourage increased usage of the library Web site.

Mr. Richard Maddox, 323 Fox Run Road, standing at the public microphone, spoke in opposition, saying the Rodgers Library was a wonderful building, but the citizens had been told at an earlier Deliberative Session that not as much staff would be needed for the new building, yet the staff budget had gone from \$132,000 to

\$185,000, with no reductions being shown. Noting that the Board of Selectmen had not funded a police officer and had cut money from every department, he said this increase was not consistent with what the Selectmen were trying to do.

Mr. John Knowles, 51 Quail Run Drive, a former chairman of the Library Trustees, said the preceding statement was absolutely false, saying what he had said at the referenced meeting was that, because the new library building would be more efficient, the new library would not need additional staff. He said the old building required a lot of people to maintain different locations, but the new one allowed a smaller number of people to control more space, but it was the same staff. He concluded by stating that it was not true that anyone had claimed staff would be cut.

Mr. Len Lathrop, 31 Winslow Farm Road, said he was the person who had asked Mr. Knowles at that referenced meeting if there would be a need for less staff, and the answer had been “Yes,” and he would be happy to find the minutes.

Ms. Arlene Creeden, 45 Cottonwood Drive, a Library Trustee, said she was here to support the tech position, saying the Trustees felt it was a better use to keep the position and be able to move the money to better serve the library. She spoke of the need for flexibility of hours, saying an employee would not have to be paid if there was no work, but the Trustees would have the flexibility of moving people around if needed, to cover vacations and have someone available when work needed to be done. She noted the increased needs during the summer, when children came, inventory taking, etc., saying she could not believe people should be penalized for trying to make as conservative a budget as possible but still wanting to do the best possible job.

Mr. Norman Martin, 3 Edgar Court, speaking as a citizen, said this was a slush fund, and no other department in the town had an item to pay a part-timer.

Ms. Connie Owens, 3 Bruce Street, referred to an earlier comment by another speaker about nonresidents using the library, saying business people were allowed to but anyone else was required to pay for it. She expressed concern about the remarks that the citizens for a number of years had voted down a new library, saying the fact was that they had not been able to get a super-majority for a bond article, but the Rodgers brothers had made a donation, and she expressed a belief that this gift should not be placed on a back shelf and not be used, saying it was difficult to understand why well-balanced budgets came under attack. She said she supported the restoration of the \$11,416.

Ms. Barbara Kurt, 3 Harvest View Circle, spoke in support, saying the library staff worked incredibly hard and needed the additional time, adding that this was a request to fund a part-time person, who would not need benefits.

Mr. Stuart Schneiderman, 2 Library Street, said the officer cut from the budget had saved \$80,639 but the Police Department’s *Information Technology* line item had increased \$65,530, so he guessed information technology was incredibly important in the 21st century. He expressed a belief that this was a small price to pay for what the citizens and children would get back.

Mr. Roger Coutu, 10 Rita Avenue, noting that the Board of Selectmen did not have any control over the library budget, said he had just heard that this was a filler position, saying it had not been presented to the Board of Selectmen as an IT position, and he would not be supporting this article.

Mr. Leo Bernard, 3 Bungalow Avenue, moved the question. Moderator Inderbitzen noted that one other person had been standing in line to speak.

Ms. Arlene Creeden, 45 Cottonwood Drive, a Library Trustee, said as much as the library would like to pay an IT person, the most highly paid library staff, not counting the director, got less than \$20 per hour and the position in question was funded at \$10/hour—adding that the reason they had not wanted to fund it full time was that they did not always need it.

Moderator Inderbitzen asked for a vote on the motion to call the question. After viewing the cards raised by those who were in favor and then those who were in opposition, he said the AYES had it, and the debate had been cut off.

Moderator Inderbitzen then called for a vote on the proposed amendment. After viewing the cards raised by those who were in favor and then by those who were in opposition, he said the NAYES had it, and the amendment had failed, adding that the discussion was now on Article 11 as previously amended.

No other comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 11.

Mr. Thaddeus Luszey, 32 Cathedral Lane, moved to restrict reconsideration of Articles 7 through 11; Mr. Norman Martin seconded the motion. There being no discussion, Moderator Inderbitzen asked for a vote on the motion to restrict reconsideration of Articles 7 through 11. After viewing the cards raised by those who were in favor and then those who were in opposition, he said the AYES had it and Articles 7 through 11 were restricted from reconsideration.

Moderator Inderbitzen then moved on to Article 12, which he read aloud.

Article 12 — Design of a dual use Hudson Senior Center and Hudson Community TV Facility

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$150,000, gross budget, for the design of a dual use Senior Center/Hudson Community TV (HCTV) facility to be located at Benson Park and to authorize the withdrawal of \$50,000 from the Senior Center Capital Reserve Fund, \$50,000 from the HCTV Building Capital Reserve Fund, and \$50,000 from the unreserved fund balance. No funds shall be expended until site location is approved by the State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation. (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget.) (There is no impact to the tax rate for this appropriation.)

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0) (Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-1).

Selectman Massey presented the article, saying the site was located at Benson Park, just to the right of the entranceway to the parking lot at the lower level. In order to construct the facility, he said, an architect had been hired through the generosity of the Hudson Seniors organization to prepare a preliminary design as a first step, finding that the building would need a basement. While the Hudson Seniors group did not need a basement, he continued, this gave the opportunity to locate the Hudson Community Television organization in that space as a place in which to operate. He noted that both groups had money in capital reserve funds, but the Board of Selectmen had determined that it would be prudent to do a more detailed cost estimate, including a list of construction documents, and then come back later with a fuller picture. He displayed an illustration of what the proposed building would look like, saying there would be three entrances to the first floor, with a basement entrance located on the parking lot side—and noting that the building would be reminiscent of the old red barn that had burned down on the park property several years ago. He said this warrant article would allow the Selectmen to engage the services of an architect to complete the design, including the bid documents to go out to a construction company.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any discussion.

No comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 12, and he then moved on to Article 13, which he read aloud.

Article 13 — Replacement of three (3) Fire Department Defibrillators

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$88,000 gross budget for the purpose of purchasing three (3) replacement defibrillators for the Hudson Fire Department Ambulances? (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget).

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 3-2)

(Recommended by the Budget Committee 10-1)

Selectman Jasper presented the article, speaking in support. He said the Board of Selectmen had opted to put this on as a warrant article because of the budget situation, saying these units were approaching the end of their useful life, and it was necessary to have all of the items replaced so that the users would be familiar with the operation of the units, rather than have to work with different models.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any discussion.

No comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 13, and he then moved on to Article 14, which he read aloud.

Article 14 — Establishment of Fire Equipment Capital Reserve Fund

Shall the Town of Hudson vote to establish a Capital Reserve Fund under the provisions of RSA 35:1 to be known as the “Fire Equipment Capital Reserve Fund” for the purpose of purchasing specialized fire and EMS Equipment including, but not limited to, Firefighter Protective Clothing, Self Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA) and Defibrillators and to raise and appropriate the sum of \$1,000.00 to be placed in this fund and to further appoint the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend from this fund in accordance with RSA 35:15 II? (This appropriation is in addition to Article 11, the Operating Budget).

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 4-0)

(Recommended by the Budget Committee 11-0).

Selectman Jasper presented the article, speaking in support. Saying the Board of Selectmen was only asking to begin this process, he said the Town of Hudson had been extraordinarily successful with capital reserve funds, noting that most were expendable only by the taxpayers but this would be expendable by the Board of Selectmen because of the possible need for quick replacement of equipment that might be lost, damaged, or destroyed.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any comments.

Selectman Massey noted that the Board of Selectmen would be the agents to expend, but it would require the approval of the Trustees of the Trust Funds, and the Selectmen would have to explain to the Trustees what the funds were needed for, so there was a fail-safe condition.

Mr. Howard Dilworth, 15 Sycamore Street, said the article talked to appointing the Board of Selectmen as agents to expend in accordance with NH RSA 35:15 II; he said he had looked up RSA 35 II, finding that it pertained to expenditure for the purchase of land, in accordance with an earlier law that allowed selectmen to purchase land when quick action was needed. He then pointed out that this article did not pertain to land but to equipment, and he asked if this reference were correct.

Selectman Jasper moved to strike after the word “fund,” the phrase “in accordance with RSA 35:15 II.” He said he did not have any idea whether the reference was correct. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion.

Speaking on his amendment, Selectman Jasper said this had been put in by the Town Attorney, not the Board of Selectmen, and both were agreed that the reference was not needed.

Mr. Norman Martin, 3 Edgar Court, noted that the State Legislature had just passed a law saying the language of a warrant article could not be changed; he then asked if this warrant article would be legal if this change were made today. Moderator Inderbitzen said he had received an E-mail saying the towns could no longer change the subject matter of a bill, but the wording could be changed; he then stated that in this case the reference was being removed because it was not clear, but the subject matter remained the same.

No one else coming forward, Moderator Inderbitzen asked for a vote on the amendment. After viewing the cards raised by those who were in favor and then those who were in opposition, he said the AYES had it, and the amendment was approved, with the discussion now being on Article 14 as amended.

No other comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 14.

Selectman Massey moved to restrict reconsideration of articles 12, 13, and 14. Mr. Thaddeus Luszey, 32 Cathedral Lane, seconded the motion.

Moderator Inderbitzen asked for a vote on the motion to restrict reconsideration of Articles 12, 13, and 14. After viewing the cards raised by those who were in favor and then by those who were in opposition, he said the AYES had it, and Articles 12, 13, and 14 were restricted from reconsideration.

Moderator Inderbitzen then moved on to Article 15, which he read aloud

Article 15 — Ratification of Agreement between the Board of Selectmen and the Hudson Litchfield Youth Football and Cheer

Shall the Town of Hudson, pursuant to RSA 41:11-a, vote to ratify an agreement between the Board of Selectmen and the Hudson Litchfield Youth Football and Cheer (HLYFC) according to which the HLYFC agrees to build the “Zachary Tompkins Memorial Field” football fields on 9 Industrial Drive, (Map 161, Lot 040 and Map 161, Lot 039) in exchange for the HLYFC having semi-exclusive right to use the fields during the regular football season beginning July 1, 2011 and ending June 30, 2036. Copies of the full text of the Agreement are available at the Town Clerk’s office.

(Recommended by the Board of Selectmen 5-0).

Moderator Inderbitzen noted there was no money involved, so the Budget Committee had not been engaged and had not made a recommendation.

Selectman Coutu presented the article, showing a series of slides, including a picture of the logo designed by Zachary Tompkins, an aerial view of the property in question, a model of what the stadium complex would look like, an engineering drawing of the proposed complex, and a photograph of the signing ceremony to lease the land, saying the Board of Selectmen was here today to ask the voters to ratify that agreement. He then concluded his presentation with a photograph of Zach in his football uniform, commenting on Zach’s dream of providing a facility that all of the community’s youth could enjoy.

Moderator Inderbitzen opened the matter to the floor, for any comments.

Mr. Jim Barnes, 2 McKinney Drive, said he had some questions with the article's wording, saying he was not clear as to what “semi-exclusive rights” meant. Selectman Jasper said the HLYFC group would have exclusive rights during some time periods but would make it available to other groups, explaining that the times would be established—clarifying that the text was as flexible as they thought they could make it.

Moderator Inderbitzen said that one registered voter had wanted to make a statement on this matter but had had to leave earlier; he then read a letter from Stacy and Michael Iwanicki, 43 Flying Rock Road, speaking in support of the article and asking for support in keeping Zachary’s dream alive.

No other comments, questions, or amendments being brought forward, Moderator Inderbitzen said he would close the discussion on Article 15.

Moderator Inderbitzen reminded all present that the citizens of the town would vote on all of the warrant articles at the Town Meeting on March 8th in this same hall.

Mr. Norman Martin, 3 Edgar Court , moved to adjourn. Selectman Jasper seconded the motion.

Moderator Inderbitzen called for a verbal vote on the motion to adjourn. After hearing the votes, both for and against, he declared that the AYES had it, and he then declared this session adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

February 8, 2010

Patti Barry, Town Clerk

Recorded and transcribed by
J. Bradford Seabury