

**Public Minutes of the Board of Assessors  
Meeting of June 3, 2021**

An online meeting of the Board of Assessors was held via Zoom on Thursday, June 3, 2021. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Chair Daniel Hansberry

**Members Present:**

Daniel Hansberry                                      Robert Earley

**Assessing Staff Present:**

Greg Turgiss                      Doug Dame                      Michael Mandile                      Richard Vincent  
Gary Turgiss                      Patricia Bell                      Lindsay Monaghan

**Other City of Nashua Staff Present:**

Administrative Services Director Kimberly Kleiner  
Deputy Corporation Counsel Celia Leonard  
Corporation Counsel Steve Bolton  
Jeff Poehnert Nashua Community TV

**Others Present**

Mike Tarello & Steve Whalen with Vision Government Solutions, Inc.

**Mr. Hansberry**

I will call the meeting of the Nashua Board of Assessors to order at 9:00 AM on Thursday, June 3, 2021. I would ask everyone to bear with me because I'm obliged to read a fairly lengthy opening statement.

Good morning and welcome to the June 3, 2021 meeting of the Board of Assessors. As Chair of the Board of Assessors, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

a) Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

We are utilizing Zoom through the City's IT Department for this electronic meeting. All members of the Board of Assessors have the ability to communicate contemporaneously during this meeting through this platform, and the public has access to contemporaneously listen in to this meeting through dialing the following number 929-205-6099, once again that number is 929-205-6099 and using meeting ID number 822-4878-5345, once again that meeting ID number is 822-4878-5345 and password of 989839; once again the password is 989839. The Public may also view the meeting on Comcast Channel 16.

b) Providing public notice of the necessary information for accessing the meeting:

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, through Public Postings. Instructions have also been provided on the City of Nashua's website at [nashuanh.gov](http://nashuanh.gov) and publicly noticed at City Hall and the Nashua Public Library.

c) Providing a mechanism for the public to alert the public body during the meeting if there are problems with access.

If anybody has a problem accessing the meeting via phone or Channel 16, please call 603-821-2049—once again that number is 603-821-2049-- and they will help you connect.

d) Adjourning the meeting if the public is unable to access the meeting:

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting via the methods mentioned above, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled. Please note that all the votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence and the reason they're not able to attend the meeting in person, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-To-Know Law. So I will now call the roll. Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

This is Robert Earley, a member of the Board of Assessors. I am following the Governor's executive order and joining the meeting remotely from home. There is no one here in the room with me.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Bergeron? Mr. Bergeron does not appear to be present. And I am Daniel Hansberry, a member of the Board of Assessors. I'm following the Governor's order to join the meeting remotely, and I am at home and there is no one in the room with me. Is there a motion to waive

the reading of the minutes from the board meeting of Thursday May 20, 2021, accept them and place them on file?

Mr. Earley

So moved. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Hansberry

Yes.

Mr. Earley

I have a quick question. On the minutes typically when a person is quoted their name is comes first and it's underlined. There's several situations in the recent minutes, and it may have happened before and I didn't notice it, where my name is underlined with two question marks. As it looks like they weren't sure if I was the person who, typically it's on when a motion is moved because I've been the one to move the motions. And, I didn't know if they thought that-- they didn't know it was me, or if they were saying that you were asking me to make, to move the motion. So, in the future they shouldn't have the question marks. Just for expediency, I've been moving any motions so we didn't have confusion and Paul did the second. Lindsay, does that make sense? I don't know who makes up the minutes.

Ms. Monaghan

Oh yes, Trish has been doing the minutes, she has been taking that over. So I believe, yes she wasn't sure if it was yourself speaking or Paul.

Mr. Earley

Okay.

Ms. Monaghan

So, going forward we'll make sure that's clear and we'll take that out.

Mr. Earley

Okay.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I'll second it. So other than the, what Mr. Earley noticed are there any other errors or corrections? Ok, so I will call the roll of voting as accepting the minutes as corrected.  
Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to waive the reading and place on file the non-public meeting minutes from the Board meeting of Thursday, May 20, 2021?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? Are there any errors or corrections? Seeing none, I will call the roll. Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted.

Mr. Hansberry

At this time I will recognize Richard Vincent who is the Department Head for our Assessing Department, for a department update. Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Vincent

Good morning, and thank you. We have Mike Tarello and Steve Whalen from Vision Government Solutions to give us an update on the revaluation status. I'll turn it over to Mike.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay. Mr. Tarello?

Mr. Tarello

Hi, good morning everyone.

Mr. Hansberry

Good Morning.

Mr. Earley

Good Morning.

Mr. Tarello

All right, June Perry couldn't make it today, so Steve and I will give the presentation. So, where we stand right now is as we've been going along we've now printed all the property record cards for all wards 1-9 for the data collection. We are now in Ward 9, getting ready to wrap up the last ward of the exterior inspections. So, to date, we have measured about 21,834 out of the 25,605 residential properties which is about 85%. We are at 85%. As for the commercials, we have inspected and measured, exterior inspections of 893 out of the 1,964 and we are 45% complete there. So, we're continuing on, we are in the last ward for the residential. Everything else going forward, the fair review is scheduled to be completed in 2022 which is the valuation review of the work. And then we are planning still to have the hearings and impact notices in July, and then July and August for the hearings. We are planning on, in July, to send out the first letters to Ward One for the call back interior inspections. So we'll be sending a letter out, that we've given to Mr. Vincent for him to approve, to go out ward by ward for us to set up calls and for appointments to do the interior inspections. Most likely those will begin sometime in mid-to late July. And then we'll continue that process through all the wards, one ward at a time. So that's pretty much where we stand right now, are there any questions or other items you'd like to discuss?

Mr. Hansberry

Questions for Mr. Tarello?

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, I have a question Mr. Tarello. Homes that are suffering from benign neglect. How are those treated? I know that Nashua has an approach that they use and I'm just wondering if it was a state wide, nationwide process. I'll give you a concrete example. I was talking to a contractor, this was years ago. It was a property not Nashua, one of the nearby towns. He was called out to give a quote on some work that had to be done. And through neglect, there was \$50,000 dollars' worth of carpentry work, just carpentry work that had to be done. And the person who owned the house was an MD, so it would appear that income was not a problem on properly maintaining the home. When you inspect a house like that, are you required to make a downward adjustment on the value, is it incumbent upon you to do that?

Mr. Tarello

Yeah, it is part of the process, there is a couple sections that we look at that relate to this. First of all, it's the quality of construction we'll identify, if its average grade, above grade, what are the materials that were used to build it. Then there's the portion that's depreciation part. Where the wear and tear you're talking about, the neglect, deferred maintenance, those type of things. Those will be categorized through our depreciation levels, you know, excellent, or totally renovated, to very good, good, average, fair, below or below average fair, poor, or even situations where there's added functional obsolescence because of the disrepair. So we look at it from every level of what the property is in and make a determination where it stands at that time of the inspection.

Mr. Hansberry

And then that obviously is going to have an impact on the value of the home, correct?

Mr. Tarello

A lower rating creates the lower value.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok. And that's consistent throughout the country?

Mr. Tarello

I don't know about the country, it's consistent how we do it in New England and some other states that we've worked in like, New York, Virginia and so forth I guess.

Mr. Hansberry

All right, thank you. Any other questions for Mr. Tarello?

Mr. Earley

I have no other questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Do staff members have any other questions? Ok, well thank you very much.

Mr. Tarello

Ok. Have a good day.

Mr. Hansberry

Thanks, you too. Okay, we're going to make a slight adjustment to the agenda at the request of Director of Administrative Services, Kimberly Kleiner, because she has an update, breaking news, relative to being able to meet at City Hall going forward. So I am going to recognize Director Kleiner for the update, Director Kleiner?

Ms. Kleiner

Good Morning. And I apologize for the noise outside of my office, we have some construction going on, so if you can't hear me, please let me know. So we have been advised by counsel who is on the call, so I'll let him speak better to the subject, that public meetings, that public bodies, meet in person as of the 12<sup>th</sup>. You have a meeting scheduled for the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 30<sup>th</sup>. We are currently working with all of the meetings and Boards, to use room 208 which you may know that's where the Board of Assessor's began meeting before moving to the city auditorium. We are arranging, CTV and IT are working hard to enable that room to allow both Zoom and in-person. So this is a hybrid model, where people will be able to call in via Zoom. You will see them, the audience will see them, but the audience will also see and hear you in person from room 208. We would like to arrange a time with the Board to walk you through this new process and we hope to have that available for your meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup>. But it would be in room 208, because the city auditorium is being utilized right now for the City Clerk. So we don't expect that room to become available until mid-July.

Mr. Hansberry

Questions for Director Kleiner?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Director Kleiner, just with the layout in room 208, if 10-15 people show up, the way it had been laid out historically, the Board is sitting with their backs to at least some of the people that are in the room, is that going to be addressed?

Ms. Kleiner

That will be addressed. So we are re-arranging that room, there's other public boards that need to be able to see and have presenters, so you'll have a table at the center, I'm sorry, at one side of the room, and you'll have the audience in front of you. Both will have access to new

screens that have been installed on the walls. So it will be a new layout, not the original table that you're used to seeing in that room.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. All right. New business, at this time I will recognize Greg Turgiss who has a Timber Tax Warrant for us. Mr. Greg Turgiss?

Greg Turgiss

How you doing, thank you. So, what I have for you today is a warrant for a report of wood cut, for Etchstone Properties. Does the Board have any questions regarding that warrant?

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay-- there's music coming through, I don't know where that is coming from.

Mr. Earley

Sorry about that, that's been taken care of.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok. Is there a motion to grant the warrant for the report of wood or timber tax cut identified as map D, lot 23?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I'll second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll for approval of the warrant. Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.



Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Does that conclude your report Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Greg Turgiss

It does, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. At this time, I will recognize Michael Mandile who has a number of abatement recommendations for the board, Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Good Morning Mr. Chairman, Mr. Earley. Yes, my first one is on 44 Indian Rock Road. The city recommends that the assessment be lowered from \$399,700 to \$281,100 based on condition. Does the Board have any questions for me?

Mr. Hansberry

Questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

Yes, I have a question. If the \$281,100, what would the market value be on that? Were we using 83%?

Mr. Mandile

Correct.

Mr. Earley

So that puts it around the \$340,000 which was what the owner thought the market value was.

Mr. Mandile

Right, it's bringing you to \$338,674.

Mr. Earley

Ok. Do you know if they have plans to do the work that's needed?

Mr. Mandile

They are trying to do it on their own. It's going very slowly. I think funds are an issue here.

Mr. Earley

Does that house have an entire crawl space or does it have any basement at all?

Mr. Mandile

A portion of it has a basement and a portion of it a crawl space, both.

Mr. Earley

Okay. I see now that the value is around \$428,000 in today's market, assuming the repairs are done, but I have no other questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Really, this is a new purchase for the particular property owner Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any kind of a pattern when a home falls into neglect, I mean is it frequently someone who's maybe got along in years and normally maintained the home and is having health problems and their physical condition becomes a priority and the home begins to get neglected? Or are there as many reasons that there are homes in need of updating?

Mr. Mandile

It's the latter. There are all kinds of reasons the home will go into neglect, it could be just apathy. And it could also be that the folks are getting a little older, and the resources are dwindling and they can't keep it up.

Mr. Earley

I believed that's what happened to this one. I noticed that on the MLS listing it looked as though an elderly person had lived there in the past and it had been vacant for two years.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 44 Indian Rock Road, from \$399,700 to \$281,100?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Second property is located on 2 Glen Drive, this is off Northeast Boulevard. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$248,100 to \$207,500. This is based both on condition and comparable sales. Does the board have any questions for me?

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 2 Glen Drive, from \$248,100 to \$207,500?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

My third property is at 30 Atherton Avenue. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$240,600 to \$188,600. This is based solely on condition of the property at the time on April 1<sup>st</sup> 2020. The taxpayers are currently working on it, making improvements. The assessment will be changed for 2021.

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 30 Atherton Avenue, from \$240,600 to \$188,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? Sorry, I second it. Any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll. Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. I got a piece power equipment running, I guess in my neighbor's backyard. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The fourth property is located 41 Indian Rock Rd. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$409,300 to \$371,000 based on comparable sales. Does the board have any questions for me?

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 41 Indian Rock Road, from \$409,300 to \$371,000?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Okay, the next half dozen abatement applications I have here are all located on 5 Caleb Street. This is a new development, new construction. The city made an estimate of value that turned out to be a bit high, so we made a uniform adjustment to all of these abatement applications. The first one located at 5 Caleb St. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$424,400 to \$395,200. Does the board have any questions for me?

Mr. Hansberry

Questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

So this wasn't a case of like the home owners association getting together, and somebody kind of leading the charge saying, gee I think our properties are all over valued?

Mr. Mandile

Someone did lead the charge on this. All of these abatement applications were prepared by a single taxpayer, that was presented to the homeowner and they simply signed them and submitted them.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, all right. Anything else for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 5 Caleb Street from \$424,400 to \$395,200?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

7 Caleb St. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$423,800 to \$387,100. Does the board have any questions for me?

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 7 Caleb St. from \$423,800 to \$387,100?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is at 8 Caleb St. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$365,700 to \$339,600? Are there any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

So, the individual that approached the homeowners, they had to do their own assessment for each individual property, correct?

Mr. Mandile

Correct. They produced a grid for the entire development. And I should note that the entire development is being adjusted, not just the ones that filed for an abatement. Yes, the taxpayer that prepared the abatement application did prepare a grid.

Mr. Hansberry

Was there like a percentage reduction across the board or was it individualized for each property?

Mr. Mandile

It seemed to be a percentage, also adjusted for time that the property was built. All of the, this development is a little different, as it was built over a period over three years. So they made adjustments for time as well as for the percentage. What we did here, was just made a change to the neighborhood code factor, or a uniform adjustment, for the entire neighborhood.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, thank you. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 8 Caleb Street from \$365,700 to \$339,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?



Mr. Mandile

Next property is at 9 Caleb St. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$364,700 to \$338,600? Are there any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Just--there's a typo. When it goes to the motion to deny the abatement... Okay, the motion to approve the abatement has 8 Caleb down, and the motion to deny the abatement has 8 Caleb down, that should be 9, correct?

Mr. Mandile

That is correct.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, just make that adjustment.

Mr. Mandile

I apologize.

Mr. Hansberry

That's all right, that's okay. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 9 Caleb Street from \$364,700 to \$338,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is at 10 Caleb St. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$462,600 to \$429,700? Are there any questions?

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 10 Caleb Street from \$462,700 to \$429,700?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

My last abatement application is for 11 Caleb Street. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$410,200 to \$380,900. Does the board have any questions for me?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 11 Caleb Street from \$410,200 to \$380,900?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

That is all I have, for today. Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you Mr. Earley.

Mr. Earley

Thank you Mike.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. At this time, I will recognize Mr. Gary Turgiss who has a number of abatement recommendations for us. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

Good morning Board. The properties that I have to present are out on Pasture Lane. It's a brand new development, they are all detached condominium style properties. There's three to four different styles out there, some have two car garages, and some have one car garages. There's a variation on the size and style of the home. The first one that I have is on 39 Pasture Lane. The City of Nashua would like to recommend a decrease in the assessment from \$339,800 to \$299,800. Similar to Caleb St., the city realized that the assessments were, because of the new development, the estimate on the assessments were higher than the new market values were indicating. So we did an across the board adjustment on the entire neighborhood. So, even those that did not file abatements also got the same reduction is assessment based on the style and the characteristics of the property. So on the first one of 39 Pasture Lane we would like to recommend a reduction of \$339,800 to \$299,800. Any questions for the board?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

Yes Gary. The original sale prices, were they set by the builder? Is that how it happened?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The original sale prices, yes, they were set by the builder. But we did not have actual sales data at the time that the tables were being set up. As the sales data came in, the taxpayers notified us obviously with the number of the abatements that were received out there. Again, there was an individual who provided the residents with a grid and indicated that they were over-assessed. The taxpayers got together and filed abatements on their properties.

Mr. Earley

Are these two developments related, the same builder or anything?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

I don't believe they are of the same builder, no.

Mr. Earley

I have no other questions.

Mr. Hansberry

And is it similar to what Mr. Mandile said, Mr. Turgiss, that there was a percentage across the board?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

Yeah, the city adjusted them by making a change to the neighborhood code. And that's when we took a look at that, they seem to fit back in line, more in line with the ratio of 83%.

Mr. Hansberry

Is this similar where these homes went up over a period of time, and they also had to be adjusted for age or did that not factor in?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

They did not have to be adjusted for age as they were put up pretty quickly in 2019 and 2020.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay. I think Raisanen was the builder for the, what Mr. Mandile presented if I remember right. And was this Etchstone maybe?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

This is Etchstone, yes.

Mr. Hansberry

So it was two different contractors that did it. Okay, thank you. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 39 Pasture Lane from \$339,800 to \$299,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I'll second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property I have is at 37 Pasture Lane. This is a similar property to the one we just discussed, again this one the city is recommending a reduction of from \$339,800 to \$299,800

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 39 Pasture Lane...

Mr. Earley

37

Mr. Hansberry

37 Pasture Lane, sorry. 37 Pasture Lane from \$339,800 to \$299,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

I will second that. Is there any discussion? Any questions for Mr. Turgiss? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property that I have is 35 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of the assessment from \$349,200 to \$307,800.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 35 Pasture Lane from \$349,200 to \$307,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

I will second that. Is there any discussion? Any questions for Mr. Turgiss? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property that I have is 33 Pasture Lane. The city recommends reducing the assessment from \$351,700 to \$310,300. Any questions?

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 33 Pasture Lane from \$351,700 to \$310,300?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. And where are these properties located Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

They're in the Thompson Preserve neighborhood, Pasture Lane is off Wason Rd.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, all right. Any other questions or further discussion?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property that I have is 31 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$345,000 to \$304,400.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay. Are there any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Hansberry

All right, is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 31 Pasture Lane from \$345,000 to \$304,400?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted.

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property I have is 29 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$322,900 to \$284,600. Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 29 Pasture Lane from \$322,900 to \$284,600?



Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is located at 27 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending reducing the assessment from \$333,200 to \$294,000. Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 27 Pasture Lane from \$333,200 to \$294,000?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Any discussion? So, Mr. Turgiss when we were given the numbers for the abatement filing deadline, the total number of abatements that had been submitted, these numbers are rolled into that, these properties are rolled into that number?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

That is correct.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, all right. Any other questions or discussions? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is at 25 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$338,200 to \$300,600. Any questions on this one?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 25 Pasture Lane from \$338,200 to \$300,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is 23 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$337,300 to \$297,300. Any questions on this one?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 23 Pasture Lane from \$337,300 to \$297,300?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is at 21 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$331,900 to a new assessment of \$292,900. Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 21 Pasture Lane from \$331,900 to \$292,900?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is at 17 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$337,300 to \$299,800. Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there much room left, much land left to be built on in Nashua?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

I don't think so. I'm surprised every time there is a new development actually.

Mr. Hansberry

I remember talking to somebody, years ago when I was on the school board. There was somebody from the planning department and we chatted in the parking lot of the central office building, after the meeting, this would have been probably the, well must have been the early 2000s, late '90s. And he was saying then that Nashua was basically built out. And he said the only way the population could really increase, is if there was to be re-zoning and I mean you're seeing some of that like with the old Nashua Corporation on Franklin St., but they keep coming up with land don't they.

Mr. Gary Turgiss

They do.

Mr. Hansberry

Just amazing. Ok, any further discussion or questions? All right, is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 17 Pasture Lane from \$337,300 to \$299,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is located at 22 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$339,800 to \$299,800. Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 22 Pasture Lane from \$339,800 to \$299,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is 24 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending an assessment reduction from \$346,300 to \$310,300. Any questions?

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 24 Pasture Lane from \$346,300 to \$310,300?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The next property is located at 28 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$330,700 to \$291,500. Are there any questions on this one?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 28 Pasture Lane from \$330,700 to \$291,500?

Mr. Earley

From \$330,700?

Mr. Hansberry

Yes, \$330,700 to \$291,500.

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, is there a second? I will second that. Any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

The last one is 30 Pasture Lane. The city is recommending a reduction of assessment from \$337,300 to \$297,300. Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 30 Pasture Lane from \$337,300 to \$297,300?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, I will call the roll.  
Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Does that conclude your report Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Gary Turgiss

Yes, that concludes my report.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you very much.

Mr. Gary Turgiss

Thank you Board.

Mr. Hansberry

You're welcome.

Mr. Earley

Thanks Gary.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok. Is there a motion to go into non-public session for two reasons, first to discuss matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of this board, unless such person requests an open meeting? This exemption shall extend to include any application for assistance or tax abatement or waiver of a fee, fine or other levy, if based on inability to pay or poverty of the applicant, pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, 11(c). Second, under...

Mr. Earley

Mr. Chairman?



Mr. Hansberry

Yes.

Mr. Earley

I'm sorry, but are we out of sequence here? Should we do the public comments first?

Mr. Hansberry

Yes, you're right, ok sorry, thank you. Is there any unfinished business to come before the Board? Any unfinished business? Is there public comment?

Ms. Ortolano

Yes, Laurie Ortolano.

Mr. Hansberry

And could you state your address for the record please?

Ms. Ortolano

Laurie Ortolano, 41 Berkely St. Thank you, Mr. Earley, for catching that. And I hope if I interrupted and I was going to, to remind you that I wouldn't have been cut off. A couple of things, and let me start my timer on my phone so I am mindful of my time. Couple of things, the last meeting I talked about the sale, commercial sales data, that's going to be used to build the model and I was unhappy with Dan's response to that. And Mr. Tarello I was going to write a letter to Vision and cc the Board of Assessor's on it. You know, I agree that Mr. Tarello believes that Nashua is going to recover well from this pandemic, particularly given the location of Nashua. However, this sales data is based on the 2020 and 2021 commercial property sales. And that is in the heart of the pandemic. And we have an overlay account this year that's showing six million dollars in the overlay, largely because of abatements which is 3 times what we would typically carry, which I believe is a result of the pandemic situation. So, is Vision not going to use this sales data from 2020 to build the model for the revaluation? Or are they weighing it differently? Because I believe that will affect the assessment levels and the distribution of equity and proportionment between commercial properties and resident properties. Secondly, I want to thank the Assessors for granting the abatements that they did today, I very much appreciate their work. Third, I want the Board to know, third, Board, Mr. Hansberry mentioned and wanted to know how these abatements were filed and came about and Mr. Mandile said it was one person and he wanted to know if evidence submitted--you know what, to the entire Board, if you complied with the state law to review abatement applications like I believe it's your duty, you would know that answer, and I think it's important

you know that answer on your own, and not leave it to the Assessors to do that. Three, the abatement, I have an abatement for 2020 for 41 Berkely St., I want to make you aware of that. Because I think the process that Nashua uses to let abatements expire without reviewing them is based on bad faith, ill will, and a dereliction of duty. I have written to our Senators to request a legislative change in the bill, and I'm hoping that will happen. And also, I am, I have written to all the Chiefs in the state on an email to get assistance on how to change this language. I think Nashua is doing a very poor job with these abatements. And when they have a war, personal vendetta, with a property owner, they are pushing every button in every limit to not perform their duties under what you know the responsibilities of what the ASB, the DRA and the state intended. Also, finally, the opening of City Hall on June 7<sup>th</sup>, I received a press release that showed that the only department maintaining closure was assessing, which shocked me actually. I got it yesterday. I had a conversation with Ms. Kleiner who informed me that there was an error in the press release. I asked if it was going to be corrected and I did not receive a response yet. But it's almost startling to me because it's her responsibility and Mr. Vincent's to somebody had to give the information to the Mayor's office on the opening of the assessing office. We've had criminal issues, I've been arrested. I do not want that to happen again. It's really important that there be clarity on how the office is being opened and how the operation will run. And it's just startling that a press release could go out that shows that the only office in City Hall not open to pre-pandemic position was Assessing. I'm glad to hear that it's a mistake, but I think we should put something out in writing to fix that, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, I just remind the members of the public, I should have said this in the beginning, that there is a 5 minute limitation per speaker. Is there a second person to speak Director Kleiner?

Ms. Kleiner

There are two other members of the public that are on the meeting, and they wish to speak.

Mr. Hansberry

Yes, Alderman Lu. Yes, go ahead. You're on mute—you've got to unmute, Alderman Lu. Alderman Lu, you're muted.

Mr. Earley

Should be good now.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, go ahead. Yeah, she's not coming through, you're not coming through. You're still--you're not coming through Alderman Lu. Director Kleiner is there anything we can do to help that situation out?

Ms. Kleiner

We'll try to mute, and ask her to unmute from here. Other than that, there's little I can do.

Mr. Earley

She said one minute.

Mr. Hansberry

Why don't we-- is there another person waiting to speak, and we can come back to Alderman Lu and maybe we can get that problem rectified in the meantime?

Ms. Kleiner

Yeah, I see no one else stepping forward to speak. If acceptable to the Board I would just like to point out to the Board and to the members of the public that the information on our website is correct regarding the opening, and members of the public should check there. I also believe there was a clarification made in the local newspaper, at least the online version. I do want to note this is a clarification, there was some question about whether appointments would still be necessary, I believe the original press release did say walk-ins were allowed. It did mention something about appointments. That has been removed. It did also mention the 15 minute time limit and that has been removed. So the information on our website and in the Telegraph online is correct.

Alderwoman Lu

I think I'm all set now.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, go right ahead Alderwoman Lu.

Alderwoman Lu

Thank you. Sorry about that. I wanted to bring your attention to article 5:5 of our ordinances. I feel there has been a lot of controversy and concern about the sealed, sealing and possibly failure to unseal minutes, which I spoke about last meeting. 5:5 suggests that because, or states I should say, that because the Board of Alderman is responsible for you know, policy making and responsibility for matters, you know, involving the citizens, that it's important that

we be able to-- well it's encouraged, according to article C under that, that they be given access to the non-public sessions. The reason I think this would be important, to be allowed to enter the non-public, is that there are claims being made about short comings of the city agencies and agents. And I feel that I can't become informed about that without being admitted into the non-public session as well. So that's what I wanted to request, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

And I'll just, read this legal advisory that was issued by Attorney Leonard, let's see when this was dated, Sept. 30<sup>th</sup> 2020, regarding what you're referencing. Lastly, in determining who may stay or not, in a public, non-public session, in a non-public session the Board may wish to consider NRO, 5-5:c which urges the Boards to invite the Mayor and Alderman to non-public sessions, at which issues are discussed that are relevant to decisions deliberations or votes made by the Mayor of Board of Alderman. So it's up to us to have to determine whether or not what's being discussed is to germane to that particular ordinance. And, historically we've made the decision based on what's going to be discussed that it would not be germane to what was stated from the legal advisory from Attorney Leonard. And each case is handled on an individual basis. So it depends upon the nature of what is being discussed in non-public, and if it does not have general applicability to the Board of Alderman, then the Board of Alderman are denied access to the non-public session. Ok, are there any comments by members of the Board?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Ok, all right, so I think I've got it right this time. Is there a motion to go into non-public for two reasons, first to discuss matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a 15member of this board, unless such person requests an open meeting? This exemption shall extend to include any application for assistance or tax abatement or waiver of a fee, fine or other levy, if based on inability to pay or poverty of the applicant, pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, 11(c). Second, under 91-A: 3, 11(1), for the "consideration of legal advice provided by legal counsel, either in writing or orally, to one or more members of the public body, even where legal counsel is not present."

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry, yes. Let the record show that we have entered non-public session at 9:57am, and I will wait for the green light from Director Kleiner.

Jeff Poehnert

I will confirm we're off the air, hold on just for one minute, one second.

Mr. Hansberry

All right.

Jeff Poehnert

This is to confirm that we are off the air and I am leaving the meeting now. Have a good one.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you very much.

You are all set Chair.

(Back in public session at 10:11 AM)

Mr. Hansberry

Ok. Is there a motion to seal the...let the record show that we have re-entered public session at 10:11am. Is there a motion to seal the minutes of the non-public session because divulgence of the information likely would one, affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of this public body, and two, and render the proposed action ineffective?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Motion is adopted. Is there anything else to come before the Board? Once again I want to thank everybody, I want to thank IT. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second? I will second that. I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry? Yes. Let the record show that we are adjourned at 10:12am. Once again, thanks everyone.

