

**Public Minutes of the Board of Assessors  
Meeting of June 30, 2021**

A meeting of the Board of Assessors was held at The Nashua City Hall, Room 208, 229 Main Street, Nashua, NH 03060, also via Zoom. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Chair Daniel Hansberry

**Members Present:**

Daniel Hansberry

Robert Earley

Paul Bergeron

**Assessing Staff Present:**

Gary Turgiss

Michael Mandile

Doug Dame

Amanda Mazerolle

Richard Vincent

Patricia Bell

**Other City of Nashua Staff Present:**

Administrative Services Director Kimberly Kleiner

Jeff Poehnert Nashua Community TV

Deputy Corporate Counsel Celia Leonard

**Others Present:**

Attorney Chris Boldt representing Diocese of Manchester

Robert Eib from the Diocese of Manchester

Pamela Wellman from Family Promise

Dusty Clobber from Family Promise

Attorney Gerald Prunier representing Family Promise.

Laurie Ortolano

**Mr. Hansberry**

Good Morning, I'll call the meeting of the Nashua Board of Assessors to order at 9 am on Wednesday June 30, 2021. Let the record show that present from the board are Robert Earley, Paul Bergeron, and myself Daniel Hansberry. Is there a motion to waive the reading of the

minutes of the public session from the Board meeting held on Thursday June 17, 2021, accept them and place them on file?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any errors or corrections? Seeing none all those in favor of the motion as presented, signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye, opposed nay, Aye's have it, motion carries.

Is there a motion to waive the reading of the non-public meeting minutes from the board meeting held on Thursday June 17, 2021, accept them and place them on file?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second..

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any errors or corrections? Seeing none, I will call the vote, all those in favor of accepting the minutes as presented signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Any opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries.

Is there a motion to waive the reading of the non-public meeting minutes from the board meeting held on Thursday June 21, 2021, accept them and place them on file?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any errors or corrections? Seeing none, I will call the vote, all those in favor of signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye, opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. There are no communications. Mr. Vincent do you have anything for us?

Mr. Vincent

I have nothing.

Mr. Hansberry

Director Kleiner do you have anything for us?

Director Kleiner

No Chair I do not.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, moving on to new business. At this time I will recognize Doug Dame.

Mr. Dame

Good Morning. I have before me a list of denials of commercial and industrial properties for the tax year 2020. These are 40 properties, which were on a list representing many cases of repeats, meaning that there are prior appeals, that for whatever reason, negotiations are ongoing or have been paused pending completion of appraisal reports, or just waiting for information to be introduced. I believe copies of that list was provided to members of the board, and I can answer any questions that you have.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Dame?

Mr. Early

No.

Mr. Bergeron

I don't have any.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to deny the 2020 abatements of properties located at various addresses in Nashua, NH as provided per the attached list?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion?

Mr. Vincent

Chair I have one item. There is one property that has to be removed from the list. That is about the seventh one down, 143 Daniel Webster Hwy, that is the Lowe's Home Center, and that will be discussed later. There was a settlement agreement for that. All the others are okay.

Mr. Hansberry

So is there an amendment to reflect the deletion of account number 30880 per the attached list?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying Aye?

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Any opposed say nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. So the attached list now becomes the new list, minus that property. All those in favor of the motion as presented, signify by saying Aye.

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Any opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Dame does that conclude your report?

Mr. Dame

That does, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. At this time I will recognize Gary Turgiss who has abatement recommendations for the board, Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

Good Morning. The first one that I have up for discussion is 4 Manorcrest Drive, this is a mobile home. Property had a tree fall on it back in November and they received a July 1<sup>st</sup> tax bill in error. We would just like to abate the amount for the July 1<sup>st</sup> tax bill. Any questions?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 4 Manorcrest Drive from \$47,300 to \$0?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye, opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The second property I have is for 4 Greeley Street in Nashua. It is a three family home. The taxpayer feels that the value of the property was \$409,000 based on a list of comparable sales that she supplied and a sales grid. The city's analysis came up with a value of \$420,000 with an equalized assessment of \$348,600. Are there any questions on this one?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Bergeron

I have one.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Bergeron.

Mr. Bergeron

Mr. Turgiss the abatement recommendation describes the property as two buildings, they're attached though aren't they?

Mr. Turgiss

No, they are not attached. They are two separate.

Mr. Bergeron

Thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Did this come before us last year?

Mr. Turgiss

I don't believe they did. I don't remember.

Mr. Hansberry

This is by the stadium?

Mr. Turgiss

Yes. (Inaudible)

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 4 Greeley Street from \$428,200 to \$348,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye"--

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

--Aye, those opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next property that I have is at 25 Broad St in Nashua. This is another three family property. The taxpayers felt the value of their property is \$430,000 based on a list of comparable sales and comparison to the assessment at 24 Broad Street. The city analysis came up with a market value of \$460,000 which is equalized at \$381,800. Any questions on that property?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 25 Broad Street from \$421,200 to \$381,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next abatement application I have is for 45 Courtland St. in Nashua. The taxpayers feel the market value of their property is \$410,000 based on a list of comparable sales and a list of deferred maintenance items. They did purchase the property in April, on April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2020 for \$441,000. The City's analysis indicates that the value that they paid of \$441,000 is an acceptable value. Recommending approval for reduction of the abatement of market value of \$441,000 with an equalized assessment of \$366,000.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Turgiss I have a question. Looking at the comps, one of the comps that you used was on Raymond St. So Raymond, Wood, Berkeley, Chester, all of those streets would be in line with Courtland St?

Mr. Turgiss

Yes, Courtland is in the same neighborhood.

Mr. Hansberry

All right. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located 45 Courtland Street from \$457,500 to \$366,000?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next property that I have is located at 10 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 104. The taxpayers felt that the market value of their property is \$197,500 based on a list of comparable sales. They also purchased the property for \$197,500 on January 31, 2020. The City's analysis supports the market value of \$197,500 with an equalized assessment of \$163,900. Any questions regarding this property?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Turgiss, as I recall before you were presenting a number of condos in a particular association, you said over time they can change significantly. When they are starting out its pretty much even Steven.

Mr. Turgiss

Right.

Mr. Hansberry

Due to either keeping up with the property or neglecting the property, could have a considerable effect on value.

Mr. Turgiss

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

I remember that going up back in 1985, seems almost like yesterday.

Mr. Turgiss

Right.

Mr. Hansberry

What 36 years?

Mr. Turgiss

Right.

Mr. Hansberry

Wow, okay. Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 10 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 104 from \$177,300 to \$163,900?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor signify by saying “Aye”.

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye, opposed signify by saying nay, Aye’s have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next property that I have is located at 10 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 203. The taxpayers feel the market value is \$309,000 based on a list of comparable sales that were provided. They also purchased the property for \$309,000 on March 23, 2020. The City’s analysis indicates that a market value of \$309,000, with an equalized assessment of \$256,500.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 10 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 203 from \$291,300 to \$256,500?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next property I have is 10 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 502. The taxpayers feel the market value of their property is \$320,000 based on a list of comparable sales provided to them. They also purchased the property [or \$320,000 on February 13, 2020. The sales analysis supports a market value of \$320,000 with an equalized assessment of \$265,600. Any questions regarding this property?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 10 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 502 from \$292,900 to \$265,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next property I have is a property located at 16 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 104. The taxpayer felt that the market value of this property was \$265,000 based on some comparable sales. He also purchased the property for that amount, \$265,000, on April 30, 2020. However this sale was an unqualified sale because there was no market exposure for it. The taxpayer knew the grantor. He knew who the grantor was and he was the one who purchased the property based on that. The City's analysis supports a market value of \$350,000 with an equalized assessment of \$290,500. Recommend approval for \$290,500.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 16 Mt. Laurels Drive, Unit 104 from \$328,100 to \$290,500?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Turgiss

The next one that I have is 16 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 201. The taxpayers feel the market value of their property is \$370,000 based on a list of comparable sales provided to them. They also purchased the property for \$370,000 on May 21, 2020. The city's analysis supports a market value of \$370,000 with an equalized assessment of \$307,100. Any questions?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Turgiss?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 16 Mt. Laurels Dr., Unit 201 from \$328,100 to \$307,100?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Does that conclude your report?

Mr. Turgiss

That concludes my report, yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you.

Mr. Turgiss

Thank you Board.

Mr. Hansberry

At this time I will recognize Mr. Mandile.

Mr. Mandile

Good Morning Board. I have some abatement recommendations, the first one I have is for 8 Dublin Avenue. It is a single family home, the taxpayers felt the value of the property was \$344,000. The City's analysis came in with a market value of \$362,000 with a proportionate assessment of \$300,500. Does the Board have any questions for me?

Mr. Earley

No questions.

Mr. Hansberry

On the comps Mr. Mandile, you mentioned Sycamore Lane, Cheyenne Dr., were adjusted for being a superior location. Is that due to traffic volume?

Mr. Mandile

Traffic is, Dublin is a fairly busy street.

Mr. Hansberry

And does the fact that there is no abutters to the rear of those properties, also play into it—their neighbor is the Nashua River?

Mr. Mandile

It can, especially on Cheyenne Drive, yes.

Mr. Hansberry

All right, any other questions?

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 8 Dublin Avenue from \$361,600 to \$300,500?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

My next property is at 255 Pine St. It's a single family home, the taxpayers felt the market value was the purchase price, \$369,000. And the City's analysis that price \$369,000 falls within the range of comparable sales with a proportionate assessment of \$306,300. Does the Board have any questions for me?

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 255 Pine Street from \$355,700 to \$306,300?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is located at 33 Wood St., single family home. The taxpayer wrote down the market value of \$75,000, I believe that is the condition of the house itself at the time. They provided a very in depth analysis of the work needing to be done to bring it up to code. The City's analysis recommends lowering the assessment to \$252,400 from the original assessment of \$329,200. I should add that this property is just about completed, well just about complete for 2021. So this is strictly for 2020.

Mr. Hansberry

It's unbelievable what happened to these people.

Mr. Mandile

I know.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

I have one question Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hansberry

Go ahead.

Mr. Earley

Mike, has this house been lived in all along?

Mr. Mandile

No. Fortunately the owners owned another property in the city that they could stay in while the construction was going on.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions? Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 43 Wood Street from \$329,200 to \$252,400?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is located on 8C St, it is a 2 Unit, Family Flat. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$214,600 to \$167,700. Does the Board have any questions?

Mr. Hansberry

Questions for Mr. Mandile? It looks like an investor that is looking for these types of properties.

Mr. Mandile

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 8 C Street from \$214,600 to \$167,700?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is located at 7 Nelson St. The taxpayers purchased the property for \$315,000 on October 7, 2019. Sales analysis shows that the original purchase price falls within the range of comparable sales, with a proportionate assessment of \$261,500. City recommends approval.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

I just have one. Your report indicates that there were attempts to contact the taxpayer to ask questions and those attempts were unsuccessful.

Mr. Mandile

That is correct.

Mr. Bergeron

Generally how do you go about attempting to contact the owners?

Mr. Mandile

Ninety percent of the time it's through the phone, over the phone. If there's an email address, we try contacting them that way as well.

Mr. Bergeron

Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 7 Nelson Street from \$282,300 to \$261,500?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is a single family located at 5 Indiana Drive. The city recommends denial for late filing.

Mr. Hansberry

Are there any questions on that property?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to deny the abatement for the property located at 5 Indiana Drive?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is located at 4 Williams Court. Taxpayer purchased the property for \$136,000 on November of 2019. The city looked at this strictly on condition and recommends lowering the assessment from \$187,700 to \$ 133,800.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is this off of Williams St? Is that where Williams Court is?

Mr. Mandile

No, this is off of Temple.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction on the property located at 4 Williams Court from \$187,700 to \$133,800?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is located at 38 Silverton Drive. It's a townhouse condominium. The taxpayer purchased the property for \$220,000 in February of 2020. Sales analysis indicates the original sales price of \$220,000 falls within the range of comparable sales, and the city recommends lowering the assessment from \$195,800 to \$182,600.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 38 Silverton Drive from \$195,800 to \$182,600?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is also a townhouse condominium located at 30 Heather Court. The taxpayer purchased the property for \$252,000. It gets a market value of \$235,000. Sales analysis indicates that the purchase price of \$252,000 falls within the range of comparable sales, and recommends lowering the assessment from \$217,300 to \$209,200.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 30 Heather Court from \$217,300 to \$209,200?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is a single family home located at 9 Nathan Court. The taxpayer purchased the property for \$310,000 in February of 2020. Sales analysis indicates the original purchase price falls within the range of comparable sales and recommends lowering the assessment from \$291,200 to \$257,300.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 9 Nathan Court from \$291,200 to \$257,300?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is located at 3 Shaker Place. This is located at Holden Farms Condominiums. It is a single family detached condominium. I need to make a change on this, I was able to speak to the homeowner on Monday the 28<sup>th</sup>. However that does not change the city's position and we recommend a denial on this abatement.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to deny the abatement for the property located at 3 Shaker Place?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is also located at Holden Farms Condominiums, this one is on 14 Shaker Place. The city recommends denial for the same reason as the previous abatement.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to deny the abatement for the property located at 14 Shaker Place?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Next property is located at 32 Dublin Avenue, single family home. City recommends lowering the assessment from \$414,000 to \$384,200. This was done by adding depreciation that had been removed earlier.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

I have a question, Mr. Chairman. Mike, can you explain the functional depreciation, like how the house has been added onto and in doing so, it's kind of hodge podge, is that it?

Mr. Mandile

That's it, basically yes. It's kind of a rambling floor plan.

Mr. Earley

Is there any way to improve that?

Mr. Mandile

Not really, no.

Mr. Earley

Oh, that's too bad. No other questions.

Mr. Hansberry

It's almost, just kind of a thought for our education, worthwhile to retain an architect when you're going through renovations, correct?

Mr. Mandile

Correct.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 32 Dublin Avenue from \$414,000 to \$384,200?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is located at 66 Harbor Ave, Unit 9. It's a townhouse style condominium. The city, if you looked at comparable sales on this, decided to make it a uniform adjustment to the entire complex. Lowering the assessment for this unit from \$162,900 to \$124,100.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Which one is this on Harbor, is this one near the ball field, like near Allds St?

Mr. Mandile

No, this is closer to like East Otterson.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay. Any other questions?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction for the property located at 66 Harbor Avenue, Unit 9 from \$162,900 to \$124,100?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

The next property is located at 9 Normandy Way up in Majestic Heights. It is a single family home. The city recommends lowering the assessment from \$379,400 to \$351,100.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions for Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to approve the assessment reduction at the property located at 9 Normandy Way from \$379,400 to \$351,100?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Mr. Mandile?

Mr. Mandile

Thank you. My last recommendation is for 2 Henry David Drive. The city recommends denial for late filing.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a motion to deny the abatement for the property located at 2 Henry Drive, Unit 104?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Thank you Mr. Mandile.

Mr. Mandile

Thank you Board.

Mr. Hansberry

At this time I will recognize Mr. Vincent.

Mr. Vincent

Thank you. I have three items to discuss. I'll take them out of order. I want to go to number two on my sheet. That is the abatement application for 6 Harvard St. There's a 2020 abatement application on this property. A little bit of history on this property. This is owned by a Catholic Church and there is some space being leased by Family Promise, which is a non-profit organization. They were in the process of renovating the space for their needs as of April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020. A tax bill was sent out for \$73,688.25. The property was considered vacant before April 1<sup>st</sup>. We found out that subsequently the space was being renovated for Family Promise's use. So it was in between tenants, as far as the actual occupancy of the space. Family Promise and the Catholic Church applied for the abatement application, partly because of financial needs, and

because they were actually leasing the space and fixing it up for their needs. We do have some representatives from Family Promise and possibly the Church to speak about the abatement application.

Attorney Chris Boldt

If I may Mr. Chairman, Chris Boldt with Donahue, Tucker & Ciandella. I'm here on behalf of the Diocese of Manchester. I'm joined today by Robert Eib, of the Diocese. We also have Attorney Prunier for Family Promise, Pamela Wellman of Family Promise, who is the person in charge, does all the good work. And Dusty Clobber who is an Executive Counsel for Family Promise. As you know from our materials, Family Promise is a homeless shelter. They are doing the good work that the church, over the centuries has always done, helping the less fortunate. They service 24 families in that facility. The lease as was provided in our materials was entered into in March of 2020, their work began shortly thereafter for the renovations, from the Infant Jesus School, to the Homeless Shelter. This is the very nature of an exempt usage. There are statutes in case law, and we respectfully request that the Board find that this bill was in essence issued in error. And that neither the Diocese nor Family Promise needs to pay this \$73,000 dollar bill. Which would have, we could go into great detail if you need, but the detrimental impact on those services that this organization is providing, which in otherwise the city would have to provide services for. So we say that the application before you is timely and complete. The A9 that listed this property from the Diocese was filed timely back before April 15<sup>th</sup> of last year, so we respectfully urge that the Board find that this application be granted. I'm happy to answer any questions and to have anyone else give you more feedback if you need.

Mr. Hansberry

Any questions?

Mr. Earley

Mr. Chairman, I have one question. What was the beginning and the end of the reconstruction or the rehab of the building?

Attorney Chris Boldt

I know the end for certain because the ceremonial, quote- unquote, groundbreaking, which was actually the end of the process, was in October of last year, which the Governor and the Mayor was in attendance. I believe the renovation began shortly after the lease was entered into on May, excuse me, March 19<sup>th</sup> 2020.

Mr. Hansberry

Any more questions?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Hansberry

So the school closed in June of '19, is that correct.

Attorney Chris Boldt

It closed in '19 I know that for a fact, yes. Not sure if it was in May or in June, June it is.

Mr. Hansberry

And from June of '19 to March of '20 it remained vacant?

Attorney Chris Boldt

That is my understanding. It was still in process of evaluation and usage by the Diocese. And when all that was going on, obviously negotiations with Family Promise was going on.

Mr. Vincent

I can add that it was not being used for any for-profit purpose, I know that.

Attorney Chris Boldt

Correct.

Mr. Hansberry

And are they connected to the Oblate Retreat House, that's used as transition housing? Is this the same organization or are those two separate distinct organizations?

Attorney Chris Boldt

I'm going have to defer on that.

Pamela Wellman

It's a separate organization.

Mr. Hansberry

And is this going to be for families in transitions, is that correct?

Pamela Wellman

Families in Transition is different organization than Manchester. But our purpose, our mission is for families that are temporarily homeless.

Mr. Hansberry

So single men, or single women, will not be allowed to live there?

Pamela Wellman

That is correct, it's families. We have single fathers, we have single mothers, and full families.

Mr. Hansberry

Any more questions?

Mr. Bergeron

When did the school cease operations?

Robert Eib

June 30<sup>th</sup> of 2019.

Mr. Bergeron

Was the building taxed prior to the 2020 tax bill?

Robert Eib

No, we filed A9's every year on time for that.

Mr. Bergeron

I don't have any further questions.

Mr. Hansberry

Any further questions?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Anything else you care to add Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Vincent

My recommendation is to approve the abatement application.

Mr. Hansberry

Anything else counselor?

Attorney Chris Boldt

Not right now sir, thank you kindly for the time.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. Is there a motion to approve the abatement of the 2020 tax bill of \$73,688.25 for the property located at 6 Harvard St?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries.

Attorney Chris Boldt

Thank you, we greatly appreciate you.

Pamela Wellborn

Thank you very much, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Vincent

Next item would be item number one on my list. That is really just a statement, there's no motion that is needed by the Board. That is the 2020 abatement application for 41 Berkeley St. But there is also a Board of Tax Land Appeals decision on the same property for the 2018 and 2019 tax years. The Board found the market value for 41 Berkeley St. for 2018 to be \$625,000 dollars and for 2019 \$650,000 dollars and that translates into an assessed value of \$577,200 for 2018—no, I'm sorry, \$592,500 for tax year of 2018, and an assessed \$577,200 for 2019. The Board also ordered that the \$577,200 assessment be carried forward until the next revaluation. So that value is to be applied to the property for 2020. So, on the TC abatement report, I listed the three tax years for 41 Berkeley St. for the abatement amounts. So, that will be taken care of when you sign the TC abatement report. We also have the owner, Laurie Ortolano, for the property here to speak.

Mr. Hansberry

Are you set?

Mr. Vincent

I think I'm set on that.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, before we hear from Ms. Ortolano, any questions for Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, Mrs. Ortolano?

Ms. Ortolano

Yes, I just want to give you these packets because I'm going to reference a few documents and I don't want you to be in the dark. I appreciate the Board not pushing the matter to appeal, and it being over with, so that's nice to have that behind me. I am concerned about my ability to get

information on neighborhood assessments and abatements that have been done within the neighborhood. One of the issues that I have is the property right next door to me at 39 Berkeley St. I feel that this Board and this city denied me the opportunity, and the assessing office, to understand how that abatement was produced, and what was done on that abatement. To justify the level of assessment, and the impact that had on my property assessment. I don't think it is right. I am going to file a complaint with the state about this. I do feel that every citizen should be able to look at other properties, especially in their neighborhood. And I wrote to Mr. Vincent on June 2<sup>nd</sup> and I said I wanted to speak to Mr. Turgiss about the abatement work he did on 39 Berkeley St. I wrote to him in 2019 and he would not respond. And nobody would respond down in assessing. So, per the DRA guidelines that questions should be responded to, it doesn't have to be by the person you wrote to, it could be somebody in assessing. Nobody responded it fell on deaf ears. My request to speak to the Board was denied. So I couldn't come to the Board last year. I think you should always be able to come to the Board on a property abatement issue before there is an appeal. And I did have an abatement, and I know the city took the position, Attorney Leonard and Attorney Bolton, that it was an inexplicably late abatement to an already existing appeal, but the BTLA did not rule on that, in favor of that. And kept them separate issues. So, I want you to understand something, 39 Berkeley St. had an abatement done by Gary. I'm not opposed to what was produced, but the sales data that he used on that abatement was Tanglewood. A house in Tanglewood and also my sister home at 45 Berkeley St. The last 4 pages of the document are some pictures off the listing sheet on that property. Now, 45 Berkeley St. was purchased in 2017. He took the data point a couple of years out, which is a little unusual for them to use sales data a couple of years old, but it was right on the street and he felt it was relevant. Here's what's unique about this property, so these photographs, there were very limited photographs on the MLS listing on this property, because the property was dated. And when you receive photographs and you see pictures like this, you can see it has this mauve carpeting, this wallpaper, it was dated. There were no pictures of bathrooms or kitchens. There was no write up on it, it was dated. When the property owners bought it, they didn't move in for 6 months, put a dumpster out front and proceeded with a major overhaul. They pulled a 15,000 dollar permit. Now Mike Mandile followed up on that property, he went repeatedly, so I believe he had an idea given the dumpster out on the side of it, very visible, that the house was undergoing a pretty significant renovation. However, the property owner would not let him in. So, and it was a fully renovated house. In 2019 that house went on the Holiday House Tour, like mine did in eight, like '17, and the assessing staff came through. Because the property owner said to me, (inaudible), looking at the house, and the property owner said, oh the assessing staff came through the house and they said do you think they'll change the assessment and I said no. I think you'll get assessed the next round, but I don't think they're going to make a change. Because you had filed the permit, the assessor was by in 2017 and early '18, before KRT set the numbers to see that this work was going on. And the assessing office made no change to that property. They gave you a purchase price of \$560,000 as being a reasonable market value for the house, and the fact that it was fully renovated, the assessing saw no reason to add value. In

part I think they were right. Because diagonal to that property was a house at 38 Berkeley St. that sold to another young couple, these were two young couples that had moved on the street. It was a thousand square feet bigger and it sold for \$540,000. It had a much newer kitchen and renovated bathrooms. And the two couples would talk, and the couple with the bigger house, always said to the other couple you really don't pay. I think in fact the assessor's looked at it and said okay, yeah it's all renovated, but they didn't want to change the EYB and make these conditional changes, because I had obviously have been making some waves about that. And really it shouldn't have been done, it needed to be addressed in the update. But, the card was never changed such that KRT saw any of that improvement. Now, in 2019 Gary uses that house at 45 Berkeley St. as a comp for 39 Berkeley St. It surprised me because the size difference between the two homes is almost about 800-750 square feet, there's a big size difference. The assessing office usually would not make those comparable. There were other larger homes on Concord St. in the neighborhood that could've been used as comps. The other issue is, if the assessing office believed that this was an un-renovated home, it did acknowledge that it was un-renovated, and there would've been no reason for them to compare that to 39 Berkeley St. If you looked at the property card which I have given you on 39 Berkeley St., it is a house that has put about 1.1 million into it. That's a lot of money. A \$400,000 dollar permit, the pool, the upgrade, and the purchase price is about 1.1 million. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to appreciate that, that's probably a well done home. It is. The property owners don't deny that at all. But for the assessor to take 45 Berkeley St. make that a comp, to 39, tells me that the assessing office knew that 45 Berkeley St. was a very renovated home as well. The problem I have, is the property card, if you looked at 45 Berkeley St., the property record card that I had given you, the EYB in the documentation on that card, shows it as a, it's right before the pictures on the back, it's that one. It shows the EYB as 1964. It's not a 1964 home. How does Vision take a home like this and know that this home at 45 is very similar to renovation level at the home at 41. How does Vision know that? Well we don't mark the card when there is no note put by the assessor that this is an upgraded house. Now I believe—well, I know that the assessing staff went through this house. I believe it was communicated to the assessors the condition of the house. If it wasn't then all of you should've questioned why would you take this really dated old home and compare it to 39 Berkeley St., it makes no sense. But I believe they knew. And so, you know, I wanted to have this understanding to go into my BTLA hearing and I could not have that understanding because the city would not allow me to have that knowledge. They would not allow me to have that conversation. I was so irritated with the June 2<sup>nd</sup> email that I sent to Mr. Vincent where I discussed in the first paragraph wanting to address this abatement at 39 Berkeley St. and the response I got was the generic. You know, response, "these are the documents developed by the assessing department to determine if an abatement was necessary; they speak for themselves. The documents are specific to each property. They do not necessarily reflect what would be considered for another property." Okay, that's a general statement. But I'm writing to you about my specific property. I have been hammered by this Nashua Legal office, in letters, in writing. You know, "AssessHelp, Mrs. Ortolano you can't you

can't write a question into AssessHelp unless it's about your own property." That's what that's used for. That came from Celia. That was never really true. But when I write to my own property, when I speak to my own property, you ignore it and you come general. You go well, you know, they don't necessarily reflect what would be considered on another property. Did it for mine? Why would 45 Berkeley St. not be a reflection of 41? It is built by the same architect, okay designed by the same architect, and built by the same construction company and I put the pictures in there, those 4 pictures, because the stairway is identical, the front to back living room, the molding in the fireplace is literally identical to mine. I was shocked when I first walked in that house, because I said Oh my gosh, this is the same architect out of Boston. And they had some drawings marked with the same name. So technically their house has a completion date later than mine. I think that is an error. It's listed as a 1937 house, mine is a 1925. They actually think based on the drawings of the house that was not correct. But we don't know. But technically it would be a newer house. And the renovations done to the property done on 2017 and 2018, make all of the upgrades ten years newer than mine. So, you know, the BTLA has come out with a decision. I have addressed with Rick Vincent, I had him come to the house to look at my third floor living space in my attic. I feel my third floor living space should not be considered the same quality of space as my first and second floor. And I cite 45 Berkeley St. All of their living space is on the first and second floor. The four bedrooms and it's about hundred square feet bigger than mine. About, 3450 and I'm 3347. Okay, they're very, very, close. But all of the living space is first and second floor and it's an air conditioned house. My living space is first, second, and my fourth bedroom is an attic. It is not heated, it's not air conditioned and it's not insulated. We've never used it as a bedroom, it's not livable. It's oppressively hot in the summer. It only has gable windows on that third floor, its open wall and it's too cold in the winter. It's a 50 degree room and you'd have to run an electric heater and with all the old wiring in there we don't do it. We don't do it. So we don't use that space. I paid \$90 dollars a square foot for that attic like I do for the second and first floor. I don't feel that is equitable. Now the BTLA comes down and gives a number of \$625,000. They don't allow, they don't specify how the property card should be changed. My understanding is the BTLA number is an override that they are going to put on my property. When KRT came up with \$652,000, KRT I think changed the data on the property record card, hit the calculate button, took the depreciation down 4-5 years, changed some features on the quality of bathrooms and the kitchens, and knocked that assessment down 30 grand. I think the math tells me that worked with a calculate button. The BTLA comes in and just gives a number. They don't care what the property card looks like. How is Vision going to rate my space and know that my card does not have the same living conditions as my neighbors' properties? And why can't the card be changed to reflect that the third floor should not be rated and paid at a \$90 dollar a square foot level? It's a data correction. And I really think it affects my property. The reason I think it does, is because at 350 square feet, billed at \$90 dollars is so different from the 450 extra square feet of the second floor of my neighbor, that my finished basement space would become a wash with their space. I do believe these two homes should be assessed fairly closely, their renovations are ten

years newer. However, it won't come out that way because the data on the cards is not even accurate. So that's what concerns me about this whole Vision thing. When the assessors use a house, that the data is incorrect on the card, don't bother correcting the card to any capacity, Vision's looking at that card and they see a 1964 house that fully isn't even renovated, whatever, \$15,000 dollar renovation they did must have been so small wasn't really worth anything, when in fact it was probably a \$200,000 dollar renovation, it was big, that's okay. But there is no knowledge for that, your assessors go in, your staff looks at it, nobody knows anything, they use it as a high end home to compare to the neighbors, and none of it is documented. So I've written to the BTLA--and I think I cc'd you on it--to say how do these data corrections get made? How does my card become reflective of the property it is? You gave me a nice number, it's an override, but it doesn't reflect the card at all. So, I really strongly object to the treatment I received last year from the legal office and from you as a Board, under the advisement of the legal office and I'm glad to see Attorney Leonard sitting in here, and I want to let you know I hope we never see Attorney Bolton sitting in here again. This was wrong to tell property owners you can't come in here and question your neighbor's property right next door, that frankly I wrote the abatement for and you granted. I think I know what I was talking about. I think I had a pretty good understanding on where that property should be as I had on mine. And if you recall in 2019, I asked you to accept \$595,000 for my property, just give me \$595,000 and I'll walk away. And you folks said no. And it turned into, what, \$50,000 bucks of city spending to go battle that, on top of me? Total waste. So that's the end of that, but in public comment I want to address another issue.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. Did you have a third item Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Vincent

Yes. I wanted to revisit the 2020 denial list that was presented by Doug Dame. I apologize there are two other properties that should be removed from that list, actually three other properties, two owned by Northern New England Telephone, 7 Graham Drive it's the eighth from the top, the eighth and ninth properties on the list, 7 Graham Drive and 124 West Pearl St., they should be removed from the list, those are still open abatement applications.

Mr. Hansberry

7 Graham and 124 West Pearl?

Mr. Vincent

Right. And then down towards the bottom of the page it's about the eighth one up, it's 213 Daniel Webster Highway. That's still an open abatement application that should be removed as well.

Mr. Hansberry

213?

Mr. Vincent

Yes, it should be about the eighth, 6<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> one from the bottom.

Mr. Bergeron

Oh I see it, it's just DW Highway.

Mr. Vincent

Yes, sorry.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay. All right, so is there a motion to reconsider the 2020 denial list as presented?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. So the original list is before us. Is there a motion to amend the list as presented which would reflect the deletion of property account number, 24984, 7 Graham Drive, 24976, 124 West Pearl Street, and account number 12190, 2000—I'm sorry, 213 Daniel Webster Highway?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Bergeron

Mr. Chairman? If we're voting on that, since we're reconsidering the list in its entirety, shouldn't we also identify as being removed account number 30880, 143 Daniel Webster Highway?

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, all right. That captures everything, Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Vincent

It does.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, all those in favor of the amendment signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. Is there a motion to approve-- the motion is to approve the motion as amended. Right, I'm getting a little lost on the wording. So, is there a motion to adopt, to approve the motion as amended? That's what it is.

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay. Aye's have it, motion carries. If you need help with wording of that, let me know.

Ms. Bell

No worries.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, anything else, Mr. Vincent?

Mr. Vincent

No that's all I have,

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, so there's no unfinished business. Okay, so once again, public comment period is 5 minutes per person, so each speaker is limited to speaking once per public comment period and is limited to 5 minutes. And I'll also point out the remarks should remain civil, rude or profane remarks are prohibited, and it was unfortunate somebody who spoke last time did use an inappropriate 4 letter word and I would ask that that not happen going forward. The presiding officer has the authority to terminate the remarks of any speaker when such remarks do not adhere to those rules, or other applicable law. Since you're live and in person...

Ms. Colquhoun

Laura Colquhoun.

Mr. Hansberry

Could you state your address Ms. Colquhoun?

Ms. Colquhoun

30 Greenwood Drive. I want to go on the record to say that I don't care if the City of Nashua puts a million dollars into software and hardware for the assessing department, I feel the whole assessing department should be closed down and farmed out. We really should have qualified people doing this, and I do not feel that we are qualified enough to do this. There's just too many errors, and to not do all the abatements that were received is totally unnecessary, they are only hurting the residents and apparently they don't care. Perfect example of the shoddy work they do, if you look at 32 Tanglewood, it was a disgrace. But as I said, I'm going on the record because I think the City of Nashua should close down our assessing department and farm it out. Thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. Ms. Ortolano?

Ms. Ortolano

Yes, just starting my stopwatch here. Laurie Ortolano, 41 Berkeley St. A couple of things, I just want to talk about an abatement issue. You all know I did work on helping people file these abatements. And the first neighborhood I went into was over in Trestle Brook, because I saw a comment on social media from somebody saying I filed last year and the abatement was lost. That was fine. So I started looking at that property and these other raised ranches and there was a group that just didn't look right over there. And, a good group of them, 7 or 8, filed for an abatement. The abatements were processed. That was the whole issue that I ended up arrested for, because I came in with the 18 and 28 Baltimore Rd abatements to get them date/time stamped on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. I had emailed them to the city on the 17<sup>th</sup> and again on the 20<sup>th</sup> through AssessHelp and the city claims they never received them. I did a right to know for all the emails and they were not in there. By the 22<sup>nd</sup> Rick Vincent said to me we never got your applications. So when I came in to get them date and time stamped, I don't know what was going on with email. I did end up getting them date and time stamped, eventually they came back to me stamped, and changed, penciled in as Jan 22<sup>nd</sup>. I really thought these abatements would be addressed first. Because we went first come first serve, and they weren't. Now, I told property owners who called me-- because they did, and they emailed me and followed up-- don't worry, they'll be taken in May and if not the first week in June. June 17<sup>th</sup> I started to get a little worried. I started making phone calls and wrote some emails, saying "what's the deal, who has these?" It irritates the crap out of me, when I write and I call and I say who's assigned the abatement, and I get put on hold and I get the run around and I'm told someone will call you back, and nobody does. Why is it I can't get the name of assessors assigned? Now ordinarily there would be an

abatement list done by April or May, April really. I think this year with changes it wasn't done. It came to me Friday. And those abatements were never assigned to anyone, those eight, there was no name given to them. They have now been assigned to Mike Mandile. It's unacceptable. I mean, and I don't get an apology, that oh my gosh, we made a mistake, these will be done, these will be done. What I was told was that we had the ability to do more abatements in July. Yes, but I would hope these are going to be the first and they are done. You make a commitment to these people that you will do the abatements, either deny them or grant them, but you will act on them. You will not leave them in a deemed denied pile to say to these people no. Here is an email I got from a gentleman at 25 Baltimore Road. "Just a quick update, no one came. I had exchanged emails with the city and was promised an evaluation would be done by the end of May. Nothing happened. On Friday this is the end of May, I received a tax bill for July and noticed that my bill was up from '19. Very discouraging. Thinking about selling the house now just because I feel the city is overtaxing, especially when I don't own the land. Have a great weekend." I wrote back, "Don't give up hope. The abatement will not show up, will show up on your next December tax bill. I've been virtually attending all Board of Assessor's meetings, and they have not started really reviewing abatements. I would think by the first week of June they will start presenting. Email Rick Vincent tonight or tomorrow, and ask him who is assigned to your abatement. Ask Rick for his email address. It will either be Gary or Mike Mandile, Gary Turgiss or Mike Mandile. Send them an email and ask them if they have started your abatement. Your street was one of the first to submit applications and in the past it has been a first come first serve. Hang in there, I'm getting other emails from folks in your neighborhood who filed and haven't heard a word yet. Keep me posted or give me a call." He said, "Thank you, I'll send the email tomorrow". I reached out to him today to find out when he emailed and what he heard. But this is discouraging for people. For no explanation. And you know what, I'm not liked, I'm freaking despised. I don't want call in and take Mr. Vincent's time. I don't want to send emails asking the same question over and over again. You know, I want to do it once and walk away. I really thought you would address these, and I almost feel like it was some kind of slamming punishment that goes with the arrest just to blow these people off and to blow me off. It's obnoxious. And there should be a reason for it. I want to read one thing into the record. I did a lot of abatements, I did them for free. I did them because I wanted properties to be assessed fairly. "Dear Laurie, I would personally like to express our appreciation and commend you for your perseverance and hard work. In the spring of this year, you approached approximately 17 homes in the Thompson Preserve Development, location is Gilson Road. You presented the homeowners with the opportunity to have their assessment value reduced. You presented homeowners with nearly filled out forms. The outcome of this project is you have succeeded. Our units were recently reduced personally by \$40,000 dollars. This resulted in a return of tax money from the City of Nashua. Our return check was over \$900 dollars. May you continue to fight the good fight on behalf of homeowners. Thank you." Signed by the homeowners. That's why I do it. And I got into these developments, because I don't think in developments we're assessing them correctly. We're jacking up developments and treating properties as if they're

full value, at market value, in the year they're completed versus when they're under construction. And this is what causes skews in these neighborhoods. People always say to me, how can I be like \$60,000 off from this house, when an update is done when we're the same house? It's happening because of how the assessors are leveling these properties when they're not completed. And I want to put an end to that. I think we need to be more conscious, which is why I did it. It's just very upsetting to me and I really feel we need to make some personnel changes. This should not have happened and these people should not have been ignored. Unacceptable. Thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. Are there any other members of the public wishing to comment? Any comments by members of the Board?

Mr. Earley

No.

Mr. Bergeron

I have none.

Attorney Leonard

Mr. Chair if I may.

Mr. Hansberry

Yes.

Attorney Leonard

Thank you. Ms. Ortolano in her presentation regarding her 2020 abatement, made a statement that I sent her an email that only her questions for her property can be sent to AssessHelp. I have no recollection, nor do I think I ever sent an email. It is my understanding that every document that Ms. Ortolano has ever requested has been sent to her, if in fact it exists and was reasonably described. I do not think she can produce any evidence that I ever sent her anything saying that. Second, Ms. Ortolano's arrest was not because she went to the assessing office. It is because she forced her way into the locked legal office, sat in front of my office, and would not leave until the police came. It had nothing to do with time or date stamping, assessment or abatement applications. As Ms. Ortolano is well aware, the legal office does not do that. Thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Comments from the Board members?

Mr. Earley

No

Mr. Bergeron

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Ms. Bell, all that should say is all those in favor of the motion as amended.

Ms. Bell

Okay, thank you.

Mr. Hansberry

Thank you. Anything else public session?

Mr. Vincent

No.

Mr. Hansberry

Okay, 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, II(c). Second, under 91-A: 3, II (L), 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?

Mr. Bergeron

Second.

Mr. Hansberry

I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Bergeron?

Mr. Bergeron

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Hansberry yes. Let the record show that we have entered non-public session at 10:11am.

(We re-entered public session at 10:42 AM.)

Is there a motion to seal the minutes of the non-public session because divulgence of the information likely would 1) affect adversely the reputation of any person other than a member of this public body, and 2) render the proposed action ineffective?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

Second.

Mr. Hansberry

I will call the roll, Mr. Earley?

Mr. Earley

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Mr. Bergeron?

Mr. Bergeron

Yes.

Mr. Hansberry

Yes, motion is adopted. Is there anything else to come before the Board? Okay, once again thank you everybody. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Earley

So moved.

Mr. Hansberry

Is there a second?

Mr. Bergeron

I'll second.

Mr. Hansberry

All those in favor of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Mr. Earley

Aye.

Mr. Bergeron

Aye.

Mr. Hansberry

Aye. Opposed signify by saying nay, Aye's have it, motion carries. And the meeting is adjourned at 10:42am.



