RICHMOND SELECTBOARD
REGULAR MEETING
October 3, 2016 MINUTES

Members Present: Bard Hill; Lincoln Bressor; David Sander

Absent: Ellen Kane; Steve May

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager; Mark Aridgides, Treasurer; Mary Houle; Linda Parent, Town Clerk; Don Palmer; Kevin O’Neal; Etmar O’Neal; Charlie Baker, CCRPC; Mike Parent; Alan Buck, Chief of Police; Dennis Gile, Fire Chief; Robert Stafford, Rick Barrett and Brian Carpenter of the Public Safety Building Committee; and Ruth Miller was present to videotape the meeting for MMCTV Channel 15.

Bard Hill called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

1. Welcome and Public Comment

Mr. Hill asked if there were any comments from the public.

Linda Parent, Town Clerk revealed a certificate she received for additional education called the Vermont Certified Municipal Clerk, “Cum Laude”. Ms. Parent also spoke about the upcoming election and that 250 absentee ballots had already been requested by voters.

2. Items for Discussion with Those Present

Round Church Lease

The Manager explained that he and the Richmond Historical Society president Fran Thomas had come to an agreement on the final lease language. There was an amendment to item 6b that Ms. Thomas requested after the packet was delivered but other language was the same and agreed upon.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the lease for the Round Church with the Richmond Historical Society and was seconded by Mr. Bressor, and the motion carried 3-0.

Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission Annual Report

Charles Baker, the CCRPC Executive Director, was present to talk about the work the Regional Planning Commission was doing, and what they had done for Richmond. He spoke about assistance with Richmond’s Town Plan, work on the stormwater permit for roads, the regional dispatch initiative and the opiates group. There was some conversation on the regional dispatch issue.

Mary Houle talked about the regional energy plan and asked if the RPC had taken a stand on the carbon tax issue. Mr. Baker said it had not been brought up as an issue for them. There was some discussion on this topic.

The Selectboard thanked Mr. Baker and the CCRPC for their help with a variety of projects.

Palmer Lane Name Change
The Manager explained that in September 6th’s packet the board had a request from Patricia Gilbert to rename Palmer Lane in Richmond to Palmer Road. Palmer lane currently has three homes, and a four-lot subdivision by Patricia Gilbert with the potential for some of those lots to be further subdivided. At that time, he wrote that he had no particular objection to the name change, and the board requested that the Manager send out letters to the other homeowners, which he did. He received responses from both homeowners – Don Palmer (who owns the property but no longer lives there) and Kevin O’Neil. Both objected and saw no reason for the road to change names.

He also heard from Richmond Rescue President Taylor Yeates, who said that as an E911 requirement roads that cross municipal boundaries had to have different names so that first responders knew in which town they should look for an address. The Manager double-checked this with E911, who explained that there were two choices towns could make – either keep the road names the same with consecutive addressing, or have road names change at the municipal boundary. Apparently Richmond has consistently chosen to have the road names different than neighboring towns in all cases that can be found.

Richmond’s addresses are not consecutive with Hinesburg’s, so the Manager recommend the board keep the name of the road to Palmer Lane and not change it. There would be some disruption for residents due to re-numbering their addresses, and there doesn’t seem to be a compelling reason for the board to take this action.

Mr. Sander recommended that no action be taken to change the name, and Mr. Bressor agreed.

Don Palmer confirmed that the Palmer Road/Palmer Lane difference was there for a long time and it would confuse 911 if we changed it.

No action was taken and the name of the road would remain Palmer Lane in Richmond.

Public Safety Building Discussion

Three members of the Public Safety Building Committee were present to talk about how to move forward: Bob Stafford, Rick Barrett and Brian Carpenter. Mr. Stafford talked about the location needs of the building and where it might be located. Mr. Carpenter talked about traffic difficulties and Mr. Barrett spoke about the size of the sally port. There was quite a bit of discussion.

Mark Aridgides, Town Treasurer, spoke about the size of some of the other facilities the committee visited, and the size of the towns they were located in. He said that Richmond wasn’t a growing community, and he didn’t think we could afford a $13 million building. Mr. Aridgides asked about Hinesburg’s station.

Chief Buck said Hinesburg had about 4,200 residents and their police department had about 5,000 square feet. There was some discussion about the similarities between the two towns and their budgets. The committee agreed they should visit Hinesburg and gain some insight into how their station was built.

There was additional discussion on call volume and where the bulk of the responses were. Taylor Yeates, of Richmond Rescue, spoke about the new fire safety standards for relative distance to fire stations. He said the new standards were likely to be 1.5 miles to a fire station and 2.5 miles for a ladder truck, but these were urban standards and there would be no way for rural towns to meet them. The issue of “sub stations” was discussed.
The committee agreed to look at other locations that had smaller sized and less expensive facilities. 
The Police and Fire Chiefs agreed that they could share a combined facility with no territory issues. 
The Selectboard thanked everyone for their continued efforts.

Police Services

The Manager explained that recently we’ve been formally approached by both Huntington and Bolton 
about providing certain police services on a part-time basis, for specific areas identified by each town.
These services are primarily traffic-control related, although for some time we have participated in 
regional mutual aid and respond to emergencies without compensation as required. The Vermont 
State Police in Williston dispatch our police, and our response is determined by a number of factors 
including our availability, proximity, response time and nature of the emergency. We also provide 
“back up” for neighboring agencies at times, as well.

The Chittenden County Sheriff has also been approached by these towns, and in some cases already 
provides some speed control on a contract basis. The Sheriff now contracts at $50 per hour plus ½ of 
the ticket revenue. In our preliminary discussions, we’ve talked about our current off-duty/overtime 
contract rate of $45 per hour, which covers our costs. We’ve also made it clear that the Richmond 
Selectboard is responsible for authorizing any service contracts in neighboring towns.

There are quite a few things to consider with these arrangements – costs, revenues, staffing levels, 
predictability and manageability. Before we agree to anything, we’d want to make sure both parties to 
a contract understand all. It has been discussed how we might function as a regional policing entity 
and this might be a good way to measure those issues and introduce other towns to police service – a 
good starting point to understanding how a more intense service level might factor into regional 
service provision.

The discussion was meant to be broad and we have no proposal to consider, but Huntington was 
preparing a special question on the issue for next March, and Bolton may go that route as well.

The discussion from the board centered on finding the real cost of a patrol hour. There was concern 
that at $45 per hour the town might be losing money or subsidizing the patrol hours at the expense of 
Richmond taxpayers. There was discussion on how to measure this cost, and to bring this back to the 
board.

Overall there was support for the idea. The Selectboard recognized that we provided services to other 
areas that weren’t reimbursed – for emergency calls. To try and formalize some sort of service with 
other towns may lead to a greater value of the police services and possibly justify additional spending 
or fulfillment of other needs.

3. Other Business

FY2018 Budget Discussions

The Manager provided an overview for the October 6th special session. No in-depth review of the 
budget was conducted at this meeting.
Interim Zoning and Buttermilk, LLC

The Manager provided a sample timeline for submittal and review of a potential development application from Buttermilk to the Selectboard for redevelopment of the creamery property. This may be modified by Buttermilk’s ability to produce an application and also by the preference of the Selectboard, although once an application is submitted we cannot unilaterally delay review and hearings beyond what’s prescribed in our zoning bylaws (which are based on State law). Any development assumes cleanup/remediation will be completed in the future, as a condition of permit approval.

The Manager and Town Planner suggested a special training session for the Selectboard on October 24th where Clare Rock and a member of the DRB can give an overview of what happens in reviewing development applications and holding hearings, and ultimately, decision on the application.

Another significant issue to consider is a traffic study of the Bridge/Railroad St/Jolina Ct intersection. While the phase 1 building may not cause significant issues, the full buildout in later phases may very well increase our traffic problems or cause new problems later. Buttermilk is preparing to do a traffic study, but the scope and potential remedies are in flux. Clare Rock has some ideas on how to handle this extra traffic, but with normal village constraints, space is at a premium. The intersection is complex, and control will generally fall to one of two options: traffic signals or a round-a-bout.

The Selectboard discussed this, and agreed that a special meeting for October 24th was necessary. The board requested that any traffic study take into account a full-buildout scenario.

VCDP Grant Agreements

The Manager explained that the VCDP grant agreements were still in draft form, and not ready to discuss or approve. The Selectboard agreed to add these to the October 6th agenda if they were ready at that time.

Planning and Zoning Organization

The Manager explained that since 2009, the town has had a separate Planner and Zoning Administrative Officer. When he started, the Planner had 28 hours per week, and the Zoning officer had 16 hours per week. We’re now at 32 hours for the Planner and 20 hours for the Zoning officer. The typical pattern for employees has been a more consistent Planner and high turnover in the Zoning officer position. Right now, Clare Rock has been Planner since April of 2014, and Niels Rinehart has been in his position for about 15 months, but is leaving soon. Both Cathleen Gent and Clare Rock have trained new hires in the zoning position, despite having no supervisory authority.

The Manager had long held the opinion that Richmond does not invest adequately in the zoning position – we invest heavily in plans and regulation development, but provide little by way of enforcement, which is the zoning position’s primary function. Therefore, he proposed that during recruitment for a replacement zoning officer we consider appointing Clare Rock as the zoning officer, and hire a part-time assistant to do the zoning leg work and staff the DRB. This change would provide some permanency in the ZAO position and give Clare credibility to train someone to do the ZAO job and retain review and approval functions – she is an experienced Zoning officer as well as Planner. This would provide some increase in pay to Clare, with an expected like-reduction in starting wages for the assistant.
I’ve spoken with Clare about this and she is interested in exploring this further. We also at this time don’t want to shut the door on the existing situation if the right person is ready to start here. Hinesburg is likely to recruit for a part-time zoning officer soon, also, and we may consider sharing one to combine the positions for 40 hours of work. In that case, I may hire a temporary assistant to Clare while we recruit and make decisions.

The Selectboard discussed this, but requested a revised job description set for both positions considering the assistant level hire. The board approved a dual-track recruitment.

Blueberry Farm Road Extension

Zoning Officer and E911 Coordinator Niels Rinehart offered a memo to explain this item. In consultation with Tyler Hermanson of the Vermont Enhanced 911 Board, a new road name is required for the road that will split off to the west from Blueberry Farm Road, accessing a total of 3 proposed plots. Mr. Hermanson suggested the name ‘Blueberry Farm Road Extension’. Given that ‘Blueberry Farm Road Extension’ will access only three proposed structures, it will remain a driveway and is therefore not classified as a road. Regardless, a new name is required to create an accurate location that the Vermont Enhanced 911 Board can locate.

The Selectboard examined a map and considered the request. Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the new private road name for Blueberry Farm Road Extension, and was seconded by Mr. Bressor and the motion carried 3-0.

Reports from Selectboard and Town Manager

The Manager talked about current construction projects and the Cote tax appeal and the contract for a regional dispatch study for the regional planning commission.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the minutes of September 19, 2016 and was seconded by Mr. Bressor, and the motion carried 3-0.

Resolution Authorizing an Additional $75,000 in Borrowing for the East Main Street/Pleasant Street Water Line

The Manager explained that the addition of Pleasant Street and additional engineering to the East Main water line project was imminent but we would exceed the original $1,200,000 authorized by the voters. Bond Counsel Paul Giuliani wrote a resolution that, by State law, would allow an additional $75,000 to this amount, so that current funds would not be necessary. The State loan on this would need to be amended as well.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the resolution authorizing an additional $75,000 for the East Main Street water line project, and was seconded by Mr. Bressor and the motion carried 3-0.

Mr. Bressor said he was glad to make this work and it was an important project.
Approval of Bank Notes

The Manager explained there were two one-year bank notes from Merchants Bank for the balance on the Highway Foreman truck and the Ventrac tractor/mower unit.

Mr. Bressor offered a motion to approve the bank note 1160123683 in the amount of $11,138 for one-year at 1.75% interest, from Merchants Bank for the foreman pickup. Mr. Sander seconded the motion, and the motion carried 3-0.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve bank note 01160123578 in the amount of $20,667.38 for one-year at 1.75% interest, from Merchants Bank for the Ventrac unit. Mr. Bressor seconded the motion and the motion carried 3-0.

Approval of Warrants

Warrants were approved and signed. There was a question about the state pension payment and how that is tracked.

Items for the next agenda were reviewed.

4. Adjourn

Motion by Mr. Sander to adjourn the meeting at 9:40 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Bressor. So voted.