	RICHMOND SELECTBOARD REGULAR MEETING May 5, 2014 MINUTES
Members Present: Absent: Others Present:	Taylor Yeates; Bard Hill; Ashley Lucht; David Sander Chris Granda Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager; Linda Parent, Town Clerk; Donna Lyons; Toby Lyons; Connie Doherty; Jackie Washburn; Bruce and Cara LaBounty; Mary Houle; Peter Pochop; Marshall Paulsen; Wright Preston; Mary O'Neill; Mark Aiken; Betsy Emmerson; Catherine Coggio; Natalie Steen; Christy Witters; Heidi Bormann; Ellen Kane; Lou Borie; Jim Feinson; John Hiltebeitel; Frederick Barrett; Gary Bressor; Jean Bressor; Ian Stokes; Nancy Zimminy; Robert Reap; Joy Reap; Ernie Buford; Larry Bohen; Tom Morreau, CSWD; Mark Carbone; Velma Plouffe; and Ruth Miller was present to videotape the meeting for MMCTV Channel 15.
Taylor Yeates called th	ne meeting to order at 7:10 PM.
1. <u>Welcome and Pub</u>	olic Comment
Mr.Yeates asked if the	re was any comment from the public for items not on the agenda.
Maureen Kangley said	that at 4:00 PM the Round Church Bell was pulled by Gary and Lincoln
Bressor as a reminder of	
•	Bob Low was a former member of the Conservation Commission, regarding previous Selectboard meeting.
2. <u>Public Hearing: I</u>	Interim Zoning for Jolina Court
	otion to open the public hearing on the Interim Zoning for Jolina Court and was and the motion carried 4-0.
Committee, their final of attorney Mark Sperry. Marshall Paulsen; Heic	d a computerized slide show describing the work of the Interim Zoning document, and some changes proposed by the Town Planner, Clare Rock, and The members of the Committee to Examine Zoning on Jolina Court were di Bormann; Christy Witters; Wright Preston Bruce LaBounty for the Planning Cousins for the Economic Development Committee. Chris Granda was the d member and chair.
redevelopment and hav two parcels associated parcels, Casing Develo before to get zoning ch	d that the committee agreed that the Jolina Court area was in need of ving a negative impact on the surrounding community. In particular were the with the former creamery, which were not being utilized. The owner of those opment, LLC (Craig Caswell) wanted to develop but had come to the town anges to allow a mix of uses for the parcel. The committee considered those as other comments from one of their many public meetings on the subject.

1 2	In summary, the interim zoning measure proposed to have all development proposed as a conditional use, with the Selectboard handling the hearing and approval of the application. A mix of compatible
3 4	commercial and residential uses would be allowed, and development would be limited to the area outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area except for appurtenances such as parking areas. There were
5	some modifications to other standards including residential density, setbacks and lot coverage. The
6	Manager noted that the original document presented to the Selectboard could be modified following
7	the presentation, and reviewed the suggested changes from the Town Planner and attorney. These
8	changes were more about form of the document and did not alter the substance of the standards
9	approved by the committee originally. Following the presentation there were questions and answers.
10	
11	Cara LaBounty asked how the developable area was calculated. Christy Witters explained the area
12	outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area and how she came up with the acreage outside of that. Ms.
13	LaBounty asked which version of the Regulations section 6.8 would be used, the current or revised at
14	the time of the application? The Manager said it should be the version at the time of application,
15	which could include any revisions between now and that time. Ms. LaBounty suggested we add
16	language to make that clear.
17	
18	Mr. Yeates suggested that we could change the "+/-" to "estimated."
19	
20	Natalie Steen of Landworks asked if the development had to be mixed use. The Manager said it could
21	be a single use, but not 100% residential. There was a component of minimum commercial area per
22	residential area.
23	
24	Ms. Steen asked what would happen at the end of two years. The Manager said it was the town's goal
25	to make permanent regulations by then, hopefully compatible to what had already been approved in
26 27	that time.
28	Betsy Emmerson urged more senior housing.
20 29	Detsy Emmerson urged more semon nousing.
30	Christy Witters explained that we should have owner-occupied housing instead of apartments.
31	ennisty white suprained that we should have owner occupied housing instead of apartments.
32	Bruce Bailey said that help with the water bills should also be a consideration for development.
33	
34	Paul Hauf spoke about the density and felt that some existing village density was greater than what
35	this proposal allows. We need to relax this standard, to allow for higher density.
36	
37	Bruce LaBounty said that this was one of the areas discussed that was contentious since some wanted
38	more and some wanted less density but we had to come to a middle ground.
39	
40	Heidi Bormann explained that it was a 1/8 acre density (8 residential units per acre) with the age
41	restricted bonus.
42	
43	Mr. Yeates said he liked the amendments to the document structure made by the Town Planner and
44	attorney.
45	
46	Ms. Lucht asked why this was less dense than some other development?
47	
48	Christy Witters said that the committee was thinking about mixed use. What they decided to allow
49 50	was a 30% bonus for age-restricted housing, up to 24 units.
50	

1 2	The Manager said the original concept from Landworks was 36 units, and we're allowing 24 units.
3	Ms. Barnard said that the creamery at one time employed over 100 people at one time. She thanked
4 5	the committee for their work, but said we needed more residential density.
6 7	Jeff Forward asked if there was any density bonus for affordable housing, and was answered no.
8	Bruce LaBounty said that the Richmond Market was sort of a model for how development should
9	happen.
10	
11	Wright Preston said they wanted to balance residential density with commercial enterprise.
12	
13	Cara LaBounty said that we needed to find someone with capability for this project.
14 15	There was some discussion by the Selectheord. Mr. Vector asked what should we do with the density
15 16	There was some discussion by the Selectboard. Mr. Yeates asked what should we do with the density question. Ms. Lucht suggested sticking with what the committee developed. Mr. Hill said it appeared
10	we had a consensus to support this as written.
18	we had a consensus to support this as written.
19	After some additional discussion, Ms. Lucht offered a motion to close the public hearing and was
20	seconded by Mr. Hill. The motion carried 4-0.
21	
22	Ms. Lucht offered a motion to adopt the Interim Zoning Report, as amended by the Town Planner and
23	attorney. Mr. Sander seconded the motion and the motion carried 4-0.
24	
25	
26	3. <u>Items for Discussion with Those Present</u>
26 27	
26 27 28	3. <u>Items for Discussion with Those Present</u> Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain
26 27 28 29	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain
26 27 28 29 30	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the
26 27 28 29 30 31	<u>Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain</u> Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with
26 27 28 29 30 31 32	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the regulations would be in effect on July 7 <sup>th</sup> , well before August 4 <sup>th</sup> . The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the regulations would be in effect on July 7 <sup>th</sup> , well before August 4 <sup>th</sup> .
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the regulations would be in effect on July 7 <sup>th</sup> , well before August 4 <sup>th</sup> . The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	<ul> <li>Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain</li> <li>Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2<sup>nd</sup>, adopt on June 16<sup>th</sup>, and the regulations would be in effect on July 7<sup>th</sup>, well before August 4<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2<sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0.</li> </ul>
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the regulations would be in effect on July 7 <sup>th</sup> , well before August 4 <sup>th</sup> . The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	<ul> <li>Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain</li> <li>Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2<sup>nd</sup>, adopt on June 16<sup>th</sup>, and the regulations would be in effect on July 7<sup>th</sup>, well before August 4<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2<sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0.</li> <li>Conservation Commission Recommendation on Willis Property</li> </ul>
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	<ul> <li>Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain</li> <li>Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2<sup>nd</sup>, adopt on June 16<sup>th</sup>, and the regulations would be in effect on July 7<sup>th</sup>, well before August 4<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2<sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0.</li> <li>Conservation Commission Recommendation on Willis Property</li> <li>Ernie Buford was present with other members of the Conservation Commission and the Richmond</li> </ul>
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 FloodplainClare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the regulations would be in effect on July 7 <sup>th</sup> , well before August 4 <sup>th</sup> .The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0.Conservation Commission Recommendation on Willis PropertyErnie Buford was present with other members of the Conservation Commission and the Richmond Land Trust to explain the Land Trust's request for \$64,000 to assist in the purchase of the Willis Farm
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	<ul> <li>Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 Floodplain</li> <li>Clare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2<sup>nd</sup>, adopt on June 16<sup>th</sup>, and the regulations would be in effect on July 7<sup>th</sup>, well before August 4<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2<sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0.</li> <li>Conservation Commission Recommendation on Willis Property</li> <li>Ernie Buford was present with other members of the Conservation Commission and the Richmond Land Trust to explain the Land Trust's request for \$64,000 to assist in the purchase of the Willis Farm on Route 2. Lou Borie, Wright Preston and Gary Bressor of the Richmond Land Trust presented a</li> </ul>
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45	Presentation of Zoning Amendment for Section 6.8 FloodplainClare Rock presented the proposed amendments to section 6.8 that would satisfy the review by the State floodplain personnel. This was not the larger re-write that was still being discussed, but with pending deadlines for the adoption of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps it was important to correct two deficiencies as noted in her memo. The proposed timeline was to present the amendment to the Selectboard on tonight's agenda, plan a public hearing for June 2 <sup>nd</sup> , adopt on June 16 <sup>th</sup> , and the regulations would be in effect on July 7 <sup>th</sup> , well before August 4 <sup>th</sup> .The Selectboard discussed this and agreed to proceed. The Manager noted that a public hearing would be on June 2 <sup>nd</sup> at 7:30 pm, in Town Center. Mr. Sander offered a motion to set a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Section 6.8 as presented and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0.Conservation Commission Recommendation on Willis PropertyErnie Buford was present with other members of the Conservation Commission and the Richmond Land Trust to explain the Land Trust's request for \$64,000 to assist in the purchase of the Willis Farm

recreation. A small portion of this property may be turned over to the schools for recreation fields but
 the remainder would be passive recreation including sledding and hiking.

1 2 Ms. Lucht asked how much was in the Conservation Reserve Fund now. The Manager said about 3 \$195,000 after the Richmond Congregational Church grant. Plus, at year's end, an additional \$44,000 4 or so would go back into the fund. 5 Mr. Borie noted there was a December 31<sup>st</sup> deadline on which to close on the property, but a June 6 deadline for the secondary funding they were seeking. 7 8 9 Mary Houle said there was about 2,000 acres of conserved land and this 20 acres was in the commercial zone. It seemed foolish to use this money and maybe the 20 acres should be rezoned. She 10 did not agree with this project. 11 12 13 Wright Preston said when they received an appraisal it was viewed as constrained. Much of the entrance area is in the floodplain, or the rest had steep slopes. Their appraiser made an assumption 14 that the best use would be twelve units of housing. 15 16 17 Mark Carbone, the Principal at Camels Hump Middle School, was a proponent of this purchase. He liked the use of wetlands for educational purposes, since his students had to travel to other locations 18 19 now to study them. Since the school was landlocked, this would provide additional land for recreation 20 and expand fields. There may also be an emergency exit for the bus. 21 22 Denise Barnard asked a series of questions to Mr. Carbone, about the number of students and faculty 23 at the school, and Richmond Elementary. Combined there were over 700 students, teachers and staff at these locations. Ms. Barnard's point was that there was a need for additional facilities here. 24 25 26 Jeff Forward said he was excited about this opportunity to make the town a better place. 27 28 Ms. Lucht asked if the Vermont Housing and Community Board did not approve their funding request, would they be able to find other funding? Mr. Borie said that they would work to find additional 29 funding, yes. There was a June 14<sup>th</sup> decision date. 30 31 32 Gary Bressor said there was no backup plan now, but they would definitely seek to replace that 33 funding. 34 35 Jon Kart said he worked with Kidsmart at Camels Hump Middle School and taught students about ecology, out in the field. He said information is retained better in the field than in the classroom. 36 37 38 John Hammerslough said that Richmond was exploring a better way to get to the park and ride facility 39 and a path option going through the schools showed an exit onto Route 2 and this could help with that. 40 41 Cara LaBounty asked how many acres were we giving to the school? Gary Bressor said it wasn't 42 known how much but it is a concept that was agreed to. Ms. LaBounty said that the Richmond Land Trust has used a lot of the Conservation Reserve Fund, to buy lower valued land and urged them to 43 give the whole parcel to the school. 44 45 Lou Borie said that the Bombardier Field was the only project they received money from the town on 46 since 2009. This property would not come off the grand list, and would pay taxes. 47 48 49 Cara LaBounty said if it only paid 30% of the tax value then the school should just have it. 50

- Fritz Martin said that there was a \$55,000 value that the Willis family was giving up, by selling under 1 2 appraised value. 3 4 Denise Barnard said that for the safety of the schools we needed to get an emergency access. She 5 asked for a delay in being able to discuss an emergency exit, or one used only for buses in the 6 morning. 7 8 Mr. Hill asked how does this work with the site improvements? Gary Bressor said that any 9 improvements would be a "Phase 2" and weren't designed vet. There was nothing that would preclude putting in a road later. 10 11 Mr. Yeates said that this could be approved or delayed. He suggested we take this at a later meeting. 12 13 Too often the Selectboard makes a decision that they regret and rethink and we need to give this time. 14 Ms. Lucht suggested a site visit, and Mr. Hill agreed. The consensus of the Selectboard was to 15 schedule a vote on this for May 19<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Hill offered a motion to schedule the vote on this issue for 16 May  $19^{th}$  and was seconded by Ms. Lucht and the motion carried 4-0. 17 18 19 Mr. Hill suggested that an egress could be decided down the road. Wright Preston said that building a road would cost a million bucks. 20 21 22 Mary Houle suggested that the public be allowed a walk with the Selectboard on the property. 23 24 Chittenden Solid Waste District Budget 25 26 CSWD Executive Director Tom Morreau was present to explain the CSWD budget and ask for 27 approval. Mr. Morreau explained that the most significant change in revenues and expenses was that the compost business was back online after last year's issues with herbicides. This caused the overall 28 29 figures to increase the expenses by 4.3% and revenues by 7.3%. Mr. Morreau also took some time to 30 explain about Act 148's organic recycling mandate. 31 32 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to accept and approve the CSWD budget for FY2015 and was seconded 33 by Mr. Hill and the motion carried 4-0. 34 35 VCEDF Grant for Firehouse Solar Project 36 37 Jeff Forward presented a revised grant application and project description for the solar project on the firehouse roof. He said he was working here as a resident and not in official capacity. He also noted 38 39 that Chris Granda, who wasn't here this evening, was thinking about being a part of this, outside of his official capacity as Selectboard member as well. He would recuse himself from any voting or official 40 41 action on this. 42 43 Mr. Forward explained that the State had a grant that would fund 50% of the costs of installing solar panels. These would be 26kw of panels. He and Chris Granda would fund the other 50% and the 44 town would improve the roof, which would include a new roof surface and additional bracing to carry 45 the weight. The investors would get the amount of the energy credit from the town for ten years, and 46 then they would sell the town the panels for \$1. There was virtually no risk to the town and hopefully 47 48 this would be a reliable revenue source for the town afterwards. This may be a reliable model for
- other similar projects afterwards. He requested that the Town Manager be authorized to sign the 49
- 50 application.

1	
2	Chief Tom Levesque asked if we put a standing seam metal roof on the firehouse, how would we
3	handle the snow sliding off the front? Mr. Forward said that the roof was ultimately the town's
4	responsibility but there were ways to mitigate sliding snow.
5	
6	Mr. Sander asked what happened to snow on solar panels? Mr. Forward said that the panels heat up
7	and the snow usually slides off. Mr. Sander asked what happens now? Chief Levesque said they have
8	an asphalt shingle roof that does not slide snow, and they have gutters.
9	
10	Mr. Forward was hopeful that this project could be done this summer.
11	
12	Bruce LaBounty asked if there was a cost-benefit analysis for Richmond? When do we break even?
13	He didn't like private citizens making money off of the town buildings.
14	The drain time private entitients making money off of the town bundlings.
15	Mr. Forward said that he expected the project to generate about \$5,000 in energy credits. After ten
16	years, the town would get that benefit at whatever rate existed at that time.
17	years, the town would get that benefit at whatever face existed at that time.
18	Maureen Kangley said that she put a new asphalt roof on her house about ten years ago, and wants it to
19	last another ten years. She was not in favor of this project.
20	hast another ten years. She was not in ravor of tins project.
21	Jeff Forward said that this roof was a good orientation for solar and would be beneficial to the town.
22	Jen i orward said that this foor was a good orientation for solar and would be beneficial to the town.
23	Mr. Yeates said the question for tonight was do we apply? This did not have to endorse the project.
24	in. Toutes said the question for tonight was do we appry. This did not have to endorse the project.
25	Mr. Hill said that the public/private issues were a concern. There was some discussion on this.
26	ini. Thi sud that the public/private issues were a concern. There was some discussion on this.
27	Cara LaBounty said that she feels that a Selectboard member is making money off of the town. With
28	interest rates so low, why use private money? Also, the roof expense was unnecessary and not a good
29	idea.
30	1404.
31	Mr. Yeates returned to the original question of whether or not to approve application. He also had
32	concerns about the cost of the roof and the potential conflict but he was willing to authorize the
33	application at least, but not the project yet.
34	approaction at roast, out not the project yet.
35	Mr. Sander offered a motion to authorize the Manager to sign the grant application and was seconded
36	by Mr. Hill.
37	
38	Mr. Hill said that he wanted to see a pro-forma return on investment analysis inclusive of engineering
39	costs, roofing costs, staff costs.
40	
41	The motion carried 4-0.
42	
43	4. Other Business
44	
45	Certification of Bond Vote from Town Meeting
46	The Manager explained that this was necessary to certify the vote from Town Meeting day on the \$1.5
47	million bond for the water storage tank and chlorine contact time improvements. There had been an
48	error in the number of times the vote warning was published, however, with the other notice
49	requirements being met and the broadcast of the additional meetings where the bond proposal was

discussed and announced, this resolution would certify that the legal requirements had been fulfilled.

- 2 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to approve the resolution certifying the bond vote for the water storage 3 tank and chlorination improvements from March 4, 2014 and was seconded by Mr. Hill. The motion 4 carried 4-0. 5
- 6 Public Safety Working Group
- 8 Mr. Yeates explained that there was a need to discuss emergency services in town and he wanted to 9 form a group to explore the long-term needs of the town.
- 10

7

1

- Mr. Hill agreed. He asked if the firehouse was going to be needed for another 40 years if a new 11 combined facility was proposed. 12
- 13

## 14 Amendments to CDL Drug Testing Policy and Reasonable Suspicion Testing

- 15 The Manager explained that last year, the Selectboard adopted VLCT's model CDL drug testing 16
- policy, and this year they proposed some minor amendments to that policy. The second policy was a 17
- model reasonable suspicion policy. The current personnel guidelines prohibited drug and alcohol use 18
- on the job, but there was little for supervisors to go on as far as training and where to confirm 19 suspicions. This policy corrected that.
- 20 21
- 22 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to adopt both the revised CDL Drug Testing Policy and the Reasonable 23 Suspicion Policy and was seconded by Mr. Sander. The motion carried 4-0.
- 24 25 **Financial Reports**
- 27 The financial reports were reviewed.
- 28 29
- 30

34

26

Appointments to the Water Commission

The Manager explained the one-year terms, to expire on April 30<sup>th</sup> of 2015. Ms. Lucht noted that for 31 Selectboard members, that may be too late. The Manager said that this could be addressed at a later 32 time, however, there needed to be a standard on when terms would expire. 33

- 35 The names were: Selectboard = Ashley Lucht, Bard Hill, David Sander
- Water Customers = Bruce Bailey and Robert Fischer 36 37
- 38 Terms to run from May 1, 2014 to April 30, 2015
- 39

40 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to appoint Water Commissioners as outlined and was seconded by Mr.

- Hill. The motion carried 4-0. 41
- 42 43 44

Cell Tower Discussions

- The Manager noted that AT&T has formally applied for the Jericho Road facility. The town had 21 45
- days to respond, which was due on May 21<sup>st</sup>. The Manager said that the issues with this application 46
- were the same as with the VTel tower, which were the zoning regulations on aesthetics, the zone, 47
- 48 tower height and possible environmental issues.

49

- Ms. Lucht questioned whether we should object to this tower or not. The Manager suggested polling 1 on Front Porch Forum to see what the public might want, since there had been very little comment on 2 3 this tower so far. 4 5 Mr. Yeates agreed. This would come back for discussion on the 19<sup>th</sup>. 6 7 Reports from Selectboard and Town Manager 8 9 The Manager reported on Highway work on Wes White Hill, and that this was IIMC Municipal Clerk's Week and recognized Town Clerk Linda Parent for all of her hard work. He added that he was 10 going to submit the Audit RFP this week as well. 11 12 13 Mr. Yeates said that he read the Selectboard Rules of Procedure, previously adopted by an earlier 14 Selectboard, and it requires that three affirmative votes be cast in order to approve a motion. He noted 15 that this was an issue at the previous meeting regarding minutes, and these would be re-voted tonight. 16 17 Approval of Minutes 18 19 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to approve the minutes of April 7, 2014; April 11, 2014; and April 21, 20 2014, with minor edits. Mr. Hill seconded the motion and the motion carried 4-0. 21 22 Warrants 23 24 The warrants were approved and signed. It was agreed that Chris Granda would review the June 25 warrants, and Bard Hill would approve the July warrants. 26 27 Approval of Right of Way work permit for Farr 28 29 The Manager explained that this was a permit from the Farrs to work in the Right of Way for Huntington Road, if needed, to connect their water source to a new home. If they could connect to the 30 31 water without using the ROW, then this permit was not needed, but this approval was precautionary. 32 33 Ms. Lucht offered a motion to approve a ROW work permit for Farr and was seconded by Mr. Hill and 34 the motion carried 4-0. 35 36 James O'Brien came in and complained that last year he had a boundary dispute with his neighbor, Denise Curley. At that time he was threatened with fines of \$100 a day if he did not move his sheds. 37 He said that a recent survey of the property showed the line was where he thought it was, not his 38 39 neighbor, and his neighbor had built a fence on his property. He wanted it removed or her fined. 40 Mr. Yeates said this would be taken up on the  $19^{th}$ . 41 42 43 5. Adjourn
- 44 Motion by Ms. Lucht to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Hill. So voted.