

**R I C H M O N D S E L E C T B O A R D
R E G U L A R M E E T I N G
M a r c h 5 , 2 0 1 8 M I N U T E S**

Members Present: Bard Hill; Stephen Ackerman; Steve May; David Sander; Jon Kart

Absent: None

Others Present: Geoffrey Urbanik, Town Manager; Mary Houle; Marie Thomas; Bob Heiser, Vermont Land Trust; Guy Roberts; Pam Foust; Chris Granda; Bonny Steuer; and others; and Marie Thomas was present to videotape the meeting for MMCTV Channel 15.

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

This meeting was held at Camels Hump Middle School as the room was set up for Town Meeting the next day.

1. Welcome and Public Comment

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

Marie Thomas noted that the microphones set up were not amplified, so please speak loud enough for the audience to hear.

2. Town Meeting Public Information Sessions

Police Building Question

The Manager explained the question and the issue:

Do the voters of Richmond support continued efforts by the Selectboard to finalize a plan for new building to house the Richmond Police Department at a cost not to exceed Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000), provided that the voters have the opportunity to approve or deny funding before any construction is awarded?

At Town Meeting in 2014, a question was raised from the floor regarding future facilities for Fire, Rescue and the Police Department. Nothing was done for nearly two years until the Richmond Selectboard allocated funds in 2015 to conduct a feasibility study for a combined Public Safety Building to house all three services.

- An initial study committee of nine members, including an ex officio Selectboard Member (David Sander) and the Town Manager and representatives from Police, Fire, Rescue
- Black River Design was engaged to facilitate the feasibility study and produce a concept building
- The Committee met for several months and visited several newer public safety buildings in the area
- The major reports can be found online at www.richmondvt.gov
- Black River Design produced a report that was released to the public in September of 2016
- The existing facilities of each service branch were scrutinized and deficiencies identified
- The initial building concept that was to replace the existing facilities was to house the three emergency services branches in a combined building of over 17,000 square feet

- 1 • At this time, Richmond Rescue decided to withdraw from the study and concentrate on
- 2 expanding their current facility
- 3 • The Architect was directed to determine a building design that included Police & Fire only,
- 4 with site criteria
- 5 • The design of the combined Police & Fire building, with a community room, was released to
- 6 the public in June of 2017
- 7 • This new building was somewhat smaller than the original, however, still quite large
- 8 • Site criteria continued to be a moving target and the initial cost estimate of the new building
- 9 was over \$7,000,000
- 10 • Two months later, the Fire Department withdrew from the building design, and opted to focus
- 11 on safety improvements to the current station
- 12 • The Architect was again asked to remove the Fire Department from the concept, and produced
- 13 a Police station with community room valued at about \$3,500,000
- 14 • The Selectboard agrees that \$3.5 million is too much for a Police station
- 15 • To date, we have spent \$30,470 on architectural services
- 16 • The Selectboard needs input from the public to continue moving forward with designing a
- 17 building
- 18 • However, the Selectboard is in agreement that if we continue to provide Police services as we
- 19 do now, a new building is needed
- 20 • The Selectboard wants to hear from voters on their level of comfort with continuing to design a
- 21 new Police station
- 22 • Voting “Yes” on this question means you might be generally in favor of continuing to explore
- 23 the design for a new building, but deferring the decision to build one until a later time.
- 24 • Voting “No” may mean that you feel that the building should be different, such as a smaller or
- 25 less costly design, or you are against the town having a new building.
- 26 • Please be aware that neither by voting “Yes” means we will have a new building, nor does
- 27 voting “No” mean that the issue will never come up again.

28
29 There was some discussion, and questions and answers. This question would be decided by Australian
30 ballot at Town Meeting on March 6th.

31 32 Bridge Street Water Bond

33
34 The next question was also presented by the Town Manager.

35
36 **Shall general obligation bonds or notes of the Town of Richmond in an amount not to exceed**
37 **Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000), subject to reduction from the receipt of available**
38 **state and federal grants-in-aid, be issued for the purpose of replacing and relocating 500 feet of**
39 **waterline on Bridge Street and the Bridge Street Bridge, the estimated cost of such**
40 **improvements being Four Hundred Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$415,000)?**

- 41
- 42 • Upper Bridge Street water line is an older line, undersized and dating to the mid-1960s
- 43 • Lies beneath storm culvert which is corroded and needs replacing
- 44 • Economy of work indicates we replace the older water line at same time as storm culvert
- 45 • Bridge Street is backbone of water system and critical stretch of pipe between the well and the
- 46 water storage tank, along with Jericho Road which was replaced in 2011
- 47 • Water supply in village south of river is serviced by a water line that is suspended beneath the
- 48 Bridge Street Bridge
- 49 • Line is vulnerable to damage from floating debris during floods; will be relocated to more
- 50 protected position under sidewalk

- 1 • This steel line dates to 1969 when the system was modernized; needs upgrade
- 2 • These two sections are critical to the system
- 3 • Existing vulnerabilities dictate their position as 'next in line' to be replaced and improved
- 4 • Eligibility for subsidized State funding, as with other recent projects
- 5 • Updated projected maximum cost of \$549,000
- 6 • Construction & Engineering = \$300,000 for the Bridge Street Bridge; \$249,000 for upper
- 7 Bridge Street
- 8 • Additional costs may be covered by system funds
- 9 • Payments on a 30 year loan for \$400,000 at negative 3.0% would be \$8,500 per year
- 10 • Not only saves any interest, but forgives almost \$150,000 of principal
- 11 • Repayment expected to begin in 2021
- 12 • Added account revenue and slight rate increases (2%) expected to cover this repayment
- 13 • Payment estimated to be around \$18 per unit annually

14
15 There was some discussion and questions and answers. This question would be decided by Australian
16 Ballot at Town Meeting on March 6th.

17 18 FY2019 Budget Presentation

19
20 The Manager then did a practice presentation on the FY2019 budget, that would be shown during the
21 discussion of the budget at Town Meeting. There was some light discussion, but the item would be
22 acted upon the next day.

23 24 **3. Items for Discussion with Those Present**

25
26 Andrews Forest: Revised Interim Management Plan

27
28 Guy Roberts, chair of the steering committee developing the management plans for the Andrews
29 Forest, presented a revised interim management plan that notably listed several prohibited activities
30 while the full management plan was being developed. In the final management plan, it was expected
31 that more activities would be allowed.

32
33 Mr. Roberts requested that the Selectboard approve the interim management plan as revised. Mr.
34 Sander offered a motion to approve the revised interim management plan for the Andrews Forest and
35 was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried 5-0.

36
37 VELCO Right of Entry issue

38
39 The Manager explained that on February 21st he met with Jacob Watrous and Sandy Fogg of VELCO,
40 along with Bob Heiser of VLT, Rick Petersen of VLT and Guy Roberts, and Jake Tapper - Chittenden
41 County Forester, to discuss a 1958 right of entry granted to VELCO across the Andrews property. The
42 right of entry allows them to cross the Andrews property to access their power lines which run through
43 the middle. While the location of the right of entry is not specified, due to topographic issues the "old"
44 access road to the parcel we're acquiring is the most logical choice and VELCO has indicated they
45 wish to use this to access their ROW to replace high-voltage poles this Summer. This is the current
46 access found on Rt 2 that we commonly use to enter the property. They would improve the road by
47 adding stone and they wish to lease part of the flat knoll area to stage equipment - they would also
48 improve this spot also. We're talking about 2,200 feet of road improvement, or just under 1/2 mile.

49
50 VLT's attorney Rick Petersen agrees that the right to enter the property is valid. VELCO has

1 examined two other access locations on other parcels and finds them unsuitable due to wetlands or
2 more significant investments to bring the roads up to a standard that supports their equipment. While
3 we (VLT and Richmond) haven't formally offered any easement or lease to the access road, we
4 generally agreed that it was the most likely spot for them to use. It seems that this right of entry is a
5 lemon, and we're trying to make lemonade out of it.

6
7 We also walked the property. The current road, while vegetated, has been in use as a logging road and
8 was used for staging during the construction of the interstate, also. It is a wide skid road now and has
9 been improved with some gravel. Improving it further would not require the removal of additional
10 trees, although it would require large - 3 inch - stone. It is now grown with grass and weeds and
11 would lose that character, at least temporarily. VELCO can provide some grass matting over the stone
12 when they are done to improve the look and the usability by pedestrians and others. VELCO also
13 mentioned the possibility of improving a small parking lot at the access with Rt 2 - which would help
14 them and us.

15
16 The Manager couldn't see that we have a strong case to deny the access at that spot. If we did, they
17 could theoretically choose another access and mow it down for their purposes - probably not in line
18 with our goals. While this access improvement wasn't originally in our plans, it does give some
19 benefits:

20
21 1) By allowing VELCO to improve the access road to the power lines, it provides an access for the
22 town and the public into the interior of the property that we do not now have, at no cost to us (it will
23 likely cost VELCO more than \$70,000 to improve the road). This access can be used by the public,
24 the town, emergency services, and others as we allow.

25
26 2) The "landing" area to be improved with gravel and used for equipment storage while VELCO
27 replaces poles can be used as a second, larger parking area that would hold up to 50 vehicles, if we
28 chose to, or be a staging area for running races, special events or forestry projects like logging. Again,
29 improved at no cost to us. They would also stabilize an erosion area at this location by installing some
30 storm water drainage modifications.

31
32 3) VELCO proposes to install control gates to limit vehicular access at their cost.

33
34 4) Green Mountain Power also owns a separate power line easement just beside VELCO, and they
35 could potentially use this access for line repairs, etc. This limits further disturbance on adjoining
36 properties which are also conserved.

37
38 5) VELCO will improve the access at US-2, and install a smaller 12-car lot at the bottom at their cost.
39 Due to environmental (wetland) and topographic constraints, parking at the bottom is quite limited -
40 12 cars max.

41
42 What do we give up?

43
44 1) The road will be an eyesore for the first year as it is installed, used, and then grass-matted.

45
46 2) The public, at least in the first year, would be encouraged or forced to use trails to access the
47 interior of the property and not use the access road.

48
49 3) VELCO would need a license or easement across the property at that location, and would use it as
50 they saw fit. Likely GMP would seek a similar license. These would be non-exclusive.

1
2 4) The access is a surprise not envisioned at the beginning of this project. There may be some public
3 objection to it.

4
5 The Manager suggested that the benefits outweighed the costs of objection, and while he
6 recommended against it, we could deny the access and see where that leads – likely a court battle. At
7 some point around the closing, expect VELCO to seek a license as described.

8
9 There was some light discussion on this topic. It was expected that the Town would close on the
10 acquisition of the Andrews Forest at the end of this month.

11 12 Conservation Reserve Fund Request: Vermont Master Naturalist Program

13
14 Judy Rosovsky was present to explain the application to the Conservation Reserve Fund for funding of
15 tuition to the Vermont Master Naturalist Program. She explained that this application was for training
16 for Richmond residents through this program, which was developed at UVM. The request was to fund
17 50% of the \$8,000 cost for 12-16 residents to go through the program. There was some discussion
18 about the details of the program, but no objection.

19
20 Mr. Kart offered a motion to approve the application to the Conservation Reserve Fund for \$4,000 to
21 the Vermont Master Naturalist Program to fund tuition. Mr. Sander seconded the motion, and the
22 motion carried 5-0.

23 24 **4. Other Business**

25 26 Appointment of Delinquent Tax Collector

27
28 The Manager explained that the Delinquent Tax Collector is an annual appointment made by the
29 Selectboard. Our current Delinquent Tax Collector is Laurie Brisbin, and she was elected in 2011 and
30 first appointed in 2013 and has been reappointed since then, and she is interested in being reappointed.
31 The Manager had no complaints about Laurie's service and recommend she be reappointed. Her term
32 expires on Town Meeting day.

33
34 Mr. May briefly left the dais.

35
36 Mary Houle explained that the Delinquent Tax Collector received the 8% penalty as compensation,
37 and that should be her exclusive compensation. The Manager explained that she also reconciles the
38 accounts at the end of the month, probably 30 minutes worth of work.

39
40 Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the reappointment of Laurie Brisbin as Delinquent Tax
41 Collector effective March 6, 2018 and was seconded by Mr. Kart. The motion carried 4-0.

42
43 The Selectboard deferred the Works in Progress discussion for the next meeting.

44
45 Mr. May returned to the dais.

46 47 **Reports from Selectboard and Town Manager**

48
49 The Manager briefly reviewed the reports.

50

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Approvals

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the minutes of February 20, 2018 and was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried 4-0-1 with Mr. Kart abstaining.

Richard Tom Ride

Tom Broido was present to request a road closure of Cochran Road on May 19th from 11am to 1pm for a children’s bicycle ride as part of a larger charity ride named in honor of Richard Tom.

Mr. May asked if the times could be moved up during the day. Mr. Broido explained that the various rides were timed to return to Cochran’s at the same time for lunch.

Mary Houle suggested that more signage was needed.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the road closure of Cochran Road on May 19th from 11am to 1pm between Cochran’s Ski Area and Dugway Road. Mr. Ackerman seconded the motion, and the motion carried 5-0.

Approval of Liquor Licenses

The Manager explained that liquor licenses are approved by the Selectboard annually. There were three classes of licenses, and the Manager read through them:

- First Class: Papa McKee’s; One Radish Eatery; Hatchet; Stone Corral; Kitchen Table; Sweet Simone’s
- Second Class: Richmond Market; Lucky Spot; Cumberland Farms; Mobil
- Third Class: Kitchen Table

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve the renewal of the named liquor licenses, and was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried 5-0.

Approval of Warrants & Purchase Orders

Warrants were reviewed and approved.

Mr. Sander offered a motion to approve Purchase Order #3478 to Breadloaf Architects in the amount of \$29,633, and was seconded by Mr. Ackerman. The motion carried 4-0.

5. Adjourn

Motion by Mr. May to adjourn the meeting at 9:14 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Sander. So voted.