

Selectboard Minutes
6/7/2021

Members Present by Zoom: Christine Werneke, David Sander, Bard Hill, Cody Quattrocci, June Heston

Absent:

Others Present by Zoom: Josh Arneson, Town Manager; Kathy Daub-Stearns, Admin. Assist.; Kyle Kapitansky, acting Police Chief; Kendall Chamberlain, Water & Sewer Superintendent; Pete Gosselin, Highway; the meeting was recorded for MMCTV Channel 15, also present: Cara LaBounty, Laucke Parke, Elizabeth Parke, Libby Parke, Willie Lee, Julia Parke, Greg Elias, Judy Bush, Justin Graham (Rise VT), Otie, Rebecca Rouiller (Radiate Art), Stephanie Rogers, Rod West, Chinta, Judy Rosofsky, Martha Nye, Pennie, Fred Erdman, Alyson Hoar, Tyler Merritt, Joan Hathaway, Fred Erdman, Jean Bressor, Will LaPointe, Kate Anderson, Matt Tabasko, Allen Knowles, Alexandra McA..., Jason Webster, Halle, Jack Linn, Jessie Heiser, Christopher Allan, Sarah Volinsky, Chase Rosenberg, Katie Kreider, Karen Yaggy, Jim Monahan, John Cornell, Samuel Water, Jamal C, iPhone, Brad Elliott, Richard First, Martha Marciel, Callie Ewald, Michael Porcelli (UMIAK), Jim Cochran, Joy Reap, John Rankin, unidentified callers at: 207-233-4353 and 802-503-2711

PLEASE NOTE: The CHAT dialog is attached at the end of the minutes.

Called to Order: 7:02 PM

Welcome by Christine with a reminder of the meeting rules

Comments from the public:

Laucke Parke asked to file a formal complaint against Josh Arneson and the current leadership of the Trails Committee for making wild assertions about him on the town website in agenda materials even though the Trails Committee had been told that their assumptions were false. He said that although the information had been removed damage to his personal reputation was circulating the internet. He said he wanted formal written reprimands of the people involved and formal apologies from the town officials responsible. In addition, he asked that item 2G-1 be removed from the agenda. He felt that town officials had not conducted sufficient due diligence to continue with the matter. Lauke Parke went on to add his personal apology to Josh Arneson for inappropriate words he left in a recorded message saying he regretted having said them, that they were spoken in an angry moment, were childish and he sincerely regretted having said them.

Christine thanked Laucke Park and asked to clarify if he was asking that item G not be discussed at all, or was he requesting only the specific items in the attachment not be discussed. Lauke Parke thought issues could be settled by other committees and not have the Selectboard's time wasted. Christine said that to react to the change in the agenda she would (Christine was then interrupted by a participant identified as 2072334353 who commented out of turn. Christine stated that participants need to be recognized to speak and asked the commentator to identify themselves, when no response was heard she asked again that if participating by phone, callers identify themselves to be able to have an accurate record of the meeting, Christine then asked that if the caller would not identify themselves, they not speak.) Christine continued with the meeting stating that the agenda item had been discussed with the town manager and she felt it was ready for discussion and that did not

mean a decision would necessarily be made, she then asked the other board members if there was any wish to remove of item 2G-1 from the agenda, Bard said he was not clear what the issue was and asked if were possible to continue with the meeting and deal with the issue at it's appointed time, deciding then whether to continue or suspend the item to a future meeting. Christine asked the board if they wanted to keep the issue to be discussed on the agenda and decide whether to hear it or not when it appeared on the agenda. Cody, June and David agreed.

Pennie asked for clarification, Christine said, that at the time the issue was on the agenda, she would ask Mr. Parke why it is not ready and then a decision could be made as to hearing it or removing it.

Additions or Deletions to the agenda: None

II. Items for Presentation or Discussion with those present

a) Consideration of appointment to the Recreation Committee

Josh reported:

- there is a seat open on the Recreation Committee for a member from Huntington, that runs until May of 2022 and Sheri Lynn submitted a letter of interest to serve on the committee as well a recommendation from the Huntington Selectboard

David moved to appoint Sheri Lynn as the representative from Huntington on the Recreation Committee for a term to run through the end of May 2022; Bard seconded. Roll Call Vote: Bard, David, Cody, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed. (June was having connectivity issues and did not vote.)

b) Consideration of approval of paving bid and purchase of utility truck accessories

Pete reported:

- that there were three (3) bids received out of the six (6) that were requested with FW Whitcomb the low bidder

Discussion included:

- that David said there were issues with a paver a few years ago and asked if those issues were still valid, Pete said those issues were resolved and they are doing good work
- that Pete announced that the town was awarded the Class 2 Roadway Grant that was applied for and was waiting for the details from VTRANS saying it could mean the project would end up being a \$500,000 project
- that Christine asked if this was the paving expense being held back during the budget /COVID discussions, Pete said that work was already being done and this was for next year's paving in FY22

David moved to approve to approve awarding the FY22 paving contract to FW Whitcomb and to approve PO 4007 for the FY22 paving in an amount not to exceed \$293,000; Bard seconded. Roll Call Vote: David, Bard, Cody, and Christine voted affirmatively; June abstained because she did not hear the discussion having lost her internet. Motion passed.

Pete reported on the accessories for the utility truck:

- that there were three (3) bids received for the plow and body for the new truck

- that Iroquois could do all the items in the shortest amount of time because they have everything in stock
- that this would put the entire truck package under what was expected by about \$5000

David moved to approve PO 4008 to Iroquois Truck Mfg., for accessories for the new truck in an amount not to exceed \$17,310.; Bard seconded. Roll Call Vote: David, Bard, Cody, June, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

c) Consideration of approval of request by Radiate Art Space to host an Art Crawl on the Town Center and Library lawns

Rebecca Rouiller reported:

- that in 2019 there was an Art Crawl, but it was cancelled last year
- that the proposed Art Crawl would be set up like a farmer's market, is local artists and would be in front of Town Center and the Library, possibly extending to behind the library building
- that changes this year include a port-a-let,
- that parking would be at Volunteers Green
- that there may be food trucks
- that this is a green event that would keep the space as clean as possible
- that insurance is set with the Town named as additionally insured
- that the date is Sept. 26, 10AM-3PM

Discussion included:

- that June loved the idea of expanding with food trucks
- that Christine asked if this would be advertised outside of Richmond so visitors from outside would be expected, Rebecca said it would be

June moved to approve the use of the Town Center and Library lawns by Radiate Art Space to host the Art Crawl on Sunday, September 26, 2021; David seconded. Roll Call Vote: Bard, David, June, Cody, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

d) Announcement of Police Chief hiring

Josh reported:

- that Kyle Kapitansky has been chosen as the new police chief and described the year long process of his hire

Discussion included:

- that David said he has been impressed working with Kyle over this past year
- that Christine said she agreed and welcomed Kyle, June congratulated Kyle saying she appreciated all his work

e) Consideration of changing the Police Chief position from Vermont Municipal Employee Retirement System (VMERS), category B to category D

Josh reported:

- that all town employees are VMERS category B except police officers, police officers are category D with the exception of the chief position because that position is not a union position, and since the chief position patrols, as well as doing the administrative duties, the position should carry the same category D VMERS benefit

- that the differences between categories include the amount of contribution from the employee and the Town, and the retirement eligibility age
- that the change would not go into effect for about a year

Discussion included:

- that Christine said that once you change a position you cannot go back to a lower category plan
- that June said it would only be for the chief because the officers have the collective bargaining and it is close to what the state police offer, she wondered why they were not all on D already, Josh responded that all officers are on category D, but the chief is not in the union, this would bring the chief into line with the other officers since he is doing the same type of work

David moved to approve VMERS D plan for the Richmond Police Chief position; there was not a second.

The motion was amended:

David moved to approve the position of Richmond Police Chief from VMERS B to VMERS D effective for fiscal year 2023 starting July 1, 2022; Bard seconded. Roll Call Vote: Bard, David, June, Cody, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

f) Consideration of request to waive permit and hearing fees related to a subdivision at 135 LaBounty Ln.

Josh reported:

- that this is a request to waive permit fees that occurred in 2019 and another request for a permit that that occurred after that

Cara LaBounty reported:

- that the request was for a waiver because in 2019 there was an issue with the Zoning Officer
- that in 2020 and 2021 that the Selectboard refunded fees to the Reap's due to errors, then the Selectboard waived fees for the Big Spruce and she was asking to have her fees waived to come in line with other decisions that were made.
- that her request was due to the previous Zoning Officer having made errors that required her to have two (2) DRB meetings.
- that her request was for the second DRB hearing fee to be waived to be in line with what the owner of Big Spruce was allowed to waive, she noted that her request was a less than the Reap's were allowed to waive.
- that Cara LaBounty said that she was not opposed to the regulations but fees are waived based on errors made, or because of the misdirection by town staff, the same thing should be done for her since she had previously made a complaint that was not responded to.
-

Discussion included:

- that Christine noted that there was information from the Town Planner and Manager in the packet provided online
- that Bard asked Josh how this request was the same or different from requests in the past, Josh responded that there were clear reasons for why a the waivers were requested, in the Reap's request the town staff member misinterpreted the law

around COVID and who could waive fees, when it was figured out the Reap's made a request to have the fee waived, in the Firman case (Big Spruce), it was due to a discussion about something that should have been in the Zoning Ordinance and why he had to come back when something when something should have been in the Ordinance and was not, in that case the board made the decision that the rule should have been in place earlier and that it was intended to be there so the fee was waived to allow Gabe Firman (Big Spruce) to come back when the Ordinance was updated. In this case, Josh said, it looks like there were two (2) straightforward subdivision requests that were requested to be combined into one (1) hearing rather than a "preliminary" and "final", both were combined although there were two (2) hearings even though the request was granted. Cara La Bounty responded that this was not about the DRB issue, it is about the Zoning Officer, that was the Secretary for the DRB, and her error misinterpreting things as she had done with the Reap's that cost her more money than the refund was requested for. She said that Gabe was being penalized and fined for not having a permit and those fees were waived, he had a DRB meeting fee waived, and it did not matter who made the error, it was an error made by Town staff and that was why she was asking for the refund adding that a complaint was made in 2019, Gabe's complaint she said, was not put in writing, the Reap's addressed their complaint in a letter, she had put hers in a letter and was now before the Selectboard in 2021 because the Selectboard had established that refunds are allowed if the Town staff had made an error, she said she was on record that a town staffer had cost them a lot of money and that was why they were asking for the refund, to be treated like others in the town were being treated. Christine responded that it sounded like there was no dispute about the two (2) DRB hearings, Cara La Bounty interjected that there was added expense for having two (2) DRB hearings but that was a different argument and discussion, that the Zoning Officer did not think they could have the "preliminary" and "final" hearing at the same time and she had to prove that there was a fee structure that allowed for them to do that adding that it was a non-stop argument with the Zoning Officer about what the existing regulations allowed and required. Christine responded that the challenge was that in reviewing the two (2) hearings the findings were appropriate and that it did not seem everything could have been done in one (1) hearing, she asked Cara La Bounty if she felt everything could have been done in one hearing. Cara La Bounty responded that what was required of her to do above and beyond what the regulations required was because of the Zoning Officer's misinterpretation of the Zoning Ordinance and that cost her survey fees and other fees that for things that were not necessary and that the refund was a way of getting back some of the money, Cara La Bounty went on to say that she was not arguing about the two (2) DRB Hearings, it was that the Zoning Officer's misinterpretation of the Zoning Ordinance that caused her to spend more money than she needed to. Christine responded that those things were relevant but that she had no documentation of those expenses, Cara La Bounty interjected that she was not asking for those expenses, and that was important for the Selectboard to realize that she would drop everything, she was asking only for a refund of a hearing fee, like Gabe (Firman) got and the Reap's got because of the Zoning Officer's error reiterating that she was not asking for as much as others. She said that the Town is fully capable of refunding her as they had done for the other two (2) parties. Christine responded that the difference she saw, noting that she was not arguing the point that Cara La Bounty may have been given misinformation or had extra expenses,

was that there was an error made in the Reap's case related to a COVID rule where the Reap's did not apply for an extension and missed the window to reapply because of the information given them. When it was looked at and determined that due to COVID they could have received an extension, without additional cost, it decided that the Reap's should not have to pay again since they would have gotten an extension without cost creating the credit. In Gabe Firman's (Big Spruce) case, there was not a "rounding rule" in the regulations and had it been there Gabe Firman (Big Spruce) would have been able to apply for the number of apartments wanted, instead he opted to move forward with construction and when the rounding rule was updated, at the same meeting it was approved, Gabe Firman (Big Spruce) requested the number of apartments he had intended to build and the Town was able to approve the number of apartments and waive the fee because the Town did not want to hold him up on his construction to wait for the Ordinance change that should have already been accomplished. Christine went on to say that in those cases it was able to be done for specific reasons and she was not certain that this request was the way to address this problem properly. Christine said that she wanted to treat everyone the same but did not see the issues as being the same adding that the costs were real but did not see that reimbursing the second DRB hearing fee and the porch permit fee was the right way to address the complaint Cara La Bounty had. Cara La Bounty restated her position saying her complaint went to Josh in 2019 and to a Selectboard member and nothing happened with it, that if staff error was the reason for Reap's, and if staff error, rounding rule error she felt that if staff errors are acceptable reasons for refunds then her coming to the Selectboard in a neighborly way saying "hey, you fixed it for these guys with a staff error, we are asking for you to fix our issue as a staff error" that would be the thing to do. She said she didn't think the Selectboard needed details about all the staff errors that occurred, that it was a simple request like others had made. Christine said that the Reap property waiver was based on a misinterpretation of the COVID law, the Gabe Firman (Big Spruce) change was not an error, it was a zoning rule that was changed to be applied in a more logical way and was identified through a process.

- that June asked, if this complaint is from 2019, could the board look at that information and make a decision. Christine replied that the information was in the packet provided, Josh added that the information was contained in the emailed memo.
- that Christine reported that Josh had addressed the complaint about service, and the quality of the service, as a personnel issue at the time, Josh said he had gone over the information Cara La Bounty had provided with the Zoning Officer who provided a great deal of detail in a written statement as well as documents, Josh said they had gone over things point by point and discussed how things may have been done better and he handled it as a personnel issue since at the time there was no specific request for a refund from the La Bounty's.
- that Christine shared the emailed 2019 complaint from Cara LaBounty noting that it was sent to Bard, that two (2) of the complaints from the La Bounty's email were read, Christine noted that the email said they had documentation to back up the claims made. Christine said that Bard forwarded the email to Josh as the Zoning Officer's supervisor and that Bard had responded to the email in November. Cara La Bounty added that the third bullet down in the email also related to the same person misinterpretations.
- that Cara said she wanted to be treated like others in the community

- that Pennie asked the amount Cara is asking for, Christine responded that the second permit amount is either \$550 or \$560 plus \$53.40 for a permit that was felt was not necessary for a total of just over \$600 depending on the DRB permit amount
- that Christine asked if there was anyone on the board who wanted to move a motion on this request, none was heard
- that June asked where the string of emails was in the packet. Then asked if there was anything done in 2019, Christine responded the email itself was not included in the packet, the some of the components of the email had been included in the memo and that Bard had forwarded the email to Josh. Josh said he handled it as a personnel matter and worked with the Zoning Officer to have a better understanding of the issues raised having a long conversation with her about the number of issues that were raised by the La Bounty's but had not provide feedback to Cara La Bounty as he would not report back to the public about any other personnel matter. June thought that if we have reimbursed someone because there was an error or misinterpretation by a town staff member, we should consider reparation for anything that was due to any error made by a staffer in this case. Christine said this is not the same as the issues where fees were waived, that those issues were related to needing a permit and this was indirect costs related to processes where information was given or not given and that there was no ability to see what those specifics were. The issues being raised are that customer service was not good, and information provided throughout the process caused extra work and expense as a result of the information provided, and that in lieu of getting that money back the La Bounty's would like to be refunded the money paid for permits that were issued and call it even. Christine said that the challenge she had with that was that the reimbursing a permit fee that is not necessarily related to an error related to that permit fee did not seem to be the appropriate recourse adding she did not disagree with the issues, just the solution being presented. Cara La Bounty responded that she was not looking for the thousands of dollars the staffer cost them, that Josh had said "there are things she could have done better" and that she was spoken to, the fact that other errors and misrepresentations were made and that other community members have benefited from refunds to make things right what she was looking for was the same courtesy. Christine responded that all she had was the email from 2019 and she would have to take Cara La Bounty's word that the staffer cost the La Bounty's thousands of dollars, or any money, she said she had no details other than Carol La Bounty's statement, Cara La Bounty said you didn't ask the Reap's or Gabe Firman (Big Spruce) for any written details, saying we let you know we would give you as much detail as was needed and based what we provided on what the other two cases provided adding she didn't know this was a court of law and needed to prepare like that, she thanked the Selectboard for hearing what she had to say.
- that Christine asked if anyone wanted to make a motion to approve a reimbursement in an amount for the permits applied for at 135 La Bounty Lane; not hearing a motion for reimbursement, she asked Cara to set up a time to go over this in more detail, Cara La Bounty said she had brought this before the Selectboard to prove a point and her point had been proven and thanked the Selectboard for treating her differently than the Selectboard treats other people.
- that Bard said that he was still struggling with the similarities and differences between this request and others and wanted to continue discussions to be sure

that people are treated equitably and find a reasonable solution that addresses this problem, Christine agreed.

Consideration of request by Trails Committee to create a trail on the Class 4 Section of Williams Hill Rd.

Christine asked Mr. Laucke Parke to explain why he felt discussing this item was premature

Laucke Parke reported:

- that initially the tax/ span map was used to indicate where the right of way purportedly existed, he then directed the Selectboard to the official road map that appears on the Town's website. Laucke Parke said that there is no continuous line linking the end of Williams Hill Road with Palmer Road, he felt that there were questions that the Selectboard needed to address like does a legal right-of-way exist connecting these two (2) roads, he said that there are conflicts in the various maps that represent Richmond that raise doubts about the existence of a continuous right-of-way and where exactly the right-of-way is. He asked that when questions like these come up concerning a Class 4 or ancient road anywhere in Richmond was there a Town Ordinance that clearly stated how the confusion would be resolved as the State Legislature has suggested towns should have. He then figuratively walked the Selectboard from his driveway at the end of the travel portion of Williams Hill Road through the woods southwest toward Palmer Road to demonstrate the importance of his questions he also described the area between his property and Palmer Lane. His opinion was that it was confusing and suggested the Selectboard do some due diligence to address his points before taking any action on the matter requested by the Trails Committee. Christine thanked him for outlining his concerns, and thought that to fully understand the issues and recognizing that there is not a need to take any immediate action that she would like to move forward and have the discussion, Laucke Parke agreed.

Discussion included:

- that Christine asked if the Board had any questions about what Laucke Parke said before beginning. June said she was confused whether there is a right-of-way and where it is, she felt there needed to be some investigation done because if there was no right-of-way, then the discussion was moot, Bard said he was struggling to see what the facts were and agreed with June.
- that Joan Hathaway said the residents of Williams Hill Road have circulated a petition that has about 151 signatures of residents or landowners of Richmond, with 2/3 of the residents of Williams Hill Road and Old Country Road having signed the petition given to Josh Arneson. She then read the petition which requested that the Selectboard do a site visit and hearing on the discontinuance of Williams Hill Road from the residence of 1360 to where it intersects with Palmer Lane. Joan Hathaway added that there were also residents of Hinesburg who live near Palmer Road that have signed the petition. Bard asked if the petitions requests intended to make the trail request moot, Joan Hathaway said yes, that if it is determined that there is a Class 4 road, it be discontinued.

- that Christine asked Joan Hathaway if that meant she was not in favor of having a trail there, Joan Hathaway said that was correct, that the Trails Committee, or some independent persons, had approached some of the landowners about having trails through their property and they had not agreed. Christine said that there could be a hearing forced once the signatures are confirmed. June said, the petition would be moot if there is not a Class 4 road. June asked how to move forward with determining whether there was a road or not. Christine replied that we could move forward with a hearing to declassify the road and then it would be considered trails on individual's land, or we would have to do as Mr. Locke Parke had stated.
- that Tyler Merritt said that Mr. Parke has tried three (3) times to have the road declassified and if it needs to be resurveyed then it should be, it is either a public right-of-way, or it is not. He said no one wants to be a bad neighbor and if it is a Class 4 road the Trails Committee would agree that it could be reclassified as a trail for a pedestrian walkway. Locke Parke said that previous requests were not denied that they withered and were not pursued to a conclusion. Stephanie Rogers said that she did not think that the Trails Committee has acted like good neighbors. She said that Trails Committee members have just appeared to clear areas without talking to the surrounding landowners and felt they were bullying their way in by saying it was public land, Jack Linn said that the decision to continue the discussion was the right one because no one really knows where those roads are, he thought that the before any trees were cut down it was important to have a survey done, Tyler Merritt said the Richmond Trails Committee was a Town committee and thought Stephanie Rogers may have mistaken the Richmond Mountain Trails Club, a private club, with the Trails Committee adding that the Richmond Trails Committee has not been involved with any of the trails in the vicinity of Williams Hill or Worthem or any of that zone. Stephanie Rogers responded that she knew the person that was on Williams Hill Road, and she felt that person was on the Trails Committee. Pennie said that she benefits from the trails that have been made and that Class 4 roads are very special in VT that they are accessible to everyone to be used and kept accessible for possible future use, she said the Snowmobile Association of VT use Class 4 roads, she said she looked forward to having clarification as to whether this was a Class 4 road and whether this could be a walking and biking pathway that would help people. Pennie went on to say that it was important to recognize that this is not about people crossing private land, she then asked those who are opposed to think about the public benefit, she asked who would be responsible to find out whether this is a Class 4 road. Willie Lee, Chair of the Trails Committee, said that he is in full support of having a survey done, he said that through a series of documents sent to the Selectboard, he believed it was a Class 4 road, that he had received a number of emails from people who were shown the petition and felt the signers may have gotten inaccurate information, including information that the Trails Committee wanted motorized vehicles, which is not the committee's mission, he said connecting trails is part of the Town Plan and this is what the people have said they wanted in 2018. Joan Hathaway said the problem is that you cannot stop a snowmobile or other motorized vehicle from coming through a Class 4 road so if there is a path there then you cannot stop them and provided information about problems on another trail that included partying and public urination. She said that the Trails Committee, if they are trying to be good neighbors, should not have published, thru Josh Arneson, slanderous and erroneous information, she felt it

should not be up to the Trails Committee determine if it is a Class 4 road or where it is. Pennie went on to address the wildlife that live in the area. Cara LaBounty recommended that because this was a legal question that should not be researched by town staff members or the Trails Committee, that there should be a budget for this work to be done and a lawyer to research what the road actually is and then have a survey done to determine the location of the road if one exists, June said there was some work to do and should investigate what and where this road is before taking any action. Chase Rosenberg said he was one of the Trails Committee members that went out two (2) years ago with a GPS enabled map to clear a few trees from the path and apologized because they should have contacted neighbors. He was not in favor of having motorized vehicles on the trail, he said he has no interest in encroaching on private land. Chase said in 2014 the Selectboard had discussed this so there should be information on the record. Christine said that she had heard that there was a petition and that would follow due process, then there was the discussion about doing research to know what the road is and then a survey to locate the road. Christine said that the Trails Committee is a formal town committee staffed by volunteer members who report to the Selectboard adding that this was the start of more conversations that would lead to a conclusion. Josh said he would put together information on costs and come back to the Selectboard to determine a path forward. Christine asked for people to send emails with information and desires so they can be incorporated into the discussion.

g) Update from Recreation Committee on survey regarding usage of Brown's Court

Justin Graham reported:

- that there is a survey that originally was specifically for Brown's Court but is now a general survey of recreational activities
- that some of the items are controversial but that conversation should wait for the survey results to come in
- that this is a postcard and online survey, that Rise VT is paying for the postcards and once input is available then a larger discussion can be had
- that the survey done previously was not prioritized and this survey is

Kate Anderson reported:

- that the committee is looking to find out how people feel about the activities

Discussion included:

- that Bard said outdoor basketball is something he sees people use and noted was not on the proposed survey
- that Brown's Court is used now, and those people should be taken into consideration
- that this is to prioritize what people would like to see and the Recreation Committee would come back to the Selectboard with the results
- that basketball was not included because courts are available at the school
- that hanging out at the park is not the same as being at the school
- that Mr. G has great ideas, and the plan is to partner with the school and not duplicating facilities available elsewhere
- that a link could be set up for additional information on survey items if people are not familiar with selections like gaga ball and story walks

h) Update on parking

Cara LaBounty reported:

- that there are signs being put up that have URL codes that link to a parking map so when someone clicks on one of the "P's" on the map it will tell them the address and number of spaces available at that location
- that one of the parking areas is "Overocker Park" that could have access to the river if a trail is cut
- that she thanked the highway department for the work on the parking lot at Overocker Park also thanking the Richmond Land Trust (RLT) for the work they are doing on another parking area, she asked that the Selectboard make a motion that would allow Josh Arneson to approve an access permit for the RLT Warren Beacon Preserve once one is submitted.
- that work was being done on the railroad lease that would allow for additional parking there
- that the Round Church parking space line painting has been completed
- that UMIAK has requested having their customers park at Volunteers Green and the Parking Committee thinks they should use Overocker Park instead

Discussion included:

- that Bard thanked everyone involved in the parking solutions
- that June liked the QR on the signs that link to where all the parking is and thanked the committee for their work
- that Cody thanked Cara La Bounty for the work she put into finding solutions
- that Cara La Bounty felt that the public had been warned regarding the access permit through the Parking Committees work, that it would delay things if the access could not be approved by Josh
- that Pete Gosselin said that he had done the necessary markings and the permit should be no issue, it would be a simple cut into the meadow that is owned by the Richmond Land Trust (RLT).
- that Cara La Bounty clarified that she was asking to have Josh Arneson be able to approve a permit requested by the RLT, Bard said that the alternative would be to have a short meeting to approve it, Christine did not have a problem with allowing Josh to approve the permit.

Christine moved to allow Josh Arneson to approve a permit for a curb cut to access the Warren-Beacon preserve on Cochran Rd when submitted by the Richmond Land Trust; June seconded. Roll call vote: Bard, David, Cody, June, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

David thought an access permit may have been issued last year, Pete said that it was discussed but the access permitted last year was for Bombardier Field. He said he looked at this and would approve it once it was applied for.

Michael Porcelli from UMIAK said that they have partnered with Stone Corral and Volunteers Green would be their preferred parking location back by the ball fields. He said it would be two (2) tours at 10AM and 2PM Tuesday – Thursday through Labor Day weekend but was not opposed to the Overocker Park location. He said they were open, to helping with maintenance and were letting their customers know that carpooling is necessary adding Umiak was looking to bring more business to Richmond.

Discussion included:

- that the tours would be fourteen (14) people each, with no trailers
- that UMIAK would also be offering shuttle service for people who have their own tubes
- that Cara La Bounty said she was opposed to having UMIAK park there and asked if there was a lease agreement, Christine replied there was not, that we do not charge other businesses without private parking for parking, Michael Porcelli said that his business has been there a few years and was not opposed to other options. He did not think the proposed plan would overload the parking since UMIAK would be parking back by the baseball fields. He felt that having the customers in town would be good for on the Rise and Stone Corral.
- that Pete asked whether anyone had reached out to sports organizations using the fields to find out what their schedules are, Michael Porcelli said operation will end by Labor Day, that it takes about two (2) hours to get from the Jonesville Bridge to Volunteers Green by tube and did not feel the shoreline at Overocker Park would work because of its sandy nature, Pete suggested UMIAK find a state access,
- that Christine thought where someone finishes their float they would want to be where the experience could be extended asking if Stone Corral have enough parking that people could walk to their car, Michael Porcelli said that because they are transporting people and the tubes the number of vehicles will be less.
- that Bard suggested since this was a Stone Corral partnership having that be the pickup spot was something they might like it because it could increase their business
- that Michael Porcelli stressed that it would not be seven (7) to ten (10) cars, it would more likely be two (2) to four (4) cars per group due to transporting people and tubes together.
- that Christine said that limiting it to five (5) cars could be the answer to alleviate concerns about the number of vehicles.
- that Christine suggested that UMIAK begin taking reservations and review how parking is going in the coming weeks
- that UMIAK will provide certificates of insurance to the Town and said he would like to have a written agreement for the parking
- that Rod West said that reducing the number of cars at the front of the Volunteers Green has been a concern but was more concerned about having a commercial enterprise at Volunteers Green when no commercial activities are supposed to take place there. Michael Porcelli said maybe a special permit or something saying June 17th was the start date
- that Christine said having a Memorandum of Understanding with four (4) parking spots, having the Parking Advisory Committee weigh in, with a trial period to see how it was going would be her suggestion, June thought it would be hard to police the number of vehicles, she wanted to see some groups picked up at Overockers Park and be able to look at all the options. Michael Porcelli said any groups over ten (10) could be taken out at Overockers Park and leave Volunteer's Green for families. Christine said the discussion would be taken offline to see what is feasible to make the best use of the resources.
- that Cara La Bounty asked Christine to accept her resignation from the Parking Advisory Committee because she was not willing to give her time for the benefit of businesses. Christine said she was sorry Cara La Bounty felt that way. She went on to say there would be work done offline to come up with an agreement on how

the stewardship of resources and parking spaces could be managed and not take up any more time at this meeting.

i) Discussion of return to in-person meetings and public access to the Town Center and Library

Josh reported:

- that for returning to “in person” meetings it was being looked at moving the Selectboard meetings upstairs for hybrid meetings that could be both in person and via ZOOM. He recommended a trial run for the next meeting with himself and a few Selectboard members present.
- that other committees would have the ability to have their meetings in a hybrid fashion as well using a laptop being purchased that would be wired in to MMCTV for committees to use.
-

Discussion included:

- that someone asked if the cameras would be able to automatically zoom in to the person that was speaking, Josh said he would ask Angelike, he said that he thought there would be wide angle shots of the Selectboard and any members of the public attending. Christine said that in the past there was a person in the room who controlled the camera, she wondered if that was still going to be the case. Josh replied that he would ask MMCTV saying that for other committees where they previously recorded that might be the case but for other committees that had not previously been recorded that wide angle shots would probably be what happened.
- June said that having a camera that moves to the speaker is something we may want to have, that she was aware of a camera called “camera meeting all pro” that will go to whoever is speaking and thought it should be looked into for the best experience for our viewers. Rod West said that the camera person from MMCTV more importantly managed the audio levels of the different speakers.

Josh continued:

- that Town Center has been open for “walk-in” business like tax payments, notary services, and some other town business the last few weeks with masks required and appointments for research still necessary due to limited space in the vault
- that the Richmond Library will be open for in person visits starting June 14, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Saturday with specific hours available on their website, visits are limited to 30 minutes and the children’s section is operating at limited capacity, visitors will be asked to wait if capacity is reached, the computer room will be open for one (1) person, 30 minute, sessions. Curbside services are still available. Christine thought that was great news.

Discussion included:

- that Cara La Bounty asked if appointments are still necessary to see the town clerk, or if you could just walk in. Josh said if you are doing research in the vault then yes, but any other business you can walk in.

j) Update on FY22 wage grid cost of living adjustment increase

Josh reported:

- that every year we look at this time the CPI is looked at and wages are adjusted based on that. He said that this year wages will go up 1.5% since the CPI is up 3% and the increase is capped at 1.5%. Christine said unlike last year when the CPI was lower than 1.5% a decision was needed but this year there is no decision needed, it was just information. Josh said that was correct.

k) Discussion of hiring a consultant to conduct a wage analysis for Town staff

Josh reported:

- that there have been different attempts over the years to see how Richmond compares to other towns for compensation
- that there was work done inhouse in 2018 that seems to have left more questions than answers and was revisited in fall 2019.
- that in 2019 we had people come in to speak to the Selectboard and a decision was made to do it in house again using the VLCT wage survey. That work was started, and questions were raised about the process, he said that he and Kathy Daub-Stearns were working on it with feedback provided by then Selectboard member Roger Brown, and every time we try to do it in-house more questions are raised. He thought having an outside company come in and have a third party prepare a report would be best. Quotes from the last time were about \$20k and an RFP process would need to be done to move forward.

Discussion included:

- that Christine wondered if we should be using a professional to do this instead of having Josh do all this work and lighten Josh's load. She suggested using unassigned funds to employ a professional who could provide objective recommendations and asked for other board member opinions. Bard agreed with Christine. David said there are no easy answers on these questions and need to remember it is a partnership and not everyone is going to walk away entirely happy adding that in fairness to both residents and employees it should be looked at. Christine thought the objectiveness of a third party would be valuable. June said you get what you pay for, so paying for it was the right thing. Cody agreed a consultant would be beneficial. Christine said that gives us the answer to move ahead with an RFP.
- that Christine said there is talk about the possibility of needing more positions, like a facilities person and a public utilities manager, and this would get information on what other positions we may need moving forward. Christine asked Josh to discuss it with staff, so they were aware. Josh said the topic was discussed at the last staff meeting and the decision would be discussed at the next one.

l) Review of invitation to bid to operate a solid waste management / transfer facility on the town owned property currently leased by the Chittenden Solid Waste District

Josh reported:

- that he has received great feedback on the RFP from Cathleen Gent
- that he would like to require the reuse zone
- that we would remain a member of the CSWD
- that the RFP was updated based on recommendations from Cathleen Gent
- that the RFP draft was included in the packet

Discussion included:

- that June thanked Cathleen Gent because she was so helpful, she is concerned that companies will rule themselves out if we mandate the reuse zone, she would like to have it say that the town would “prefer” the zone to make certain bids are received, Christine said that the driver for the RFP was the reuse zone and if we got no respondents we would renew the lease and know there was not an option for a reuse zone, Rod West said that if we are not going to have a reuse zone and if trash can be picked up anywhere the property could be used for another purpose that might bring in more money to the town and have trash picked up from another location. He would like to not have the reuse zone mandated and use the wording “preference will be given”. Christine asked if the RFP specifies that the location is specific to where it is currently located. Josh said it does.
- that Bard thought changing the wording to “preference will be given to, or it is strongly encouraged, that there will be a reuse zone” would be ok but moving the drop-off center is a larger question that is valid but has not been explored. June wanted “preference will be given” as opposed to “strongly encouraged”. Christine said with the change to “preference will be given” related to the reuse zone, we can move ahead.

m) Consideration of nominating a Selectboard member to review financial policies prior to a review by the full Selectboard

Christine reported:

- that there are policies that need to be reworked based on information from auditors and having them reviewed would be preferred, June volunteered to do the review.

Bard moved to appoint June Heston to review financial policies prior to the Selectboard’s review; David seconded. Roll Call Vote: Bard, David, Cody, Christine voted affirmatively, June abstained. Motion passed.

III. Approval of Minutes, Warrants and Purchase Orders*

a) Minutes of 5/17/21

David moved to approve the Minutes of 5/17/2021; Cody seconded. Roll Call Vote: Bard, David, Cody, Christine voted affirmatively, June abstained. Motion passed.

Invoices and warrants:

Josh reported that the warrant was corrected to include an invoice that had been omitted in the first warrant and has been updated to the Board.

David moved to approve the warrants as presented; Cody seconded. Roll Call Vote: Bard, June, Cody, David, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

Discussion included:

- that June and David reviewed the invoices and warrant that was updated

Josh will send the warrant out for signatures using DocuSign.

Purchase Orders:

David moved to approve PO 4149 to County of Chittenden, for taxes in an amount not to exceed \$ 22,653.88; Cody seconded.

Discussion included:

- that there is a discrepancy of .02 of the written number of the amount to be approved. The warrant and invoice said \$22,653.86

David amended his motion

David moved to approve PO 4149 to County of Chittenden, for taxes in an amount not to exceed \$ 22,653.86; Cody seconded. Roll Call Vote: David, Bard, Cody, June, and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

IV. Discuss Items for Next Agenda

Update on petition if verified by Linda -Josh will get some legal advice on the process

Charitable event policy (see packet) June thought it should be reviewed

Water Sewer Commission appointments

Hunter Wasser project

V. Executive Session if necessary

VI. Adjourn

June moved to adjourn; Bard seconded. Roll call vote: David, June, Cody, Bard and Christine voted affirmatively. Motion passed.

The meeting ended 11:06 PM

CHAT DIALOG

00:07:32 Rod West: suggest the participant mute themselves by using *6 on their phone

00:25:05 Cara LaBounty (she/her): Sorry for interrupting, we just wanted to make sure Pete stayed on.

00:31:48 Cara LaBounty (she/her): Congratulations Kyle! We are happy to have you as part of our community.

00:32:59 Kyle Kapitanski: Thank you all.

01:39:35 Alexandra McAleer: We fully support the trails committee and all the wonderful work they are doing.

01:52:37 Allen Knowles: The 2019 VTRANS website Richmond Town map shows a "impassible or untraveled" road at the location under discussion

02:01:11 John Linn, AIA: The SPAN map that the trails committee has been using to locate the property lines says clearly that "Parcel data are not a land survey. Instead, they are a reference index of property ownership. Surveys may inform parcel data and ultimately improve them with time, but they are not the same. See the Vermont Land Survey Library for more info on surveys created and submitted to VCGI after January 1, 2020" and "Relatedly, parcel data are not perfect in spatial or positional alignment. While spatial accuracy may and should be continually improved, linework may not appear in perfect position when viewed over an aerial photo." I'm disappointed they'd rely on inaccurate data to locate property lines.

02:04:40 Judy Rosovsky: Deeds of local landowners should have plats with surveyor names and data on those properties and associated rights of way. Might be a good place to look for information to get answers to these questions.

02:08:24 Chase Rosenberg: VT still hasn't put anyone in the NBA far as I know.....time
to fix that!

02:19:01 Justin he/him: Survey Input: Justin.graham@uvmhealth.org

03:37:05 Cody Quattrocci Board Member : be right back

04:06:25 Willie.Lee: thanks for your time