

**Town of Richmond
Selectboard Meeting
Minutes of June 2, 2025**

Members Present: Bard Hill, Jay Furr, David Sander, Caitlin Filkins, Adam Wood

Absent: None

Staff Present: Town Manager Josh Arneson; Assistant to the Town Manager Duncan Wardwell, Planning and Zoning Director Keith Osborne, Highway Department Foreman Pete Gosselin.

Others Present: MMCTV Erin Wagg, Planning Commission Chair Virginia Clarke, Bonnie Stoyer Richmond Equity Group, Ian Bender, Mary Houle, Patty Bruschett, Chris, Wright Preston, Ian Stokes, Chris Granda, John Rankin, Emily Wood, Logan Hegg, Robin Hegg, Jim Cochran, Brad Elliot, Dan Wolfson, Josi Kytle, Andrew Mannix, Maya Balassa from CCRPC, Chelsye Brooks.

MMCTV Video: Recorded by MMCTV by Erin Wagg
<https://youtu.be/t-jdv2FkExs?si=B1VP-2XUX1ZmeiVV>

Call to Order: 7:00 p.m.

Welcome by: Furr

Public Comment:

Houle wanted to thank the Highway Department for the swift and skillful removal of the problem trees and the green islands out behind the post office. She also said she attended the recent Tree Warden and Arbor Day conference where tree issues in several towns was discussed, such as shedding and falling limbs and she feels that it is important to stay ahead of this in Richmond.

Additions, Deletions or Modifications to Agenda

Timestamp: 0:03

Bender wants the second item on the Agenda stricken, which Furr refused.

Items for Presentation or Discussion with those present

Presentation by Mrs. Dumas's fourth grade class of a Project Citizen research project regarding Dog Safety

Timestamp: 0:05

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3a_Dog_Safety_Dumas_24-25_w_Videos.pdf

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Dumas

Students from Dumas' class presented about Dog safety in person and on zoom. They suggest creating a dog park and a trail that allows off-leash dogs in Richmond.

Discussion of proposed changes to the Black Lives Matter Sign and Flag resolution

Timestamp: 0:21

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3b1_Resolution_In_Support_Of_Black_Lives_Matter.final_Signed.pdf

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3b2_Amendment_to_Resolution_In_Support_Of_Black_Lives_Matter_6-18-21_signed.pdf

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Bender, Stoyer, Hill, Houle, Heston, Granda, Bruschetti, Filkins, Sander

Furr said a motion to table is inappropriate. Bender stated that this item was not warned properly. The Black Lives Matter sign was voted on in June 2020 to keep up for three months and to be voted on every year. Stoyer feels their suggestions will only improve the design of the current sign and keep it the same size primarily to make the sign more inclusive. Hill doesn't feel the change is very substantial. Bender does not think keeping the flag up year around was warned appropriately. Sander said he remembers that previously a sample sign was presented. Heston agreed with Bender and feels this needs to be warned more properly. Houle feels it should say All Lives Matter if it's going to be posted all year. Granda was the original creator of the sign and he gave some context for that sign. Bruschetti feels the question involves making the sign prettier and leaving the discussion regarding leaving it up year around to a different discussion. Filkins wants it in writing that it should be clearer if the time to post the sign is to be extended and what changes will be accepted moving forward; that this is to be voted on at a future meeting. Sander said it's agreed that the new sign is approved.

Update from the Andrews Community Forest Committee on progress of updates to the Town Forest Management Plan

Timestamp: 1:07

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3c_Memo_From_ACFC_For_SB_June-2nd-2025_Meeting.pdf

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Stokes, Preston

Stokes and Preston trade off being Committee Chairs every 3 months. Stokes said he has submitted a progress report since Feb 2025, which summarizes their challenges. Preston said the recreation section is one of the most challenging sections, and so is the ecological section. They have been meeting twice a month and hope to have a complete plan ready by the end of August. A map of the current trails was shown. They intend to improve their signage this summer.

Continuation of Public Hearing to consider approving amendments to the following sections of the Richmond Zoning Regulations: Section 3.9, Jolina Court Zoning District; Section 5.12, Planned Unit Development; Section 6.15, Residential Density Bonus Program; and Section 6.16, Affordable Housing Development

Timestamp: 1:17

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3d1_SB_RZ_R_Amendments_Memo_with_motions_1_.pdf

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3d2_RZR_Section_5.12_revision_for_SB_5.13.25.pdf

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Osborne, Clarke, Hill, Wood, Filkins, Bruschetti, Van Eeghen, Granda, Kytle, Mannix

Osborne mentioned that the previous public hearing would need to be closed before a motion could be made. There are four options to choose from: residential density will be increased to 24 with or without a bonus program or increasing density only to 20, and fourth option is to put 40 units in the second building in Butterfield. Hill mentioned that previously the Selectboard had been told the height could not be increased, which Osborne pointed out that zoning does not indicate that you must stay under a specific height. Wood thinks the distinction related to height is because there is no ladder truck at the Richmond Fire Dept, so this is a fire safety issue. But there are buildings that are higher than the proposed building already in Richmond. It's unclear how DRB would be able to verify or guarantee that the building would be approved before Building 2 gets built. Wood wants some of the units in these buildings to be rent controlled. Clarke feels this is beyond DRB's scope. Hill added that the density bonus program is just an offer and the builders don't have to utilize it. Filkins mentioned that the bonus program is a good idea because it allows a larger diversity of people to live there. Bruschetti commented that the bonus program is more inclusionary and important to maintain, she doesn't think there is housing for young people here. Van Eeghen said she thinks increasing base density is an innovative idea, and she feels that developers should have more options to make future development easier to accomplish. Clarke mentioned parking and warned this could become a problem if the developer builds the maximum number of units. She added that only one parking space is allowed per unit at present. Parking will be discussed again later. Hill said that the previous base density was 15, which will now be increased to 24 units per acre. Mannix thinks people will not rent an apartment with one parking space if they need more than one parking space. Kytle is one of the developers and she said they already have nearly twice the number of parking spaces. Additionally, they already have apartments that are available at a lower rent. She said cost of construction is higher now and she can't commit to building a building with more apartments and then keep those rents low, it doesn't work financially. Arneson stated that the issue of timing exists, because this may have to go back to the Planning Commission if this isn't moved on today. Wood feels a motion needs to be made regarding the first floor and the density bonus program to make this move forward.

Filkins moved to instruct the Planning Commission to amend Section 3.9 to increase the base density to 24 units per developable acre with a total density of up to 30 units per developable acre if all bonuses are utilized. Residential density bonus program should be revised to exclude the parking bonus option 6.15. And to remove the first floor commercial requirement as presented from section 5.12 and to implement section 6.16 as per state statute. Wood seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Furr, Hill, Filkins, Sander, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Filkins moved to set a new public hearing per 24 VSA paragraph 442(b) for August 4, 2025 for consideration to approve the revisions to paragraph 3.9 Jolina Court District, paragraph 5.12, Planned Unit Development paragraph 6.15, Residential Density Program and paragraph 6.16, Affordable Housing. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Furr, Hill, Filkins, Sander, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Consideration of opting in for the Tier 1B designation which would provide an exemption from Act 250 for housing projects in an area served by water and sewer that are 50 units or less and 10 acres or less until 2027

Timestamp: 2:27

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3e1_PC_-_Tier_1B_recommendation_to_SB_5.29.25.pdf

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3e2_Tier_1B_-_Opt-In_Recommendation-_Richmond_Housing_Committee_1_.pdf

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Clarke, Balassa, Hill, Brooks, Mannix, Kytle, Osborne, Wood

Clarke explained that the developer meets certain parameters and avoids an Act 250 review. The Jolina Court developers are already under Act 250 permit, so this would mean that the Town would be responsible for everything that Act 250 now reviews of new projects. The housing committee wants to opt in. The Planning committee does not think the Town has enough staff to take on this task. Balassa mentioned that Tier 1B is only allowed in Towns that are planning for expansion and that are served by water and sewer as well as buildings under 10 units. Hill thinks there is a limited number of properties that could fit into the Water and Sewer district and house these many units. Brooks does not feel we have the staff to support this. Mannix feels Tier 1B would be beneficial to Richmond. Kytle said that choosing Tier 1B is important to give developers a chance to build affordable housing. Osborne said that wetlands would still be reviewed by the State, the Town would mostly have to absorb administrative time. Hill asked how much in time and money does an Act 250 review cost. Kytle said it takes 8 months and costs around \$100,000. Wood wondered if the review could be contracted out. Furr wondered if this discussion should be revisited. Filkins thinks the Selectboard needs a bit more time. Balassa said this should be reviewed by the end of June.

Discussion of plan to cover Zoning Administrative Office duties until the position can be filled

Timestamp: 3:00

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Arneson, Wood, Filkins, Brooks

Arneson said that the Zoning Administrator position is open and CCRPC does not have anyone to lend us. Osborne does not get any compensation for the extra work he is doing. Osborne said he is spending 12-15 extra hours per week covering zoning tasks. Wood and Filkins supported this. Brooks wholeheartedly supported this.

Sander moved to provide a \$500 per week stipend to Director of Planning and Zoning Keith Oborn through the end of August 2025 or until a temporary or full time Zoning Administrative Officer is hired, whichever comes first. Filkins seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Sander, Furr, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Discussion of process to appoint the next Fire Chief including consideration of setting a term of service for the Chief and consideration of non-Richmond resident candidates

Timestamp: 3:09

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Wood, Filkins

Wood thinks hiring a Chief for one year at a time is a bit short and doesn't show support or trust, he thinks a 3 or 4 year term is more reasonable. Filkins would like to hear from some Fire Dept members, they were away on a call. Wood and Filkins are volunteering to help with hiring a new Fire Chief. Furr thinks one year terms make sense in the short-term. Hill likes a 3-year term but wonders if a probationary period should be utilized. Everyone agrees that a 3-year term makes sense.

Discussion of traffic calming measures on Bridge St. from intersection with Rt. 2 to intersection with Huntington Rd.

Timestamp: 3:18

People who participated in the discussion: Furr, Gosselin, Filkins,

Gosselin said most of the painting has been completed. The pedestrian crossing signs are very faded and should be changed. He thinks the Cochran Road/Huntington Road intersection could use a speed bump at Long Trail Physical Therapy, and a flashing red light on Cochran Road to remind people to stop. He said a physical speed bump would slow things down. Filkins supports this idea and she wonders what the right of way is at that intersection. Gosselin said a speed bump and flashing light is a simple and cheap alternative to changing traffic patterns as suggested by the Cochran Road study. Furr concurred with the idea. Gosselin said they have used several tons of asphalt to repairs roads in Town already this year. Gosselin thinks the speed limit at Faye's Corner should be set to 30-mph, it is 40-mph presently, he also suggested three speedbumps and two yellow flashing beacons to slow people down at that 90-degree turn. He thinks signs are faded and need to be updated. Gosselin reminded the board there is a traffic calming

budget that would likely cover new LED flashing lights for certain intersections. Arneson said speed studies have to be done before speeds can be lowered, a speed study is being done on Hinesburg road.

Discussion of amending and extending the agreement with Hinesburg for police services and discussion of searching for an interim shared chief, possible executive session

Timestamp: 3:33

People who participated in discussion: Furr, Arneson

The committees are still meeting to talk about shared policing of the two Towns. Wood thinks a collective bargaining agreement is necessary to make an agreement with Hinesburg.

Wood moved to find that premature public knowledge about a police services agreement with Hinesburg would cause the Town or person to suffer a substantial disadvantage. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Sander, Furr, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Wood moved that we enter into executive session to discuss a police services agreement with Hinesburg under the provisions of VSA 313(a)(1)(a) and VSA 313(a)(1)(f) of the Vermont Statutes. Filkins seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Sander, Furr, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Sander moved that we exit executive session. Filkins seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Sander, Furr, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Consideration of setting a date for a public hearing to amend the Traffic Ordinance

Timestamp: 3:47

https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/05/3j_Traffic_Ordinance_Effective_May_12_2023_DRAFT_UPDATE.pdf

People who participated in discussion: Furr

Wood moved to set a hearing date of July 7, 2025 at 7pm for proposed amendments to the Traffic Ordinance. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Furr, Sander, Filkins, Wood, Hill in favor. Motion approved.

Consideration of accepting the loan from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for Step 1 design of the flood mitigation project for the Wastewater Pump and Force Main at 100% subsidy

Timestamp: 3:48

[https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/04/31_FY26_Paving - PO 5251 Pike Industries.pdf](https://www.richmondvt.gov/fileadmin/files/Selectboard/Meetings/2025/04/31_FY26_Paving_-_PO_5251_Pike_Industries.pdf)

People who participated in discussion: Furr,

Wood moved to accept the loan from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for Step 1 design of the flood mitigation project for the Wastewater Pump and Force Main at 100% subsidy. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Filkins, Furr, Sander, Hill, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Approval of Minutes, Purchase Orders, Warrants

Timestamp: 3:49

Minutes:

Sander moved to approve the draft Selectboard Minutes of 05/19/25 as presented. Wood seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Furr, Sander, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Motions for Purchase Orders:

Wood moved to approve Purchase Order number 5168 to the Town of Williston for an allocation to the Community Justice Center in the amount of \$15,840.00. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Furr, Filkins, Sander, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Wood moved to approve purchase order 5258 to SD Ireland for \$72,543 for concrete for sidewalks. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Sander, Furr, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Wood moved to approve Purchase Order number 5290 to Mount Mansfield Unified Union School District for education taxes in the amount of \$2,091,980.00. Sander seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Furr, Filkins, Sander, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Warrants:

Sander moved to approve the Warrants as presented. Wood seconded.

Roll Call Vote: Hill, Furr, Sander, Filkins, Wood in favor. Motion approved.

Next Meeting Agenda

Timestamp: 3:52

Policing

347 Andrews community service
 348 Black lives matter sign
 349
 350 **Adjourn**
 351
 352 *Sander moved to adjourn. Wood seconded.*
 353 *Roll Call Vote: Hill, Filkins, Sander, Furr, Wood in favor. Motion approved.*
 354
 355
 356 **Meeting adjourned at: 10:54 p.m.**
 357
 358
 359 **Chat file from Zoom:**
 360
 361 00:34:14 Ian Bender: your muted
 362 00:34:17 mannix: cannot hear discussion. just me?
 363 00:34:31 Duncan Wardwell: I cannot hear it just now
 364 00:34:41 melissawolaver: We have lost our audio of the meeting
 365 00:35:03 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Still can't hear
 366 00:35:16 June Heston: Can you let us know if you are reading these chat
 367 messages.
 368 00:35:35 mannix: have audio
 369 00:35:36 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Yes
 370 00:35:38 Maya Balassa (she/her) CCRPC Planner: we can hear
 371 00:35:38 melissawolaver: Yes we can hear
 372 00:36:04 Maya Balassa (she/her) CCRPC Planner: we heard the description
 373 00:37:10 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Mics go in and out; hard to hear
 374 00:37:16 Chelsye Brooks: Cannot hear Jay Furr.
 375 00:37:21 Duncan Wardwell: i cannot hear jay
 376 00:37:22 mannix: mics dont work
 377 00:37:25 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Can
 378 00:37:37 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Can't hear Jay; can hear Bonny
 379 00:38:00 Chelsye Brooks: Yes, I cannot hear Jay or anyone on the Selectboard.
 380 I can hear Bonnie.
 381 00:38:03 mannix: still cant hear comments from Jay
 382 00:38:09 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Can't hear Selectboard
 383 00:38:12 Brendan: Jay's laptop audio may be on and canceling the audio
 384 00:38:16 Duncan Wardwell: cannot hear bard or any side microphones
 385 00:38:30 mannix: can hear josh
 386 00:38:32 Duncan Wardwell: i can hear josh
 387 00:38:34 Chelsye Brooks: I can hear Josh and Bonnie.
 388 00:38:46 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: No'
 389 00:38:48 June Heston: No
 390 00:38:51 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Can't hear Katie and David
 391 00:38:59 melissawolaver: Can only hear Josh
 392 00:39:02 Duncan Wardwell: it was working earlier did someone kick out a cord
 393 00:39:10 mannix: lost everyone
 394 00:39:14 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Jay, could you mute your laptop?
 395 00:39:17 mannix: now back
 396 00:39:32 Brendan: no

397 00:39:34 mannix: no
 398 00:39:40 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: No, can't hear D or K
 399 00:40:07 Duncan Wardwell: if you share mikes it can work
 400 00:40:16 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Can't hear Jay at all now
 401 00:41:13 Ian Bender: video frozen
 402 00:41:36 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: I don't have frozen video; I can see everyone
 403 moe
 404 00:41:39 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Move
 405 00:41:54 Duncan Wardwell: i am getting sporadic audio
 406 00:42:05 mannix: atever you just did cut the feed
 407 00:42:08 mannix: whatever
 408 00:42:11 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: No audio
 409 00:42:55 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Still no audio
 410 00:44:02 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: No audio, still
 411 00:44:13 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Yes!
 412 00:44:20 John Linn, AIA: We can hear you now
 413 00:44:21 Ian Bender: hear but no see
 414 00:44:24 melissawolaver: I can hear Josh
 415 00:44:38 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: But not anyone other than Josh
 416 00:44:45 Richmond 2: I can hear josh but not see
 417 00:44:51 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: I can hear Bonny faintly
 418 00:45:00 Ian Bender: I hear Bonnie and Josh
 419 00:45:05 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: And not Jay at all
 420 00:46:06 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Only Josh
 421 00:46:06 Ian Bender: I can see you
 422 00:46:07 Duncan Wardwell: i can see and hear josh
 423 00:46:13 Brendan: Can hear now
 424 00:46:14 Ian Bender: yes
 425 00:46:15 June Heston: Yes
 426 00:46:16 mannix: good
 427 00:46:16 Duncan Wardwell: yes i hear
 428 00:46:16 John Linn, AIA: You're back! Audio and video
 429 00:46:16 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Yes!
 430 00:49:41 Linda Parent: The old flag was faded & torn, I gave it to Chris & Jeff
 431 01:05:38 Brendan: No scenario "all lives matter" is going on any sign
 432 01:29:28 mannix: you can sprinkle a building with a water system and go
 433 many stories high.
 434 01:51:51 Chelsye Brooks: They want to be able to put 40-50 units in building
 435 two. So the only way to "force" them to use the density bonus would be to lower the base
 436 density. Just realistically, it's cheaper to not build low income or inclusive units.
 437 01:54:00 Chelsye Brooks: To be clear, I'm not saying decreased density is the
 438 answer, but want folks to be realistic that they're unlikely to use the density bonuses if
 439 the base density is increased to 24.
 440 01:54:34 Josi Kytlye: Reacted to "To be clear, I'm not..." with 👍
 441 01:57:28 Chelsye Brooks: You could lower the base density, but then give
 442 much larger room to expand with the density bonuses. THATS how to incentivize them.
 443 02:03:28 Chelsye Brooks: Is anything limiting the number of bonus units per
 444 acre? Can we make the bonus 10 units per acre? I don't think they would use it in
 445 developing building 2... but maybe they would in 3 or 4.

446 02:32:56 Jay Furr: I move to instruct the planning committee amend section
 447 3.9 to increase the base density to 24 units per developable acre with a total density of up
 448 to 30 units per developable acre if all bonuses are utilized. Residential density bonus
 449 program should be revised to exclude the parking bonus option in 6.15. And to remove
 450 the first floor commercial requirement as presented from section 5.12. and to continue to
 451 implement section 6.16 as per state statute.

452 02:42:17 Chelsye Brooks: I strongly oppose opting into the Tier 1B program.
 453 Our town does not have the expertise to replace the function of Act 250 review. The DRB
 454 has directly misspoken about state Stormwater recently. Furthermore if things do not go
 455 before act 250 the state doesn't have the staff to police things like wetlands. They rely on
 456 applicants to be honest, and unfortunately sometimes folks aren't, because it's cheaper to
 457 avoid or subvert it.

458 02:42:29 Chelsye Brooks: Also, this is not only water sewer.
 459 02:42:41 Chelsye Brooks: IT CAN BE SHARED SEPTIC.

460 02:43:16 Chelsye Brooks: For example, if the trailer park gets mapped for
 461 planned growth they could expand and be exempt from act 250.

462 03:02:18 mannix: Great point Maya
 463 03:02:22 Chelsye Brooks: I'd like to hear clarification from Maya regarding
 464 whether this has impacts on funding as implied.
 465

466 Also, would anyone be ensuring that state permits such as wetlands and stormwater are
 467 obtained?

468 03:03:24 mannix: Chelsye - the bank always ensures these are done. No
 469 permits, no money

470 03:03:29 Brendan: To be respectful of everyone's time I will leverage the chat,
 471 I think we need to strongly consider removing barriers to Richmond development. Just
 472 because low income housing isn't viable in the current market conditions doesn't mean
 473 we should pause more high-end development. We've had 2 restaurants go out of business,
 474 in the last ~3 months. This is important development.

475 03:03:55 Maya Balassa (she/her) CCRPC Planner: Thank you for having me!
 476 03:04:01 Connie van Eeghen, she/her: Thank you, Selectboard, for thoughtful,
 477 inclusive discussion!

478 03:04:12 Maya Balassa (she/her) CCRPC Planner: And thank you to Virginia
 479 and Keith for their work on this!

480 03:04:55 Chelsye Brooks: Replying to "Chelsye - the bank a..."
 481 I've personally seen development without appropriate state permits. So I am not
 482 confident in this statement.

483 03:05:24 Chelsye Brooks: Replying to "Chelsye - the bank a..."
 484 A bank would only make you get the permits they KNOW you need. What happens when
 485 someone says, nope, I don't have any wetlands?

486 03:10:49 Josi Kytile: Replying to "Chelsye - the bank a..."
 487

488 @Chelsye Brooks From my understanding.. in that case.. a person doesn't get permits
 489 they can't resell until the permits or fees and fines are paid. I just know this from a friend
 490 trying to buy a house with such a situation. At the creamery, my bank required copies of
 491 our Act 250, our wetlands, our fire permit, town permits etc.. BUT there are likely bad
 492 players out there! I don't doubt that.

493 03:17:21 Josi Kytile: Thank you all.
 494