

41 Werner also said there was an e-mail response from Elizabeth Peebles, a Historic Resources Specialist
42 with the State Division of Historic Preservation on the warning devices at the Pulp Mill Bridge that was
43 included for their information.

44

45 Citizen Comments

46

47 Irene Barna said she was here because she had further thoughts on the Pulp Mill Bridge during the
48 downtown shutdown next summer. She wants to be sure everyone understands how the covered
49 bridge works, and that it is not a static structure, it's flexible. She said these bridges move, and she's
50 concerned that with the amount of traffic that bridge will have during the downtown construction,
51 there's going to be too many vehicles on the bridge at the same time and that will be very bad for the
52 bridge. She said there used to be a sign that said "One vehicle per lane", but those signs are gone. She
53 said she just wanted to bring attention the fact that the bridge is a vulnerable structure, and suggested
54 Ramsay contact Alpine Construction who reconstructed the bridge the last time, about the potential
55 overload. She said the damage may not show up right away.

56

57 Werner said it was VTrans that recommended limiting vehicles to one-vehicle per lane prior to the
58 repairs some years ago, but once the repairs were done the sign came down. He said he was told that
59 the way the bridge was constructed the weight of the floor far exceeded the weight of the bridge if it
60 was fully loaded with vehicles, so the last time it was reconstructed the floor was redone so the bridge
61 has far less load now than it did before.

62

63 Water System Upgrades

64

65 Werner went over the Court Street Water Main project, which he'd broken down into 3 contracts. He
66 said the Committee had been thinking about programming additional funding each year towards these
67 water projects, so he programmed that amount (\$109,000) each year towards these contracts, and also
68 showed the additional funds needed beyond the Water Capital Improvement funds. Ramsay said for the
69 additional funds needed, which is just under \$1 million, the Committee had discussed two possible
70 options; a bond vote or using Cross Street Bridge Funds. She said Werner has cautioned against bonding
71 because of how it ties our hands for future projects if committed to a bond payment for 20 years.

72 Robbins said she's in favor of using the Cross Street Bridge Funds. Baker asked how much was available,
73 and Ramsay said there was around \$2.5 million.

74

75 Tenny said when you look holistically at all the highway and water deficiencies; he doesn't know how at
76 some point we will avoid bonding. He said there is too much deferred maintenance and he doesn't
77 think we can raise our user rates and tax rates that aggressively to keep up with this without incurring
78 some debt. He said he agrees it's not the greatest thing to do, but there has to be a plan to bridge that.

79

From: Peebles, Elizabeth [mailto:Elizabeth.Peebles@vermont.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 20, 2019 6:22 PM
To: Kathleen Ramsay <KRamsay@TownOfMiddlebury.org>
Cc: Chris English <CEnglish@TownOfMiddlebury.org>
Subject: RE: Art Panels on Buildings & Protection Structures for Pulp Mill Bridge

Hi Kathleen,

Thank you for sending the summary email and the art proposal. We would be happy to offer advice when you are getting into the specifics of project installation.

For the bridge I can understand the interest in putting up a warning bar to try and limit potential collision damage. I would suggest that if it is considered as a potential project that the placement is far enough back so that people can still see and appreciate the bridge without a visual obstruction. Looking at the map I think that could be done on the west side but might be challenging on east side since the turn of the road is so close to the bridge.

Please contact me if you want to talk more about either project.

Thanks!

Elizabeth

PLEASE NOTE NEW PHONE NUMBER BELOW

Elizabeth Peebles | Historic Resources Specialist
Vermont Division for Historic Preservation

1 National Life Drive, Davis Bldg, 6th Floor | Montpelier, VT 05620-0501
802.505.1147

125 should be coordinated with the Planning Commission to areas they've targeted for future growth.
126 Seeley also asked if the \$20,000 for stormwater projects should remain in the Capital Budget or do we
127 want to put it in the operating budget. Ramsay said if it's placed in the operating budget and not spent
128 that year, it will go into the General Fund, whereas if it's in the Capital Budget it will remain in there for
129 future stormwater projects. Werner said this would not be adding \$20,000 each year, and if it isn't used
130 it is there, but if some of it is used during the year we might just replenish it back to the \$20,000 for the
131 next year. Tenny said stormwater is getting stricter with regulations, so that money would be available
132 if more money was needed for some existing project, so leaving it a line item now is fine.

133

134 Tenny made the motion to recommend to the Selectboard the 2nd Draft of the FY20-21 Capital
135 Improvement Budget for \$1,457,379 with the amendment to move Line 24 "Gravel Road Paving" to Line
136 29 "Highway Construction". Baker seconded the motion. The motion was approved 7-0.

137

138 Ramsay said when discussing the Capital Budget forecast earlier, the Selectboard considered the
139 possibility of using \$400,000 from the Cross Street Bridge Fund as it did last year to subsidize or pay for
140 capital improvements and using funds from the Local Option Tax surplus to fund the passenger rail
141 platform, and the downtown improvements to go with the railroad bridge project, so that would reduce
142 the amount needed from \$1,457,379 to just over \$900,000 because we'd be applying \$557,000 from the
143 Cross Street Bridge Funds Local Option Tax. She said this would be just a little bit over the annual
144 surplus of the tax. Seeley thought that sounded reasonable. Ramsay said that would mean a 1/3 of 1
145 cent increase in the tax rate.

146

147 Ramsay said there would be discussion on the use of the Local Option Tax and Cross Street Bridge Funds
148 at the Selectboard meeting on October 29th.

149

150 Robbins mentioned attending a meeting at the Ilsley Library regarding spending \$10 million on their
151 building, and how people said the Town wasn't doing any other projects, so she wished more people
152 would be involved to know all the other projects that the Town is working on and struggling to pay for.
153 Seeley agreed it would be nice if more people were involved and be a part of the process, so maybe they
154 should encourage more citizens to attend and see what problems the Town is grappling with. Tenny
155 said the cost of construction is far outpacing the wage increases so there needs to be a higher level
156 discussion of the problem we have, and it's only going to get worse. He said he thinks this feeds into
157 using the Local Option Tax, because we are the core community serving many surrounding communities,
158 and they need to shoulder that burden.

159

160 Chief Hanley left the meeting.

161

162 Pulp Mill Bridge Protection Devices

163

164 The Committee reviewed photos of possible devices used to protect structures from vehicles that
165 exceeded the height limit. The cost of the devices ranged from \$200 to \$44,000. Werner said the intent
166 is that whatever device that's used will be temporary and only there for the 10 weeks Main Street is

167 shut down in 2020. Tenny said no matter what device you use, the vehicles are still going to hit the
168 structure, so isn't sure about spending the money. He said it's a very pretty bridge and no matter what
169 device you choose it will take away from that beauty. Ramsay said no matter what device is chosen we
170 should check with the State Historic Preservation Office. Seeley thought it was worth the \$750 for the
171 device on a separate arm mounted away from the bridge.

172
173 Following further discussion there was no further action taken.

174
175 Creek Road – Report from Creek Road Task Force

176
177 Seeley summarized a memo she had written the night before and handed out to everyone prior to the
178 meeting. She said when they were discussing the guardrail option, there were other options presented
179 and the outcome of that was to take the options and go to the property owners to discuss the options.
180 She said Ramsay had supplied information regarding pent roads and an old legal opinion regarding
181 possibly closing roads, and after she'd read them she determined that it had not been a good decision to
182 put the gates up. She said we anticipated it was going to be temporary, but considering 4 plus years has
183 gone by and the road still isn't open, she wants to fix the illegal closure and one way to do that would be
184 to install guardrails on the southern section of the road and open the gate to open the illegal closure;
185 however, she said decisions still need to be made about Creek Road going forward. She said the Creek
186 Road Task Force made a recommendation and it is coming to the Infrastructure Committee for
187 discussion and consideration on making the recommendation to the Selectboard, based on the
188 information provided by Bill Kernan, herself and the Creek Road Task Force.

189
190 Baker said with such a small Task Force it should have been coordinated so they were all present to vote
191 on a motion. Seeley said they tried and she let Peter DeGraff know Dean George wasn't going to be
192 present, but DeGraff said to go ahead with a meeting since it had been a long time between meetings.
193 Baker said they voted and they should have waited until the 4th member had been there, and he thinks it
194 smells bad that you have a 4 person committee and you can't arrange to all get together at one time,
195 and he questions the determination that the road is closed illegally since he thought we had a legal
196 opinion. Dean Rheaume said according to the Statute the road is illegally closed. Seeley said at the
197 time we put up the gate we didn't go through any public process to close the road and it was supposed
198 to be temporary, so they made the best decision they could. Now she feels enough time has gone by
199 and more information has been received, and she thinks it warrants further discussion.

200
201 Robbins said if it gets reclassified as a Class IV or a trail, it still has to be open to the public, so if we want
202 to abandon it we would need to have a public hearing, and maybe we should look into that. Seeley said
203 we'd have to do a complete discontinuation and the land would revert back to the landowners and
204 they'd need to maintain the gates and locks. Robbins said she thinks it's something we should look into.
205 Seeley said the Task Force met last week and updated a list of all alternatives and they're in the process
206 of each member looking at the alternatives and adding comments and questions, and then they'll all go
207 back to DeGraff to compile. She said they hope to weed out the alternatives that don't work. Robbins
208 said the abandonment alternative was put in there as just a no-action alternative that could be thrown