Regular Selectboard Meeting **Large Conference Room – Town Offices Tuesday, June 27, 2017 Meeting Minutes** Members Present: Brian Carpenter, Susan Shashok, Laura Asermily, Farhad Khan, Heather Seeley and Victor Nuovo. Nick Artim was absent. Staff Present: Town Manager Kathleen Ramsay, Director of Planning and Zoning Jennifer Murray, Director of Public Works Operations Bill Kernan and Director of Public Works Planning Dan Werner, Fire Chief David Shaw, Community Liaison Jim Gish. Also present were representatives from ACTR and members of the community. The meeting was televised on MCTV by Kurt Broderson. 1. Call to Order The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chair Brian Carpenter. 2. Approval of Agenda Carpenter said there was a need to add an agenda item 6.a. for Letter of Concurrence on the Main Street and Merchants Row Bridge Project. He said there would also be the need for an Executive Session.

Shashok moved to amend the agenda with the addition of item 6.a. Seeley seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

3. Public Input Meeting on Temporary Relocation of ACTR Transit Hub

Carpenter said this was an opportunity for the Board and the community to look at the three location options for the ACTR temporary relocation of their transit hub for the period beginning around November of this year and conceivably running through the end of 2020. He said the Board has asked Planning and Zoning Director Jen Murray to look at the options and make a recommendation. He said Murray would give her presentation and then there would be a chance for public input, however a decision would not be made this evening.

Murray began her presentation by defining the "interim" and "temporary" locations of the ACTR hub. She said the interim location on the south end of South Pleasant Street was needed due to the temporary bridges installation, and this will last around 6 months. The temporary location will last through the duration of the railroad bridge project and could become the permanent location if it works out well for all involved. Murray said the Selectboard approved the interim location at their meeting on May 23rd, and a working group was formed to review these alternatives, in the public right-of-way, for the

Selectboard Minutes 6-27-17

Board to partner with ACTR on, so ACTR can move forward with design and permitting.
She said following public input, the working group, consisting of ACTR and Town staff,
will meet again before going to the Infrastructure Committee on July 6th, and Board
approval of a site on July 11th. She said this hub will need a Work in the Right-of-Way
permit and a zoning permit, and will need to go before the Development Review Board,
with a target completion date of November. Murray said throughout this review, there
will be plenty of opportunity for public input on aspects of the project.

54 55

Murray presented the three alternatives with pros and cons of each, beginning with the North end of South Pleasant Street.

565758

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

- North End of South Pleasant St ranked highest by ACTR and lowest by the Town
 - Loss of 7-9 parking spaces
 - Curb needs to be relocated
 - Power poles may need to be moved to create wider lanes
 - South Pleasant Street will be made one-way
 - Not currently on the ACTR bus route
 - Planning Commission has concern about the historic character of the neighborhood
 - Does not conform with the Town Plan
 - Snow plowing will be more difficult
 - There will be queuing of busses in lane
 - No room for overflow busses
 - All busses have to turn right and cross the bridge to the roundabout
 - No long-term parking

71 72 73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

Adam Lougee, Chair of the ACTR Board, along with Operations Manager Bill Cunningham, gave the reasons why this is their preferred location. He said this is a very important site for ACTR, because all busses run through this location and he spoke of the importance of their service to the area. He said that when reviewing these locations, they looked at three primary areas; safety, service and scheduling.

- Safety ACTR felt this was the safest because South Pleasant Street has less traffic than Seymour or College Streets. This location also gave them the ability to control and isolate the pedestrians getting off the busses.
- Service ACTR feels this is the closest location to the downtown and that they
 can perform a service to the town by transporting people into the downtown
 during construction when parking is limited.
- Scheduling This location is immediately adjacent to the existing hub and would have the least impact to scheduling. Lougee said by moving the hub across town you can impact the schedule by as much as 10 minutes. He said there are roughly 160 people disembarking and embarking at this location every day.

878889

90

Cunningham added that ACTR acknowledges there will be snow plowing issues at this location but feels that some of the problems listed for this site will be the same problems at the other locations as well, such as loss of parking and bus overflow.

Murray noted that the Town concerns for this location were from others on the working group, which included Fire Chief Dave Shaw, Police Chief Tom Hanley, Director of Public Works Operations Bill Kernan and Director of Public Works Planning Dan Werner.

97 98

99

Irene Barna stated that no matter where the ACTR hub is located, the safest thing for everyone would be to make South Pleasant Street one-way south to avoid people going the wrong way around the Town Green.

100 101 102

Seymour Street - Least favorite of ACTR

103104

105

106

107

108109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

Murray said the Seymour Street location was looked at extensively in 2014 and 2015 and at one time was the preferred alternative. She said the location has shifted more to the north now. Pros and cons for this location are:

- Congested during construction as there will be construction activity adjacent to and near this area. Construction equipment will exit close to this site.
- Loss of parking is not as significant
- Passengers could unload directly onto the sidewalk
- Lighting similar to South Pleasant Street
- Bi-directional drop-off is a possibility
- Less physical investment than South Pleasant St
- Crosswalk will need to be added
- Future development of the Greg's Market area and bike-ped improvements could compliment the transit hub in this location
- Heavy truck traffic in the area
- ACTR concerned about exiting Seymour Street onto Main Street

118119120

Lougee gave ACTR's comments:

- Safety Having to turn left onto Main Street by the Emma Willard Monument causes safety and operational constraints for the busses. There is a lot of traffic on this street and traffic can back up at the Main Street intersection, and concerns about Fire Department movement on a fire call. He said the bidirectional busses cause both safety and scheduling concerns for ACTR.
 - Service Most customers would rather be closer to downtown.

126 127 128

129

130

Cunningham said this location is just not workable for ACTR and is the worst for safety and scheduling. Mary Crogan of ACTR, said the sidewalks on Seymour Street are not convenient for loading passengers and to use the wheelchair ramp they'd have to do it in the roadway.

131132133

134

There was discussion over the ability to make left-hand turns coming onto Main Street and how busses that wanted to go north on Route 7 would be able to coming out of Seymour Street, and the possibility of exiting construction traffic.

Cathy Wood said from a passenger's point of view, this is the worst location. She said if you have people getting off a bus and there's only one crosswalk, they aren't going to utilize it and there will be people just crossing the street to find their next bus.

139 140 141

137

138

College and Academy Street – preferred by ACTR over Seymour Street

142143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

- Murray said that with all the operational problems from the Town staff's perspective, they had favored Seymour Street over South Pleasant Street. In an effort to keep it downtown, they looked at the College St/Academy Street location next to the new park, with adequate parking, an existing bus stop and a location for the bus shelter to go on the corner of College and Weybridge Street. She listed the pros and cons:
 - Easiest location to design and the move could be done quickly
 - · Existing parking that is underutilized
 - Long-term parking available
 - Located near Park and Ride on Mill Street
- Bike parking available
 - Two of five ACTR routes already circle this bus stop, so has potential to keep some busses out of the construction area
 - The approach to the stop is highly visible
 - Charging station in Mill Street
 - Existing infrastructure and streetscape already improved
 - Sidewalks are wide
 - No snowplowing issues
 - Regional busses can access easily
 - Academy Street is already one-way
 - Lighting is better than either of the other two locations
 - Stop light at Academy/South Main can be adjusted to prevent bus queuing
 - Food and ice cream available nearby

164165166

ACTR's concerns:

167 168 169

170

171

 Safety – ACTR has significant safety concerns because of the heavy traffic (4,000 cars per day) that go up College Street. The College/Academy/Weybridge Street intersection is already difficult and lining four buses up along College Street will cause visibility issues for Weybridge Street traffic.

172 173

- Service Potentially some service benefits, especially for people going to the College, but not for those wanting to go to downtown businesses and services.
- Scheduling This location impacts their schedule the most and will be the biggest challenge for ACTR.

175176177

178

174

Lougee said that ACTR has some other alternatives for this area involving Academy Street and the parking lot that they would be happy to go over, but Murray said they should wait until the working group could go over them.

Carpenter suggested that maybe the Seymour Street location should just be eliminated to save time and discussion, since it isn't preferred by either the Town or ACTR. There was some discussion and Pam Smith, who lives at 168 South Pleasant Street, said she would hate for them to eliminate one until fully hearing the impacts on the other two, and suggested keeping it a distant 3rd choice. Carpenter said that was why he'd like to limit the testimony to the two highest priorities due to the short amount of time, but he thought Seymour Street might not even be an option due to the fatal flaws and another option might need to be found should the other two not be chosen.

Smith continued with her concerns for the South Pleasant Street location. She said she lives on the last house on the corner of Cross Street Bridge, and traffic on South Pleasant Street is already a concern and it gets backed up at the Cross Street intersection, especially at school time. Visibility is also an issue now with the busses parked in front of Cole's now she said, and she is concerned about the safety of all the "child traffic" in the area on their way to school and Ilsley Library. She said South Pleasant Street is used as an overflow parking area for downtown, so removing so many parking spaces will be a problem. Carpenter asked if the sight issue would be a problem if the busses were located on the north end of South Pleasant Street, and she said this is predominantly a residential area and trying to get out of driveways is already a challenge, so to have four busses parking anywhere on the street will impact the ability to get in and out of driveways.

Bill Cunningham said that concept drawings show two lanes, one for left and one for right hand turns. Since the busses only turn right at Cross Street, he thought that might alleviate some of the problem. There was some discussion on the number of busses that might queue up at the intersection, and it Cunningham said it was possible that all four busses could be lined up to turn right at the same time, and it could be as many as 15 times a day.

Madeline Field, of 88 South Pleasant Street, next to Town Hall Theater, spoke next. She said the traffic is already awful by her place, and when traffic is rerouted down South Pleasant for problems on Court Square, then it's impossible for them to get out of their driveway. She said parking has become an issue when there was no parking on Merchants Row, and the tenants in the apartments have no place for their guests and service workers to park. She is concerned about a big bus stop being across the road from their apartment complex which has several families living there, and is concerned about the "sketchy" people that get off these busses. She thinks the College Street location sounds like a good solution, and really doesn't want it on South Pleasant because of the safety concerns, the traffic congestion and the fact it will be an eye sore in this beautiful, mostly residential neighborhood.

Bruce Grove, who owns the Inn on the Green with his wife Brenda, said that it was 51' 9" from his front door to the curb, and now he finds out they're going to move the curb back 2 feet, making it even closer. He said like every quality hospitality establishment, they do their best to manage the whole guest experience, and locating this bus stop that close to their business will impair them from doing that. He said the Link bus to

Burlington leaves at 6:00 a.m., so there will be diesel engine noise and fumes, along with backup alarms, so guests will be unable to sit and enjoy being outside when it's nice. He said none of this works and will really hurt them. He's concerned that the parking will impact them if their off-street lot can't accommodate all the guests, and the one-way street will limit guest's ability to locate them. He asked the Board to please not impair their ability to run their business.

Irene Barna spoke as a long-time rider, and had been in favor or the South Pleasant Street location, but is now thinking that the location near the old Town Offices and that parking lot makes more sense.

Carpenter asked Cunningham if that parking lot off Academy Street is one of their alternatives they mentioned. Cunningham said that the College Street location was deemed by ACTR to be less safe than the original Merchants Row site, so they are considering the parking lot which the working team will look at; however, from an operational standpoint, South Pleasant is still their preferred location.

Maggie Supernault, one of the ACTR bus drivers, first asked the two South Pleasant Street residents to make eye contact with the bus drivers when trying to exit their driveway, because ACTR drivers will stop and let them out. Both residents said the problem isn't with the bus drivers, but the other cars trying to go around the buses. Supernault said the current interim location on the south end of South Pleasant Street makes it very difficult to lower the elevator for the handicapped riders, and the thought of the jersey barriers planned for the north end of South Pleasant Street gives her chills. She said from a driver's point of view, the major drawback to the locations presented is room to lower the bus elevator, which needs 8 to 10 feet. She likes the idea of using the Academy Street parking lot.

lan Ross, now a resident of Cornwall but a former Middlebury resident and ACTR bus rider, said he had reviewed all the plans on-line and felt the College Street/Academy Street location was the best and allowed easiest access to all the downtown amenities other than the Post Office.

Elizabeth Stabler, a resident of Eastview who used to work in the transit field, urged them to look at fixing the "fatal flaws" on Seymour Street to make it work. She felt it was wider and if designed so all busses were on one side, there would be no safety concerns of riders crossing the street. She felt College Street was too narrow, had too much traffic and was not as close to downtown as Seymour Street. Cunningham said having busses on only one side would not work for their scheduling at all, and Carpenter felt that saying Seymour Street was closer to downtown than the College Street location depended on how you defined the downtown area. Irene Barna said she would not feel safe at night transferring busses on Seymour Street.

Carpenter said he would be interested in the traffic counts for all three streets. Madeline Field asked that they please be sure the traffic counts were from a busy time of day, and preferably when school is in session, to give an accurate picture. Pam

Smith said that there are several Counseling Service clients that live on South Pleasant Street that have CSAC staff visiting them throughout the day, and she knows that the loss of parking there has been a challenge. Field said she has elderly neighbors and they sometimes have the ambulance there on a monthly basis, and they've had the fire department there before as well.

Seeley asked if there would be another presentation, because if so, she would like to see ACTR's pros and cons included side-by-side with the staff's. Carpenter said he would provide a matrix format to be used. Carpenter said he wasn't sure if a decision would be made at the next meeting since there were still some outstanding questions and at least one more option to look at. Nuovo requested that they also consider Quality of Life when reviewing the locations. Shashok said she would like to see the matrix show how much extra time is added to the bus schedules by location.

Farhad Khan asked for the Police and Fire Chief's opinions on the locations. Police Chief Hanley said the north end of South Pleasant Street is not a good idea, and if there is ever an event in the area of Court Square, then the bus schedule and service will be nonexistent because emergency services will take over this space as a staging area. Fire Chief David Shaw said that the plans for the north end of South Pleasant Street show a travel lane of 10' 5", and their new ladder truck width measures 10' 6", so this is a real pinch-point for fire apparatus. He also feels the placement of the jersey barriers will create a life-safety issues as they would not be able to reach the Inn on the Green with a ladder truck should they need to do a 2nd story rescue. Shaw also said that they used to have firemen parking on the street and racing to the station for a fire call, and a couple had been hit crossing the street, so he feels this will also happen if the busses are on Seymour Street and riders need to cross the road to catch a bus, as it's a heavily travelled street and does back up.

(The Board took a short break and resumed at 7:15 p.m.)

4. Approval of Selectboard Minutes of June 13, 2017

Asermily moved to approve the minutes of June 13, 2017 as presented, seconded by Khan. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 1 abstention (Nuovo) and 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

5. Citizen Comments

311 None

6. Appointment to Addison County Regional Planning Commission's Transportation Advisory Committee

Asermily moved to appoint Betty Nuovo to a one-year term as Middlebury's **representative** to the Addison County Regional Planning Commission's Transportation

Advisory Committee. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 1 abstention (Nuovo) and 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

319320321

322

323

318

Shashok moved to appoint Town Manager Kathleen to a one-year term as Middlebury's **alternate** to the Addison County Regional Planning Commission's Transportation Advisory Committee. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

324 325 326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

6.a. Letter of Concurrence on the Main Street and Merchants Row Bridge Project

Jim Gish, Community Liaison, gave the Board a quick rundown on what they were being asked for in this letter. He said that part of Phase I of the project includes a new drainage system for the rail corridor that involves an outflow pipe in the Town's easement for Riverfront Park, and also installation of a catch basin on railroad land that directly adjoins Triangle Park. He said during these installations, a portion of these parks will need to be temporarily closed to the public. The letter of Concurrence is required because recreation areas are one of the resources protected under 4(f) of the 1966 Department of Transportation Act. He said this letter is asking for the Board to concur with their determination that the temporary closing of these two areas will have a minimal impact on the public's ability to use these two parks, and for the Town to concur with the de minimis recommendation to the Federal Highway Agency. He said VTrans is also requesting a permanent easement from the Town to maintain the outfall pipe and the drainage facilities around Triangle Park. He said even though the Town does not own Riverfront Park, VTrans feels that since they have the easement they are the ones to have jurisdiction over the public park use. He said Town Attorney Benj Putnam has reviewed the letter and signed off on it. Carpenter said this is an updated version of the letter the Board signed on May 23rd. Gish said the major change from the first letter is VTrans has decided not to leave the more permanent maintenance roadway to the overflow pipe, and will restore it to what it was before construction.

347 348

Ross Conrad asked if it could be written in that if the pipe is ever abandoned, the State needs to remove it. Carpenter assured him this is a very large drainage pipe and would not be abandoned.

350351352

353

354

349

Shashok moved that the Board approve and sign the Section 4(f) Letter of Concurrence for the Main Street and Merchants Row Bridge Project, dated June 27, 2017 and replaces and retracts the letter approved on May 23, 2017. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

355356357

Gish said the next phase of the project will begin on July 20th, immediately after the Lions Club auction on the 19th.

358359360

7. Director of Planning & Zoning Jennifer Murray

361 362

7.a. Application to Vermont Sales Tax Reallocation Program

Murray said this is a "fun" opportunity that comes up each year for construction projects that happen in the Designated Downtown. She said this application isn't a grant, but a competitive program against other downtown construction projects. Murray explained that the project chosen has all the all the excess sales tax over \$200,000 paid on construction materials for the project reallocated back to the town to construct a municipal project that benefits both the town and the developer. Murray said that this application is for the Food Co-op project currently under construction, and it could generate around \$55,000. She said she had met with the Food Co-op Director Glenn Lower, as well as the architect for the project, Ashar Nelson from VIA, and they had come up with several ideas, such as improving the existing crosswalk with some type of treatment, maybe some benches and landscaping in the Town right-of-way on the Shaw's side of the street, and a covered structure of some type, for bikes in events, in the area outside the Co-op that currently has picnic tables and seating. Murray thought there was around \$2 million in state funds available for the program, but it is divided up between this program and the tax credit program for downtowns.

Seeley asked about the structure on the Co-op land if this is supposed to be town infrastructure. Murray said it's not necessarily infrastructure, and it can be on municipal-owned or private land. Shashok was concerned about the staff time and if this project would fit into that, and Murray assured her she could take this project on. Asermily thought it was exciting, and a covered bike area could be used as a model and it would enhance the whole widely used area.

Asermily moved to authorize the submission of a Town of Middlebury/Middlebury Natural Foods Co-Op joint application to the Vermont Sales Tax Reallocation Program. Seeley seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

Shashok moved to approve the Selectboard letter of support for the application. Seeley seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

7.b. Proposal for Creating a Conservation Commission

Murray said that she had worked with Conservation Commissions while working in Williston and Jericho, and since she'd been here she had missed having that group to do things like natural resource inventories and to do the work gathering the data the Planning Commission needs to do work on their regulations. She said the Planning Commission had just finished work on the Town Plan update, and that while updating them, they had identified opportunities to create regulations to protect natural resources, but you can't protect them if you don't know where they are. She said there are inventories and mapping work that needs to be done, and she'd like to know where the wildlife crossings are and to plan where trails could go. Murray said there are 3-5 years of backlogged work she'd like to get this group working on. She said this would be a working group, and she'd like it to remain small with 5 members, who would come in and work on specific tasks, and there is money in the Planning Budget to get started

and to pay for a consultant to do some mapping of rural pools and wetlands to get the Town Plan maps up-to-date. Murray said over the last year-and-a-half she's been doing some recruiting, and has 5 people who were interested in being on this commission. State Statute says the members need to be town residents, and several of the ones interested are professors at the College who are also residents, so she thought it was interesting to bring in different perspectives.

Seeley was concerned about the number of committees the Town has already and the volunteer hours. Asermily thought if there was already interest by people wanting to serve, why not have another committee? Murray said she is an environmental scientist and that's what she did before planning, but she doesn't have the time to do all this work, so it would be nice to have this group to help get this work done twice as fast. Nuovo said he was in favor of this commission, but maybe in a year or so look at reorganizing some of these committees. Murray said there are four committees defined by State Statute, and that's the Planning Commission, the Development Review Board, Design Advisory Committee and the Conservation Commission, and Statute specifies what they are and what work they do, and they have to stay within those rules.

Shashok moved to approve the creation of a Middlebury Conservation Commission and authorize staff to begin advertising for interested candidates. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

8. Vermont Bike & Pedestrian Grant Program.

8.a. Application for a Small-Scale Grant for the MALT RR Crossing near the Boathouse Bridge

Town Manager Ramsay said this item was a follow up to the Board's June 13th discussion regarding funding options for installing safety gates at the MALT railroad crossing to the west of the Boat House Bridge. She said this is a proposal to submit a Bike-Ped program application for a State Funded Small-Scale Construction Project grant, which will fund up to 50% of eligible construction costs for a project, with the applicant providing the remaining 50%. The total estimated cost for installation of the gates is \$38,000, which would create a roughly \$19,000 local match commitment that would be potentially shared by the Town, Middlebury College, MALT and VAST.

Asermily moved to authorize the submission of a 2017 Bicycle-Pedestrian Program small scale grant application to seek funding for the installation of safety gates at the MALT railroad crossing. Shashok seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

450 As

Asermily also moved to commit the Town to a share of the required 50% local match, amount to be determined upon further discussion with Middlebury College, MALT and VAST. Shashok seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent.

MOTION PASSED.

Seeley noted that 50% of the \$38,000 needed for the project is \$19,000 and if divided 4-ways, each portion would be \$4,750.

8.b. Application for Extension of the Sidewalk on the east side of Court Street from Creek Road to Middle Road

Ramsay said the representatives from the State Local Motion Program came to town last week and looked at various pedestrian crossings and ways to make them safer and had brought this project forward for consideration. She said she realized the Board had been working hard to get funding for the Exchange Street Sidewalk Project, but we had not been successful the last 3 rounds, so it may be that the State wants to see some kind of progress on the project before the Town submits for additional funds. She said we are making progress with that and construction is on Phase I is set to begin next year.

Ramsay said Shashok had been concerned this section of sidewalk had not come before the Infrastructure Committee, but Town Planner Murray will bring it to the Committee on the July 6th; however, they need to keep in mind the deadline for grant submission is July 14th.

Murray said that Local Motion had been providing technical assistance to the Town, providing free engineering work over the summer. She said Middlebury was added to the schedule at the last minute, and they were in town on June 21st and 22nd to look at various dangerous intersections. Creek Road had recently risen to the top of the list for dangerous intersections she said, and when looking at the area it was thought that if there was a sidewalk that connected the Court Street sidewalk with the sidewalk at Middle Road, it would redirect the bike/pedestrian traffic to cross at the safer Middle Road intersection. She pointed out that it wasn't just pedestrians, but school children heading to the Middle School, and because of all the housing, schools and activities in that area, she felt this would make this a strong grant application.

Shashok said she thinks it's a great project, but she's concerned that it has to fit into the master list of projects for budgeting, so we know we have the money for it if the grant is approved. She said she's still having guilt over orphaning the Exchange Street project from the Capital Improvements Budget, so she wants to be sure she doesn't have to do that to any more projects.

 Seeley said she has been waiting for a list of sidewalk priorities from Public Works, and she doesn't want to take on any more, however this one was identified as needed in the Town Plan, so she's not sure where she'd place it on the priority list. She said if money was no object, she'd have no problem with this, but the Capital Improvement budget already is trying to catch up with sidewalk maintenance by adding \$5,000 each year and we still aren't able to catch up, so where is this \$20,000 matching amount coming from.

Shashok said in order to do this project, something on the priority list would have to move down and that's hard to do. Seeley and Shashok both wished that the

Infrastructure Committee had been notified as soon as this grant was known of and to work with them to see where this money would come from.

There was additional discussion over the timeline of the project and the potential to phase in the Town's funding portion over several years. Shashok said she was okay applying for it, since the Town didn't have to accept it, and as long as these grants come to the Infrastructure Committee first in the future.

Shashok moved to authorize the submission of a 2017 Bicycle-Pedestrian Program grant application to seek funding for a project to design and construct 900-ft. of sidewalk on Court Street between Creek Road and Middle Road and commit the Town to the required 20% local match on total cost. The motion was seconded by Seeley. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

Shashok further moved to approve the Selectboard letter of support for the project. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

9. Infrastructure Committee Meeting of June 22, 2017

9.a. Creek Road Erosion Stability Study Report

Shashok reported on the June 22nd Infrastructure Committee when they reviewed the Creek Road Erosion Stability Study Report. She said in the spring of 2015, the Board closed Creek Road due to significant road erosion along the banks of Otter Creek. Gates were installed to allow access for farmers, and the Board asked the Committee to look at what to do to reopen the road without relying on the traditional expensive repairs done in the past. The Town hired Pathways Consulting and they put together the Creek Road Erosion Stability Study to look at the nature of flooding and bank erosion along the Otter Creek, explore strategies for stabilizing the banks, investigate lower cost alternatives for reopening the road and provide alternative designs with cost estimates.

Shashok said they looked at the top 3 options, since #4 was implementing the minimum of maintenance as we've been doing. She said the #1 option was to shift the road 8,320 feet to the east within or near the existing right-of-way, and restore the 25' riparian buffer between Creek Road and Otter Creek. This was the option that was sustainable in the future and would solve the problems in a different way and restore the buffer to prevent the need to keep fixing the road with the rocks.

Shashok said the Committee met with members of the community and there is a lot of interest in reopening the road, while everyone was conscious of the cost. She said unfortunately, there appears to be no inexpensive way to fix this road and keep it open. She said in the end, after much debate, their recommendation is to fix the section of Creek Road that needs to be fixed to open it as soon as possible and as soon as we can afford it, by the method outlined in the Study, so we can evaluate how this method holds up while we are in the process of exploring phasing the work over the course of

possibly many years. Shashok said we do want to reopen the road and she thought it would be interesting to take on one phase to see if it would work.

Seeley said it was really clear from public comments that they want the road back open. Carpenter asked how many people were present at the meeting, and Seeley and Shashok were unsure of the exact number, but there were 2 property owners and maybe 10 people. Shashok said she'd given this road a lot of thought over the last 2 years and has been torn about what to do, since it's a lot of money for a road that doesn't have many residents on it, but it's also a road that's close to town that is used and enjoyed by bikers and runners and she's afraid if it's closed we would lose that. She said initially she had thought they should just keep it as a bike/pedestrian route to East Middlebury, but she doesn't feel she can bring forward that recommendation. She does feel they should spend the money to keep it open for the residents, farmers, fishermen and residents who want to use it as a connection.

There was discussion around the possibility of downgrading the road classification, rights-of-way and the fact the new State Municipal Roads General Permit Program will require us to fix any hydrologically connected roads where there is erosion; however, grant money will be available to help fix these areas.

Seeley said even though this road doesn't have a lot of residents, it does have a lot of agricultural property the farmers need to get to. She felt if we could repair North Branch Road, that doesn't have a lot of residents and is used mostly by people from Ripton, we shouldn't treat this road any differently. She said it's a Town road and it's the Town's responsibility to repair and maintain it and get it open. Carpenter felt the Town had tried in the past and what if we spend \$1.2 million now only to have to do the same thing in 10 years as the river shifts, and do we really need that as a two-lane road. He said it's functioning very well as a farm road the way it is now. Seeley said she disagrees with the engineers, and she would like the Selectboard to take a site visit and see where she believes the Town has made "good money repairs" and where we haven't, and see the difference. She would like to repair a portion of the road to see how the method as designed holds up, before moving ahead with the entire \$1.2 million repair.

Ramsay read the motion approved by the Infrastructure Committee that said "to recommend to the Selectboard to fix the section of Creek Road that needs to be fixed to open it as soon as possible, and as soon as we can afford it, by the method outlined in the Study so we can evaluate how this method holds up while we are in the process of phasing, and exploring grant funding to do the remainder of work recommended in Design #1." Fiske seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously. She said the Infrastructure Committee is now looking for the Board to charge them with exploring grant funding.

Asermily moved to look at what the cost to reopen the road would be by making a relatively small repair, while exploring the option of phasing the project and what grant opportunities were available to help with cost. Shashok seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

Shashok commented that the Board will need to look at where this project fits in to the list of priorities agreed to at the Board retreat, and will things on that list need to be shifted around.

9.b. Engineering Proposal on Pump Stations #3 & #9 Force Main

Dan Werner said this was a quote from Aldrich and Elliot, who is also doing a lot of the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) work for the Town. He said Pump Station #3 and Pump Station #9, both on Weybridge Street, pump towards each other to a T right around Jayne Court, where it then goes to a Sag Pipe that goes under Otter Creek to the main pump station on the east side of Creek. He said this proposal is to look at the hydraulics these two pump stations have to see if we can make them function more efficiently, because in heavy rain events they are both pumping at the same time and can't get through the Sag Pipe, so Pump Station #9 overflows. This work is to design a better functioning junction of those two force mains.

Shashok moved to award the contract to Aldrich & Elliott for engineering services to design improvements for the Pump Station #3 and Pump Station #9 force mains, for a lump sum cost of \$9,800. Asermily seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

9.c. Municipal Roads Grants-In-Aid Pilot Project Funding

Werner said the first step in the process of this Grants-In-Aid Pilot Project Funding is for the Town to sign a Letter of Intent saying we want to participate in the Program. Werner explained that anytime there is a road around a storm sewer structure, drainage basin, or creek, or other similar area, the Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) has identified these as areas the Town will need to inventory and come up with a best-management practice to deal with that situation. Werner said the DEC has identified 35 to 45 miles of hydrologically connected roads in Middlebury, and they have a \$12,500 grant through the Addison County Regional Planning Commission for us to come up with some solutions. The Town would need to contribute \$2,500, which could be in-kind or simply by the highway crew regarding ditches or installing stone check dams. He said this is a way for the Town to get initiated into this Program, which we'll see more of in the next year to 18 months.

Asermily moved to approve the Town of Middlebury's participation in the Municipal Roads Grants-in-Aid Pilot Project and to sign the Letter of Intent. The motion was seconded by Seeley. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

10. Vermont Gas Systems Request for Easement for Distribution Lines – Mill Street & Bakery Lane – Follow-up on Discussion of June 13, 2017

Tom Murray and Karen Kotecki from Vermont Gas joined the Board. Murray said that Vermont Gas had 400 customers in Middlebury that they were working with to provide service, and they had efficiency team in town doing energy audits for customers.

At the June 13, 2017 meeting, the Board had asked Kopecki about compensation to the Town for the easements Vermont Gas was seeking on Town property. Murray said that in the past there has been no compensation paid to communities, since the company is offering a service to the residents. He said it's general practice that utilities not be charged, because communities want these services (such as broadband) expanded to their residents, and the see Vermont Gas as one of those added services that people want. Murray also wondered if there was a precedent set that the other utilities paid compensation to be located on Town property. He said Vermont Gas will be paying a little over \$200,000 a year in property taxes beginning next year, so they will be contributing a significant amount to the community and they are happy to do so as a business entity in the community.

Asermily asked Ramsay if the Town had received compensation from the other utilities on the property, and Ramsay said we had not. Asermily said she is personally opposed to natural gas in general, but is trying to look at it as we stand currently in the project. She said she was also the one who had asked about the calculation of property taxes. Murray said it's taxed on the infrastructure, which by the time the distribution network is complete will be approximately \$8 million dollars, and this amount will depreciate over time to a set level where it remains. Asermily said she is still struggling with this, even though there is a precedent for no compensation from utilities, because of the damage to the climate. Asermily went on to describe her thoughts and philosophy on natural gas and her many concerns. Murray understood her concerns, and went on to state Vermont Gas's safety record and commitment to serve a quality product, and they feel they are the cleanest fossil fuel.

Asermily asked about the recent news that a portion of the pipeline in New Haven had not been installed at the proper depth. Murray said that was in a wetlands area and it was installed below the federally required 3' depth, but not as low as the VELCO-requested 4' depth due to the wetness of the soil. He said they filed a Non-Substantial Change and it has been signed off on by all permitting parties.

Shashok said she had her questions answered and especially now that Vermont Gas would remove the line. Carpenter clarified Vermont Gas had agreed to relocating the line to another easement area, at their expense, if the Town needed the land for another use. Kopecki said this is not typical, but Vermont Gas agreed to it in lieu of compensation to the Town. Ross Conrad asked if the line was abandoned by Vermont Gas, would the easement be relinquished back to the Town, and Kopecki responded it would be relinquished.

Shashok moved to authorize Town Manager Kathleen Ramsay to work with counsel to finalize Vermont Gas easement deeds for Bakery Lane and Mill Street, based on the

Board's input. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 1 abstention (Asermily), 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

Shashok further moved to authorize Town Manager Kathleen Ramsay to work with counsel to prepare a Notice for Conveyance of Real Estate in accordance with 24 V.S.A. § 1061, for publication only upon the satisfactory resolution of any concerns noted by the Selectboard in its discussion. The motion was seconded by Nuovo. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 1 abstention (Asermily), 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED**

11. Code of Ethics for Administration of Federal Emergency Management Agency/Department of Public Safety Grants

Ramsay explained that this is required as part of the grant agreement for the East Middlebury Flood Resiliency Project grant.

Shashok moved to sign the Code of Ethics for Administration of FEMA and Vermont Department of Public Safety Grants. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

12. Approve Loan Documents for Vehicle & Equipment Purchase Authorized at Town Meeting

Ramsay said Town Treasurer Jackie Sullivan is seeking Board approval to borrow funds for the purchase of vehicles and equipment approved by the voters at Town Meeting in 2015 and 2016, and Sullivan worked with the National Bank of Middlebury to prepare these documents

1) Seeley moved that the Board authorize the Town of Middlebury to borrow \$23,780 from National Bank of Middlebury to fund the purchase of a 2017 Dodge Charger Cruiser, as approved by the voters at Town Meeting on February 29, 2016. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

2) Seeley moved that the Board authorize the Town of Middlebury to borrow \$15,000 from National Bank of Middlebury to fund the purchase of a 2016 Dodge Charger Cruiser, as approved by the voters at Town Meeting on March 2, 2015. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

3) Seeley moved that the Board authorize the Town of Middlebury to borrow \$14,080 from National Bank of Middlebury to fund the purchase of a 2016 Ford C-Max Hybrid, as approved by the voters at Town Meeting on February 29, 2016. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

4) Seeley moved that the Board authorize the Town of Middlebury to borrow

\$30.612 from National Bank of Middlebury to fund the purchase of a 2017 Dodge Pickup 1500, as approved by the voters at Town Meeting on February 29, 2016. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. MOTION PASSED.

5) Seeley moved that the Board authorize the Town of Middlebury to borrow 731 \$6,650 from National Bank of Middlebury to fund the purchase of a 2017 BWise Trailer, 732 733

727

728

729 730

734 735

736

737

738

739 740

741 742 743

744

745

746

747 748

749

750

751 752

753 754

755

756

757 758

759

760

761

762

763

764 765

766

772

as approved by the voters at Town Meeting on February 29, 2016. Nuovo seconded the

motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. MOTION PASSED.

6) Seeley moved that the Board authorize the Town of Middlebury to borrow \$17,160 from National Bank of Middlebury to fund the purchase of a 2016 Graco Line Painter, as approved by the voters at Town Meeting on February 29, 2016. Nuovo seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. MOTION PASSED.

13. Extension of Agri-Mark Agreement

Ramsay said the Sewer Usage Agreement with Agri-Mark expires June 30, 2017, and as discussed at an earlier meeting in Executive Session, we are working on negotiations with Agri-Mark to have a new agreement in place by October 1, 2017. This request is to authorize Ramsay to sign an amendment to extend the Agreement to October 1st.

Asermily moved to authorize Town Manager Kathleen Ramsay to sign the Seventh Amendment to the Agri-Mark Sewer Usage Agreement. Seeley seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

14. FY17 Year-to-Date Budget Report

Ramsay reported that the budget is on target, and the General Fund is looking good with the Police Department coming in slightly under budget and the Highway Department is on-target with their budget thanks to a manageable winter.

Ramsay said there is a surplus in the Cross Street Bridge Funds as expected, and she has contacted Aaron Guyette, the engineer of the Cross Street Bridge, to work on a maintenance plan for the Bridge. This plan will be submitted to the Infrastructure Committee as the first step in getting public input, and to get an idea of what we can expect going forward for a surplus, and what we might want to do with this surplus. She said this will be coming up in August.

Asermily asked about the Water Revenues, and Ramsay said there is one more billing and there may some adjustments made to past bills that were estimated.

15. Set FY18 Tax Rate

Selectboard Minutes 6-27-17

Ramsay said on March 6, 2017, voters approved the General Fund operating budget of \$10,321,456 for FY18, with \$7,106,034 to be raised by taxes. Additionally, at the polls on March 7th, voters approved several special articles: Article 6, increase Selectboard stipends, \$7,400; Article 7: Police K-9, \$30,610; Article 9: Addison County Restorative Justice Services, \$2,500; and Article 10, Addison County River Watch Collaborative, \$1,200, plus the \$40,000 for Veterans. She said this brings us to a projected tax rate for FY18 of \$.9822, an increase of under \$.005 cents over FY17's tax rate of \$.9780. Ramsay said it had been anticipated the tax rate would go down a fraction of a cent, but with the addition of some of the Articles it went up some.

Khan made the motion to set the municipal tax rate for the 2018 fiscal year at \$.9822 per \$100 of assessed value. Shashok seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

16. Approval of Check Warrants

Asermily said she had reviewed the checks and they were in good order. Asermily moved to approve total expenditures in the amount of \$337,395.15 consisting of \$227,477.68 for accounts payable, and \$109,917.47 for payroll, for the period June 14, 2017 through June 27, 2017. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

17. Town Manager's Report

The Manager had nothing to report.

18. Board Member Concerns

Nuovo said he felt something should be done about the hearing level in the Conference Room. The person in the back of the room at this meeting had problems hearing, and he has problems hearing as well. Ramsay said this has been the complaint of a few people, and today Assistant Town Manager Chris English had met with Kurt Broderson of MCTV regarding the sound. She said there is an issue of a sound system working with the MCTV broadcast mics and possible feedback.

Khan welcomed the Language School students in town. He said he had also heard from a person who had a hard time hearing what Ramsay and others on that side of the table were saying. Ramsay said she had heard this as well, so she had placed the microphone directly in front of her for this meeting.

Asermily found it hard to understand how the MCTV sound equipment wouldn't work with a sound system, and Shashok said there is interference between systems, so it would require a special system that worked together. Nuovo said people should be able to hear everything at these meetings and it doesn't make sense to not hear each other when you're sharing points of view. Asermily said even the people at home were

having a hard time hearing the meeting on MCTV as well, so maybe the Board should sit up and speak into the mics. Carpenter thought it was made worse this evening because of the size of the audience.

Asermily wanted to apologize for the Court Street sidewalk project bypassing the Infrastructure process. Also, she had heard today about a sidewalk repair that was

Carpenter wanted to thank the listening audience for all their patience with the projects going on. He said Jim Gish had worked hard to get out a daily update and he encouraged anyone listening who wasn't on the list-serve and wanted to know what was going on, so sign up for these updates.

19. Executive Session – Anticipated – Legal Matters

Shashok moved that in accordance with Vermont's Open Meeting Law requirements, I move that the Board find that premature general knowledge of the consideration of a legal matter would clearly place the Selectboard at a substantial disadvantage, because the Select Board risks disclosing its litigation strategy if it discusses the legal matter in public. Khan seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

Shashok further moved that the Board enter into Executive Session to discuss a legal matter under the provisions of Title 1, Section 313(a)(1) of the Vermont Statutes. Seeley seconded the motion. The motion carried with 6 in favor, 1 absent. **MOTION PASSED.**

The Board entered Executive Session at 9:10 p.m.

needed in front of the Post Office.

20. Action on Matters Discussed in Executive Session

21. Adjourn

The Board exited Executive Session and adjourned the meeting at 9:17 p.m. with no further action.

The next meeting of the Middlebury Selectboard will be Tuesday, July 11, 2017 in the Town Offices at 77 Main Street.

Respectfully submitted, Beth Dow