1 Town of Middlebury 2 **Creek Road Task Force** 3 **Rotary Conference Room** 4 January 3, 2020 5 6 Members Present: Heather Seeley, Peter DeGraff, Dean Rheaume, Dean George and Luther Tenny 7 arrived shortly after the meeting began. 8 Call to Order 9 Heather Seeley called the meeting to order at 8:00 am. 10 Approval of the Agenda 11 George moved to approve the agenda and Rheaume seconded the motion. The agenda was approved as 12 presented with 3 in favor and 1 absent (Tenny). 13 Approval of the Minutes 14 The approval of minutes was postponed. 15 <u>Citizen Comments</u> – None 16 17 Final Review of Alternative 8.1 18 19 They reviewed the edits Seeley made to Tenny's Alternative 8.1. Seeley said Tenny had indicated to her 20 that he had not intended to soften the language around when to close the road as much as Seeley had 21 softened it. She said she doesn't know if part of the recommendation should be what the Task Force 22 feels is a maximum amount of money that should be invested at this time, which is difficult when we 23 could spend \$500,000 this year and another big storm like Irene could wash it all away. George said it 24 was hard to put a number on something we're just guessing that needs to be done. He said he was 25 under the impression at the end of the last meeting that it would be the recommendation to spend a 26 "modest" amount on what needed to be done to keep the road open and they need to define what the 27 minimum standard is to keep the road open. 28 29 There was discussion on the level of work to be done on the road, and was the one-way traffic in certain 30 areas of the road meant to be a short-term thing until something could be planned and constructed, or 31 was it intended to be the final fix. Tenny said the intent of his Alternative 8.1 was that this is a 32 reasonable stop-gap measure, maybe 2 to 5 years, to try and secure easements and for landowners to 33 construct their own access to their properties, or the Town can purchase land so they can offset the 34 road in certain areas. Seeley said she doesn't see this proposal as a long-term answer and said we need 35 to be clear that with this alternative there is still work to be done to identify what the long-term plan is. 36 She said their charge was to determine what the long-range plan is, but the result is we need to have 37 stakeholder meetings and there are a lot of questions that need to be answered, so these short-term 38 fixes allow us the time to do the work that needs to be done. Tenny said they need to come together

and agree that at some point we will lose a portion of the road and we need to make a plan for that, knowing we can't continue to make these huge multi-million dollar investments to keep this road open.

Seeley asked them if they should go to the Board and say they need more time to complete the work necessary for a long-term solution and the Task Force wants to continue to do the work, or do they want to go to the Board and say here's a short-term solution, this is what needs to be done, and this is who we think should do the work. Tenny said it's the Town's responsibility to pursue easement agreements and property negotiations with landowners, because he doesn't want to be part of some committee doing that and speaking on behalf of the Town. He said he thinks they should spell out the tasks the Town needs to do. Seeley didn't feel it was fair to go to the Board and say this is what the Town needs to do, because "we" are the Town, so it would be more helpful if we say that Town staff needs to take this on or do we say we recommend hiring someone to do the work. She said she thinks the recommendations need to be specific.

George said what the Task Force seems to be in disagreement on is what the ultimate goal is. DeGraff said he agrees there are a lot of unanswered questions, but we have to have a goal.

The Task Force spent considerable time working on the wording of Alternative 8.1, its description, pros and cons, outstanding questions and steps forward. Some topics discussed included:

- Access for property owners
- Property acquisitions
- Available funds for repairs
- Timeline of repairs
- Extent of repairs needed to reopen the road
 - Who defines what "safe" conditions are
 - Reclassification of portions of the road in the event there is future damage to the road

Upon completion of the edits, George made the motion to approve Alternative 8.1 as the recommendation to the Selectboard. Tenny seconded the motion.

Rheaume said he wanted to see the edits before voting. Seeley had been making the edits on her laptop, so went to print the final version.

Seeley said she was fine with what the Alternative was saying, but felt there was some reworking of the language needed. DeGraff suggested voting on it as it was, and he would work on the rewording.

Seeley called the vote and Alternative 8.1 was approved 4-0.

Seeley said she wished they'd talked more about who would be doing the additional work needed.

George said if the Board approved the recommendation, he would be willing to continue to work on the

next steps. Tenny said he was interested in doing the walk-through and the work scope going forward,

but gets uneasy doing any negotiating with landowners. Rheaume agreed that he didn't want to be involved in negotiating considering he might be on the other side of the negotiating table. DeGraff said they need to consider that if a committee does this work it has to be done in public meetings, and you don't want to be negotiating in a public meeting. He said negotiations have to be done by someone with the authority to do so.

Seeley suggested taking it to the Board and deciding after that whether or not to reconvene a meeting. It was decided DeGraff would make the presentations to the Infrastructure Committee on January 9th and the Selectboard on January 14th.

90 George moved to adjourn and Rheaume seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

- 92 Respectfully submitted,
- 93 Beth Dow