

**Town of Hinesburg
Selectboard Meeting
Meeting Minutes
July 11, 2011**

Attending the meeting: Jon Trefry, Andrea Morgante, Mike Bissonette, Ken Brown, Joe Colangelo and attached list of residents.

Meeting called to order at 6:45 p.m.

Mike B moved the Board go into executive session including Joe Colangelo for personnel discussion, second by Andrea and approved.

Andrea moved the Board come out of executive session, second by Ken and approved.

Jon moved the Board vote to authorize a cost of living increase of 3.08% to Town staff non union employees as proposed and approved in the budget voted at Town Meeting, March 2011, to be effective retroactive to July 1, 2011. Second by Andrea and approved.

John Kiedaisch submitted a petition to the Board requesting the Board approve reducing the speed limit on Lewis Creek Rd and Turkey Lane from 35 to 30.

Barbara Lyman submitted a petition to the Board titled "A petition to save our limited commercial land for new business".

FEMA Maps

Jon opened the Public Hearing on the Zoning Regulation Revisions Flood Hazard Area Regulations.

Jon summarized the work done on the revisions to date and noted the most recent changes to sections 6 and 10.

He then read the following regarding exceeding the minimum National Flood Insurance Program standards.

There have been questions throughout about how and why the proposed regulations exceed the minimum NFIP standards. From the beginning of the process, the State floodplain management experts have urged municipalities to exceed the minimum NFIP standards because avoidance and prevention are the best and most cost effective ways to minimize flood related disasters, damage, and expense. This is why the Planning Commission initially proposed more stringent regulations to prohibit most new development in the flood hazard area. The current proposal does not go that far, and continues to allow limited development in the hazard area if such development is properly designed and if it is demonstrated that there will be no undue adverse impacts. The minimum NFIP standards require most if not all of the design standards incorporated into the current proposal. The proposed "no undue adverse impacts" provision is not specifically required by the NFIP program, but helps address certain NFIP requirements according to State floodplain management personnel – i.e., it is a valuable and potentially necessary component for NFIP compliance. The primary way that this proposal exceeds the minimum NFIP requirements is the recognition it gives to the Fluvial Erosion Hazard (FEH) areas. FEH areas are not tied to the NFIP program in any way, even though stream

related erosive events constitute the bulk of the flood related damage in Vermont according to the State floodplain management program. Vermont has seen plenty of examples of the damage streams can cause when channel realignments occur during major storm events.

Chuck Reiss asked what had changed from the original proposal from the Planning Commission. Jon explained allowing building in the 100yr flood area if you can prove there is no undue adverse effect to other properties. Jo White said showing no undue adverse effect is key.

Jon closed the Public Hearing.

Ken moved that the Selectboard vote to adopt the Zoning Bylaw revisions related to Hinesburg's flood hazard regulations as outlined in the written proposal prepared for this July 11, 2011 meeting. Second by Andrea and approved.

Additional Funding for Rec Fields Behind Town Hall

Background/Existing Conditions:

The Rec Field in back of Town Hall was completed in fall 2004. It is approximately 175' by 200', not a full sized soccer field, fill material from Town pit was used, and some of it was hauled by Highway crew. Darryl Hayden was the contractor and the project was completed on a shoestring budget for \$12,400.

It is used extensively by the Rec Dept. in the spring and fall for soccer and misc. sports programming and some in the summer for soccer programs. It is big enough for youth sports programs up to U-10. With Lyman Park utilized almost exclusively by HCS for after school sports, this field is essential for youth sports programming, especially in early spring and late fall when it gets dark earlier (don't have to wait until HCS sports are over as at Lyman Park). The field was constructed with less than minimum pitch for drainage; the concept was that water would percolate down through topsoil into granular fill below.

With settlement and not enough pitch, the field drains poorly and 3 major areas flood/hold water after rains. In FY 10-11 \$8,000 was included in budget to add topsoil to these 3 major areas to raise to grade. During budget discussion for FY 11-12, the Rec Commission felt it would be better to include more money to raise the elevation of the field to promote better drainage. As such \$7,000 was included in this year's budget for a total of \$15,000 for work on the field.

During the spring of 2011, Rocky Martin worked with Mike Weisel to develop a plan and specs for field work to include stripping existing topsoil, adding more granular fill from Town pit, topsoil, seed and mulch. The project went out to bid June 10 with bids due June 27. 20 RFP's were sent to all local Hinesburg and select larger contractors. Two bids were received; one from Don Weston Excavating for \$38,708 and one from Gregg Lyman for \$24,200. Mike Weisel's bills for engineering total \$1250; including that the low bid is \$10,450 more than budgeted.

Rocky on behalf of the Recreation Department is requesting approval to utilize up to \$11,000 of fund balance to deficit spend for this project. The Rec dept feels that the low response to RFP relates to the nature of this project. The project is too small to attract the attention of large excavation contractors and smaller contractors might not have all the equipment needed to be able to do the work efficiently. Lyman Excavating has the necessary equipment and we feel is very qualified for the job. They would like to get started on as soon as possible so grass seed can get established this fall.

Andrea suggested investigating possible use of lighting the field so they can be used for more hours in early spring and fall.

Mike B moved the Board vote to authorize use of the additional funds needed up to \$11,000 from the general funds fund balance to complete the project. Second by Ken and approved.

Annual Wastewater Allocation Renewals – Ken moved to approve the allocation renewals as presented in the July 7, 2011 memo from Rocky Martin. Second by Andrea and approved.

Lot 15 Update

John Kiedaisch reviewed the questions the committee is researching.

What is the acquisition process to obtain Lot 15 ownership if an application to the DRB is denied on the basis of, among other criteria, the Official Map? Covered below

What are the potential viable community uses of Lot 15? Covered below

What is the approximate cost to purchase Lot 15? Covered below

What are the approximate costs to plan, develop and maintain these community uses? Not covered yet

What are the potential funding sources to purchase Lot 15, and to plan, develop and maintain these community uses? Covered only generally below

What are the potential public benefits and/or incomes from any of these community uses? Covered below

What might be the effect on individual property taxes and Town revenue to acquire, plan, develop and maintain Lot 15 for any of these community uses? Covered only generally below

The Lot 15 Committee has met six times and as of our latest meeting on June 2nd can make the following comments:

Acquisition Process

The implications of the relationship between the two and a half year purchase option held on Lot 15 and the 120 day period after a DRB rejection of the application for the Town to take action to acquire is a major, if not the major issue. There is essentially no legal case history associated with the authority of an Official Map. From what we have found, neither Bud Allen nor any other Vermont attorney has any experience with this question. Further investigation would require the Town to spend money on legal opinion.

It is apparently possible for a town to use the eminent domain process to override option agreements and proceed with a purchase and there is substantial case history on eminent domain. A critical requirement for effectively using eminent domain is to clearly show the “necessity” of public ownership – e.g. for a road, water or sewer main, town center, police station. The Town will need to prove “necessity.” There remains a question as to whether use as a public park would be considered a necessity. Case law has also confirmed the eminent domain process can be used when working with a “willing seller.” However, the definition of what constitutes the town taking steps to acquire the

property, other than possibly pursuing eminent domain, is undefined in the Official Map legislation or Vermont case law.

John K explained the information on acquisition process is what is known to date, there is no legal case history on the authority of the official map.

Viable Community Uses

A variety of possible public uses for Lot 15 are being explored - a town green with tree planting and integrated "wetland", lawn/play field area, backstop, benches, bandstand, gravel paths, children's play area (e.g. swings, climbing structure, seesaw, slide), path lighting, pond/ice-skating, community greenhouse, multigenerational center, and relocated town library. There may be a possibility of the Town leasing some of Lot 15 for small scale commercial development in combination with some of the public uses listed above. The existing site, because of its wetland, has limitations, which means not all these activities can be included.

A survey of public and private parking options near Lot 15 showed there exist approximately 139 private spaces within Commerce Park, approximately 30 public spaces along one side of Commerce Street that could be developed and 74 private spaces on the south side of Mechanicsville Road (phone company offices and "Blue Mall"). An additional 59 spaces may be developed on Lot 1 on the west side of Route 116 not including the spaces designated for town emergency responders use. Spaces for handicapped parking are included in these numbers. At a minimum, there should be several HC spaces developed within Lot 15 as the closest potential spaces, at the bank and post office, are approximately 300ft from the middle of Lot 15.

Cost to Purchase

The current assessed value of Lot 15 is \$180,000. If that dollar amount is the purchase price, Lot 15 would be valued at \$40,000 per acre. Our informal review of the offering price for 15 commercial properties in towns near Burlington indicates that, at \$180,000, Lot 15 is one of the lowest per acre. Only two 35 acre parcels were lower per acre.

After checking with local commercial appraisers, we conclude that "drive-by" or "windshield" appraisals, particularly for Lot 15 and its rather unique conditions (e.g. some wetland, zoned commercial and designated for public use on the Official Map, long time on the market), could be very misleading. A full appraisal will cost \$3,000 to \$5,000 and may take up to three months to prepare.

(It should be noted that a full appraisal will typically be required if funding from a nonprofit, state or federal government source is sought. The lead-time for such an appraisal may be 60 to 90 days. The long lead time means that if town purchase of Lot 15 were to be considered, contracting for an appraisal should start immediately after any DRB rejection of the Hannaford plan based on the official map)

Costs to Plan, Develop and Maintain

Costs for the planning, development and maintenance will be estimated once the committee has identified potential viable community uses.

Funding Sources to Purchase, Plan, Develop and Maintain

Funding sources are being researched and more definite information will be provided as we continue our work and viable community uses are more completely defined.

Possible sources include Vermont Housing and Conservation Board, Land and Water Conservation Fund, Trust for Public Land, Preservation Trust of Vermont, Vermont Community Foundation, Orton Family Foundation, Vermont Land Trust, the Hinesburg Land Trust, the Hinesburg Land Conservation Fund and a Town budget line item and/or bond vote. The actual funding sources that may be available will to some degree depend on what community uses are ultimately proposed. It is likely that a combination of funding sources (public, private, nonprofit, federal, state and local) can be used. It is also likely that funding can be obtained over time as each stage - purchase, planning, and development - of the overall project is implemented.

(A number of local citizens have indicated a desire to make private donations to purchase Lot 15 if that opportunity arises.)

Effect on Town Revenue and Individual Property Taxes

(The following numbers do not yet include the town revenue and tax implications of the costs for planning, developing and maintaining Lot 15 for public use.)

Assessed value of all properties as of 6/29/10: \$513,618,100 (\$5,136,181 Grand List)

2010-2011 Residential Tax Rate: \$1.8659 (\$0.4384 Town, \$1.4275 Education). 2010-2011 Non-Residential Tax Rate: \$1.8683 (\$0.4384 Town, \$1.4299 Education)

2010-2011 Hinesburg taxes to be raised: \$2,246,483

2010-2011 Lot 15 Commerce St appraisal is \$180,000; Property Tax Bill \$3,362; \$789 Town Portion (0.035% of taxes to be raised)

Commercial development on Lot 15

Assume large commercial development on Lot 15 valued at \$3,000,000; net addition to grand list would be \$2,820,000 (\$3,000,000 minus current appraised value of \$180,000); produces a decrease of \$0.0024 on tax rate. Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.8635 and Non-Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.8659. A \$100,000 residential property would see decrease of \$2.40 per year.

For Lot 15 Commerce St with large commercial development the Tax bill would be \$52,618; \$12,295 to Town and \$40,323 to Education. \$12,295 represents 0.55% of all Town taxes to be raised.

Town purchases Lot 15 without bonding (one year line item)

Assume purchase price \$180,000; subtract \$180,000 from grand list and add \$180,000 to Town taxes to be raised; assume everything else remains same as 2010-11 tax year above. Results in a \$0.0352 tax rate increase. Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.9011 and Non-Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.9035. A \$100,000 residential property would see increase of \$35.20 for one year.

Town purchases Lot 15 with bond for 20 years at 4%

Assume purchase price \$180,000; subtract \$180,000 from grand list and add \$13,089 to Town taxes to be raised; assume everything else remains same as 2010-11 Tax year above. Results in \$0.0027 rate increase. Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.8686 and Non-Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.8710. A \$100,000 residential property would see increase of \$2.70 per year.

Town purchases Lot 15 with 100% Grant/Private funding sources

Assume purchase price \$180,000; subtract \$180,000 from grand list; assume everything else remains same as 2010-11 Tax year above-results in \$0.0002 rate increase. Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.8661 and Non-Residential Tax Rate would become \$1.8685. A \$100,000 residential property would see increase of \$0.20 per year.

NOTE: Based on the 2010-11 Grand List, when Town spends additional \$10,000 (i.e. \$10,000 additional taxes to be raised), a \$100,000 residential property would see tax increase of approx. \$1.95 per year.

Andrea asked when looking at additional costs did the committee consider costs associated with the type of development proposed. John said they were not able to get actual figures, however information from the town of Williston indicated they covered any additional costs through the Williston town additional .01 cent sales tax.

Rolf Kielman said the value of how it makes the people feel as a community to have a public space in the Village area is important.

Mike Bissonette asked about the tax rate. He feels we need to look at the total rate, town and school. Also noted was to integrate lot 1 proposed uses into any proposed uses for lot 15.

Ken Brown asked the committee to create a time line project plan relating to the 120 day period. John Rose said regarding a comparison to other towns on the impact on services, towns have seen a 5 year lag time before they have seen any effect.

Lease Financing: Fire Apparatus & Mower

Joe investigated the possibility of combining the fire apparatus and the mower into one (1) lease financing purchase. The argument being that in the municipal lease financing world transactions greater than \$100,000 allow for better interest; thus, by combining the two (2) pieces of equipment Hinesburg would have a combined total equipment cost of \$113,600, rather than \$82,000 for the fire apparatus alone.

The difference when comparing the two (2) quotes Hinesburg received from Tax Exempt Lease Corp. is that the 5-yr lease for the fire apparatus only was quoted at 4.19% and the 5-yr lease for both pieces of equipment was quoted at 3.59% .

Joe sent out an RFQ to seven (7) municipal lease financing firms and received back four (4) quotes. The results are summarized below.

Municipal Lease Credit Corporation	4.885%
California First National Bank	2.980%

Tax Exempt Leasing Corp.	3.580%
Municipal Leasing Consultants	3.270%

While California First National Bank was the low bid he recommends the Board approve the municipal lease financing deal with Municipal Leasing Consultants (MLC) out of Grand Isle, VT. The 29 basis point difference represents roughly a \$250 per year savings in the annual repayment if Hinesburg went with CalFirst, a nominal amount. Joe has experience working with MLC when he worked in Barre Town and he believes there is a benefit working with a (more) local firm.

If the Board does in fact approve this transaction, the FY2012 will start the year with a \$32,480 savings because the payments on the mower would not start until the next fiscal year. Joe recommended, therefore, the following items could be completed with some of the 'extra' funds.

Phone System - \$6000
 Webpage Upgrade - \$3000
 Employee LIFO Assessment - \$3000

These items represent \$12,000 total. That still leaves a \$20,000 surplus for future FY use for unforeseen projects/needs that may arise.

Remember, however, that there will be a five (5) year commitment from the Highway Department to pay for this lease. Of the \$24,996 annual payments, the Fire Department would be responsible for \$17,997 (72%) and the Highway Department \$6,998 (18%).

Mike B moved the Board vote to approve signing a municipal lease financing agreement with Municipal Lease Consulting out of Grand Isle, VT, for the F350 Fire Apparatus and the 50" Heavy Duty Mower at a total cost of \$113,600 to be financed over five (5) years at a rate of 3.27%, per quote received July 1, 2011. Second by Ken and approve.

Ken moved the Board vote to approve the funding for the new phone system, webpage upgrade and LIFO assessment with an amount not to exceed \$15,000 using the savings in the FY2012 budget realized by financing the 50" Heavy Duty Mower for the Highway Department opposed to paying cash as originally budgeted. Second by Andrea who added she appreciates these proposed improvements and supports funding them thanks to the new method of financing items which allows for savings that can be used for funding. Motion voted and approved.

Consider New Part-time Position: Special Projects Coordinator

Joe discussed with the Board the need for some additional 'man' (in this case woman!) hours needed to assist the Town Administrator and Buildings & Grounds Director with managing special projects and some administrative tasks. Currently we have an employee who manages the Town's e-911 database and overweight truck permits, and this employee has the capability to help in more ways. Joe would like to expand her hours from approximately 5 per week to an amount closer to 20. Ken noted that Hank Lambert also had the comment that he spent a lot of time on administrative duties that could be done by someone at a lower pay rate. The Board would assess the value at budget time. Andrea asked there to be an evaluation process created to identify what Joe and Rocky were able to accomplish without having the additional administrative tasks.

Joe stated with the additional hours she would be able to take some of the administrative burden off him and allow him to use his time engaged in activities that will have a greater return on investment, such as working on obtaining grants and working more closely with the many committees (locally, regionally, and statewide).

Of course, this position was not budgeted for in the FY2012 budget passed at Town Meeting. Joe found the necessary funding needed to support this position without placing any burden on fund balance or eliminating a program or purchase in this years' budget.

The funds to support the hours would come from the following places. 1) the 5 hours per week this employee already puts in would be transferred to the new position; 2) it is reasonable to assume that we will have an open highway position for at least one (1) month after our temporary summer employee leaves for College; 3) we are not paying the wages for our other highway worker who is out on workers compensation. That employee will be out at least five (5) months and maybe longer; therefore, there is a savings in that wage line.

The total savings more than pays for the Special Project Coordinator position.

	Cost	Hours	Weeks	Total (Cost)/Savings
Special Projects Coordinator	\$ 18	20	44	\$ (15,840)
Current Hours	\$ 18	5	44	\$ 3,960
Highway Maintainer Temp Summer	\$ 15	40	4	\$ 2,400
Highway Maintainer Fulltime	\$ 20	40	20	\$ 16,000
Total Net				\$ 6,520

The Special Projects Coordinator will work no more than 24 hours in any week; some weeks the SPC may work more like 5 and others closer to 20. Budget season, one would suspect, for example, the SPC would work more. Also, the SPC could work 8 hours in one day and zero hours other days – in other words it's flexible depending on workload. Much of the work may be done from a remote location as well.

Jon pointed out the need to keep the position at under 24 hours so no benefits are included.

Andrea asked if this is to become a permanent position should it be advertised. Jon said the position is expanding the hours of a current employee so it is not necessary.

Mike B moved the Board vote to approve funding for a Special Projects Coordinator for FY2012 for a total cost up to \$15,840 with this being an exempt position with the individual working no more than 24 hrs in any week. Second by Andrea and approved.

Education Benefit for Employees – Personnel Policy

Currently, the Town's Personnel Policy allows for a reimbursement of 100% at amount not to exceed to \$500 for an employee who obtains a C or better. Joe recommends the Selectboard update this policy immediately to encourage/give an incentive to any full-time employee who would like to (or is recommended by their department head to) gain new skills or work towards a degree. The \$500 amount was set in 2008; costs have gone up since then.

Joe recommends the following policy: The Town will reimburse 100% of the amount equal to six (6) credit hours at the in-state rate for the Community College of Vermont (CCV). For this upcoming semester that rate is \$241/credit hour = $\$241 \times 6 = \$1,446$. The employee could go to any institution – the University of Vermont, for example – and be eligible for reimbursement at an amount not to exceed the six (6) credit hour at CCV level.

This would be a non-budgeted item. Joe said this benefit has not been used much in the past and he doesn't see it being used by too many employees in the future; however, this is a benefit that SHOULD be used more and one that would be nice to have for employees in conjunction with their annual evaluations so they can get the training needed to help overcome any issues that come up during the annual evaluation process. Joe estimates that at most the Town would have a \$3,000 per year liability for this – that is just a guess.

Ken moved the Board vote amend section 4.6 of the Hinesburg Town Personnel Policy to increase the reimbursable amount to six (6) credit hours per semester at the in-state rate for the Community College of Vermont, and that pre-approval must be given by the Town Administrator. Second by Mike B and approved.

Set Tax Rate FY2012

The Board reviewed the tax rate summary draft prepared by the Town Administrator. Hinesburg sees a slight decrease in the education portion of the tax rate and close to a 5¢ increase in the municipal portion of the tax rate.

Andrea moved the Board vote to set the FY2012 Hinesburg Property Tax Rate at \$1.9090 for the Residential Rate and \$1.9213 for the Non-Residential Rate. Second by Ken and approved.

Town Charter / Administrator / Manager

Joe reported he has heard some questions around town regarding the Town's policy with non-residents serving on Town boards/commissions/committees, such as the DRB, Planning Commission

and Trails Committee. The Town does not have a Charter that governs Town government and specifically deals with these issues. He strongly encourages the Selectboard to pursue adopting a Town Charter – possibly at Town Meeting. Joe will be meeting with Jim Barlow, Staff Attorney for VLCT, this Thursday to discuss this issue and will have more to report at the July 25 meeting. Diantha Francis said she contacted Joe with her concern of individuals who are not Town residents of Hinesburg serving on committees and commissions. She felt they could serve in an advisory position but should not have voting privileges. The Board advised some of the non-residents were residents when appointed and have since moved.

Joe said in conjunction with looking into a Town Charter, the Selectboard should take on the discussion of the Town Administrator v. Town Manager position. He recommends the Selectboard move towards a Town Manager position. This will help the Selectboard stay away from some of the nitty-gritty management and focus attention on the large policy issues that affect the Town. The scope of knowledge needed and for modern-day local government management is more burdensome than what a volunteer Board is capable of handling, and, quite frankly, is not the proper function of a governing board. Governing boards should govern; not manage. You need to separate the political from the apolitical aspects of government.

The average Hinesburg resident will NOT notice a difference if the Town switches from an Administrator to a Manager. The Selectboard and staff will notice a difference because the Manager will truly be more of a CEO. Richmond recently passed a Resolution that officially gives their Administrator the authority of a Manager as a trial before going to vote at Town Meeting. Joe believes this is a very good idea and one the Selectboard should look into.

Ken talked about the Town Manager issue being discussed last year and he would support a citizen’s petition for a warning at Town Meeting to vote to change to a Town Manager form of government. Ken mentioned the presentation last year comparing the two forms of government and Mike B asked if the Board could have the presentation again.

End of the Year Budget Report

Board members received a copy of the full budget report for review.

There are still transfers and payments being made in the FY2011 budget and it will not be ‘finalized’ for a month or so and then the audit will begin in September. Therefore, this is an estimate only at this point, but a good estimate of how things will end-up.

	Budget	Actual	Difference Favorable / (unfavorable)
General Fund Revenues	\$ 2,664,538	\$ 2,755,016	\$ 90,478

General Fund Expenditures	\$ 2,664,538	\$ 2,735,729	\$ (71,191)
Total Balance			\$ 19,287

	Budget	Actual	Difference Favorable / (unfavorable)
WW/W Fund Revenues	\$ 547,127	\$ 552,359	\$ 5,232
WW/W Expenditures	\$ 547,127	\$ 534,888	\$ (12,239)
Total Balance			\$ (7,007)

Joe said there are some aspects he might recommend changing, mostly in the way capital items are budgeted. He sees no red flags or any real problem areas with the budget, but has some ways to make the budget work more effectively.

We will have a more through budget review at a later meeting when the books are more cleaned up from FY2011.

Town Administrators Report

Highway Department Request for Funding; Mike Anthony is requesting funding to purchase a roller for the back of the grader at a cost of \$6,000 using \$4,000 from the old culvert scrap metal income and taking \$2,000 from the gravel budget.

Ken moved the Board vote to authorize the purchase of a roller not to exceed \$6,000 using funds of \$4,000 from old culvert scrap metal and \$2,000 from the gravel budget. Second by Mike B and approved.

Smoke & Cure Grant – Since the last meeting Hinesburg was awarded a \$550,000 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to loan to VT Smoke & Cure. Alex and Joe will meet with Chris Baily, CEO VTSC, and Lisa Ryan with Vermont Economic and Community Development on July 14 to discuss next steps.

Employee BBQ – We are going to have a little lunch time BBQ on July 21; Selectboard members who are in town should feel free to join.

Police Cruiser Bid Opening – two bids were received; Justin Genova for \$2,750 and Ron Yonkers for \$2,150.

Andrea moved the Board vote to award the bid to Justin Genova for his bid of \$2,750. Second by Mike B and approved.

Jon asked Joe for an update on the problem Alan Caswell reported to the Board. Joe said Alan brought in documentation that the neighbors have agreed to post “no trespassing” signs on the property. If someone is trespassing the police will respond when called.

Mike B proposed Friday, Oct 21 for a date to hold a Selectboard retreat from 9:00 a.m. to approx 2:00 p.m.

Andrea moved the Board vote to approve the minutes of June 20 as amended, second by Jon and approved.

Mike B moved the Board vote to approve the warrants, including payroll warrants for bills payable as submitted by the Town Treasurer. Second by Andrea and approved.

Next Meeting Preview – Route 116 Signal Timing; Food Hub Presentation; VT Gas Extension Presentation; Saputo Intrim Zoning.

Mike B moved the Board vote to adjourn, second by Ken and approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Valerie Spadaccini, secretary