

**Joint Meeting of the Waterbury Select Board,  
Village Trustees, and Library Commissioners  
July 1, 2013  
Main Street Fire Station**

Present: J. Grenier, Chair; R. Ellis, C. Nordle, C. Viens, and K. Miller, Select Board; P. H. Flanders, Village President; L. Sayah and N. Howell-Sherman, Trustees; M. Luce and H. Grenier, Library Commissioners; S. Lotspeich, Community Planner; B. Farr, Long Term Economic Recovery Director; W. Shepeluk, Municipal Manager; A. Imhoff, ORCA Media; K. Fountain, Waterbury Record; and C. Lawrence, Town Clerk.

Public: Eva Loomis, Carol Miller, Frank Balco, M. K. Monley, Joyce & Raphael Lowe, Tiny & Gloria Commo, Fauna Hurley, Hershell Murry, Sue Miller, Don Schneider, Harry Shepard, Everett Coffey, Peter Hack, David Luce, Theresa Wood, Gena & John Callan, Felix Callan, Gene & Erik Nelson.

The meeting of the Boards was called to order at 7:00pm.

**PUBLIC**

No public comments.

**HMGP GRANT APPLICATION FOR STANLEY AND WASSON HALLS**

Barb Farr had proposed some potential additional funding through the HMGP fund for potential reconfiguration of the Stanley/Wasson Hall site. FEMA performed a preliminary benefit/cost analysis. B. Farr and staff have been meeting with FEMA representatives during the last few weeks and have been gathering information. She got word this morning that the mitigation projects did not pass the eligibility requirements; therefore there is no opportunity to acquire hazard mitigation funds. She explained the reasoning behind the decision.

B. Farr suggested that BGS may renegotiate with the Town on the property. In thinking about reutilizing the site, the Town could purchase 1½ acres with Wasson Hall, and eliminate the Stanley site. Wasson Hall could be renovated and elevated, and the Town could potentially come in under \$4 million for a bond vote. This is an option to think about if the Town is still interested in the site. The Town could also consider the current site of the Library. The Boards will consider which sites they wish to pursue. In the meantime, Darren Winham has a client very interested in purchasing Wasson Hall.

**CDBG-DR GRANT APPLICATION FOR 28 NORTH MAIN STREET**

B. Farr, E. Loomis, and R. Ellis, attended a hearing where public input was considered. The State is putting together their plan as to how these funds are going to be spent. The funds are designated for specified projects. The Town may submit a letter expressing interest in 1) slums in blight: \$350,000 to purchase two homes next to the fire station for parking; 2) public infrastructure: \$550,000 to look at cost of repairing and renovating the Jane's House; 3) three potential planning grants: alternative site designs for 51 South Main and the 28 North Main (to get ideas as to how buildings would be used if purchased); a grant to support the coordination of LTCR Steering Committee; and a grant of \$20,000 for flood plain studies and public education for flood plain mitigation. The first round of applications will most likely be in October. There is some homeowner money through this program that is primarily for buyouts.

C. Viens suggested another option might be to purchase other property in the Village and asked if some of these funds might be available to help construct housing for displaced people. B. Farr indicated that it is difficult to deal with displacements. B. Farr will look into potential low income housing displacement.

F. Balco stated that this will be a long drawn out process and asked the Boards if they would be discussing any plans for the sale of existing properties before any decisions are made. K. Miller indicated that this question will be addressed later in the meeting when next steps are discussed.

C. Nordle asked if it matters whether the letter of intent for the CDBG-DR grant application is signed by the Village or Town. B. Farr stated that it does not matter, as the grant board is trying to determine what type of funding towns are interested in. W. Shepeluk suggested that there be one letter of intent from each Board, or one letter representing both Boards. C. Nordle moved to authorize the Manager to sign letter of intent for the CDBG-DR grant application with the modification that potential housing displacement funds be considered. The motion was seconded by R. Ellis and passed by those present.

The \$1 million already received is transferrable from one location to another; however there must be a public hearing to explain the change.

N. Howell-Sherman made a like motion on behalf of the Trustees to sign the same letter of intent. The motion was seconded by L. Sayah and passed by those present.

It was clarified that the property under discussion was that of Mike Bell on North Main Street.

#### **LTCR RECOVERY DIRECTOR REPORT**

B. Farr has had bi-weekly calls with BGS and continues to have discussions about Ladd Hall, the property for the Hunger Mountain Childcare Center. Demolition will be starting soon. Discussions are also being held around the timing of the new construction, the Main Street project and the round-about project. There will be a public relations person assigned to work with the community.

J. Callan asked about the life cycle of the Stowe Street Bridge. W. Shepeluk explained the work that has been done on the bridge and that it is high on the State's list to be replaced.

E. Coffey asked who is on the LTCR Steering Committee. R. Ellis explained the guidelines adopted in 2012 that lays out the committee membership, which includes R. Ellis, N. Howell-Sherman, M. Luce with M. Rivera as an alternate, the Executive Director of RW with M. K. Monley as an alternate, M. Callan, and R. Washburn. The committee was set up to operate for 18 months to help with the 22 LTCR projects. They also work closely with CVRPC, CVEDC and CVCAC. They most recently have been focusing on Municipal Civic Building project. They meet on the first and third Mondays and 5:30pm, and the meeting times and minutes are posted on the website.

#### **MUNICIPAL CIVIC BUILDING – NEXT STEPS**

J. Grenier asked to hear from the Board as to what their thoughts are on moving forward. He asked that the members work together and establish a set of guidelines to work under. K. Miller distributed a handout for a proposed process entitled 'Process Proposal for the Waterbury Municipal Resilience Project'. She suggested forming a committee to include one person from each Board and four people from the community. The committee would identify options and costs. The options would be presented to the public for input and one option would be recommended. The Select board would send out RFP's and select 3 for review, which would be presented at a public meeting. One RFP would be chosen and the Select Board would then agree to warn a bond vote.

She feels it is critical for success that the Select Board unanimously agree to warn the bond. There is no timeline on the process. By October 15<sup>th</sup>, certain conditions of the \$1 million grant must be met, and there is a 2 year timeline on the funds.

J. Grenier suggested including more people on the committee, and moving the RFP process to the beginning so that a professional is on board. C. Viens stated that the project should be defined before estimates are given. R. Ellis gave an explanation of how the process worked for the fire station bond vote, and stated it makes sense to go with a Design Build firm. K. Miller clarified that J. Grenier's suggestion is to put out an RFP to hire a design build company to be the professional to work with the committee to price out different options. C. Viens disagreed with the process under discussion, and wants to bring back the competitive nature of the bid process. C. Viens suggested that more faith be placed in the people on the Board and members of the community to provide some of this information.

C. Nordle commented that the Board needs to get to the point where they are not talking over each other. He asked that the Board members give each other respect during the discussion process.

J. Callan suggested that a firm that just does estimating be considered, as they have no vested interest in the project.

C. Miller asked about the competitive nature of the project. C. Viens suggested that the sites under consideration be boiled down, and to tell firms what is needed for square footage. They will then bring some conceptual drawings to the table. He does not want to discuss what the Board is willing to spend in the beginning. M. Luce suggested that the Boards need to consider what criteria are required for the project, and that there is a real difference between building a residential building and a commercial building.

T. Wood has been involved in two major projects of this size or larger and disagreed with the comments from C. Viens. She believes that professionals need to assist with lay people in determining the costs. She explained the process in building TBPS and CBMS. More discussion followed as to whether a professional should be on board to provide estimates during the process in which options are being identified.

P. H. Flanders stated that he is favor of expanding the committee members and getting professional help up front. His concern is that there are two municipalities involved in the project. He will be disappointed if the police are not included in the project, both for reasons of efficiency and that the Manager is the supervisor of the police department.

P. Hack asked if the amount voted on by a bond had to be spent in its entirety, and asked some question about the process for the schools. T. Wood stated that the process was made clear to all firms at the outset. J. Grenier continued to suggest that a design professional be included in the process.

R. Ellis feels that the building committee should be the Tri Board. K. Miller feels it is important to have representation from the community. R. Ellis suggested that community members are welcome to come to any meeting. F. Balco pointed out the difference between attending a meeting and being involved in a question and answer format, and actually participating. C. Miller suggested that the public should have equal footing with the Tri Board.

C. Nordle feels that Tri Board meetings would be participatory as the only topic would be the project. M. K. Monley stated that there is little hope that anything will get done if people cannot work together.

G. Callan stated that it is really important to get the community involved. E. Coffey agreed with C. Viens in terms of not stating a cost up front, and sees a possibility of two different locations.

M. Luce made the point that all Boards members are elected and represent their constituents. T. Wood appreciates the work of the Board but agrees with adding at large members of the public to get broader depth of experience and opinion.

P. Hack stated that he came into the process late, and that if the public does not know what is going on that is their problem. He thinks having community members on the committee is a good idea. He feels the initial price was way off the mark, and someone has to keep watch on the dollars. He also suggested that the community members be chosen without the Board knowing their names.

J. Grenier proposed that the Tri Board decide whether to add community members to lend perspective outside the elected officials, and simultaneously start to go through criteria that will be included in an RFI or RFP. He asked if the criteria should include that all four functions stay together, either under one or two sites. P. H. Flanders stated that efficiencies will be lost if there is more than one site. T. Commo asked to be part of the committee given his past work experience.

Discussion continued with regard to how many members should be included, how to advertise and how to choose. The Board needs to be up front about time commitment and specify that it is a working group. Continued discussion was held with regard to how many community members to include on the committee.

K. Miller made a motion to approve a Municipal Building Committee comprised of the Select Board, Trustees, Library Commissioners, and 6 community members at large with voting rights. The motion was seconded by H. Grenier and passed by those present.

The position will be advertised in the paper on July 11<sup>th</sup>, with responses due back by July 19<sup>th</sup>. The criteria for selection will need to be determined. The Boards will meet on the 22<sup>nd</sup> to review applications and choose 6 members. Names will not be included while reviewing applications.

H. Grenier made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 28<sup>th</sup> Tri Board meeting. The motion was seconded by R. Ellis and passed by those present.

The Trustees and Library Commissioners adjourned at 9:30pm, and the meeting of the Select Board continued.

Respectfully submitted,

Carla Lawrence, Town Clerk

Approved on: July 22, 2013