

**CHARLOTTE SELECTBOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
TOWN HALL
SEPTEMBER 14, 2015**

APPROVED

Draft minutes are subject to correction by the Charlotte Selectboard. Changes, if any, will be recorded in the minutes of the next meeting of the Board.

SELECTBOARD MEMBERS: Lane Morrison, Chair; Fritz Tegatz, Carrie Spear, Matthew Krasnow, Jacob Spell.

OTHERS: Christina Booher, Mary Mead, Moe Harvey, Charles Russell, Jenny Cole, Vince Crockenberg, Robert Mack, Patrice Machavern, Gerald Bouchard, Lynn Jaunich, Janet Morrison, Michael Yantachka, Hugh Lewis Jr, David Marshall, Joe Stone, Jeremy Cota, Keith Morrill, and others.

ITEMS TAKEN UP:

- 6:30 PM Review of Monthly financial Reports – discussion only.
- 7:05 PM First Public Hearing on a Legislative Charter for changing the municipal budget approval process. *Actions under consideration: 1) approve date of vote on Legislative Charter; 2) warn a 2nd hearing.*
- 7:35 PM Joseph McCarren and Laura Pacheco-request for a License Agreement to place utilities under Spear Street. *Action under consideration: approve*
- 7:40 PM Fund Balance Policy. *Action under consideration: approve*
- 7:55 PM Accounting, auditing and Financial reporting Policy. *Action under consideration: approve*
- 8:05 PM Policy on Misuse of Public Trust and Fraud. *Action under consideration: approve*
- 8:15 PM Policy on Signing of Non-payroll Warrants. *Action under consideration: authorize Chair to sign warrants on weeks when Selectboard doesn't meet*
- 8:20 PM West Charlotte Village Wastewater Committee. *Action under consideration: 1. Re-form the West Charlotte Wastewater Committee for the purpose of A. Developing recommendations for prioritizing the use of limited disposal capacity; B. Determining the preferred method of financing construction of the system, C. Determining user rates, and D. Developing draft sewer allocation and sewer use ordinances. 2. Make the following appointments to the committee for two year terms: David Marshall, Dana Hanley, and possibly others, with Fritz Tegatz to be the Selectboard's liaison.*
- 8:30 PM Municipal Planning Grant application for wastewater planning in the West Charlotte Village. *Action under consideration: authorize application, including match of \$4,000.*
- 8:40 PM Burns Property – delineation of boundary with Wildflower Farm. *Action under consideration: approve hiring Stuart Morrow to retrace survey for less than \$1,000; approve marking with metal posts at additional cost of \$500.*

- 8:50 PM Legislation regarding taxation of utilities under Lake Champlain. *Action under consideration: authorize Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission to work on legislative bill at no cost to the town.*

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Morrison, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

REVIEW OF MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORTS – discussion only

Ms. Mead reviewed a General Fund Balance Sheet, as of 09/09/2015, that included a check book balance, Special funds and liabilities. The Balance Sheet shows all the Special funds and balances in those accounts, such as Fire and Rescue, and Recreation. All funds in the asset line item, page 2, were ‘due to, or due from’ for every account, which was totaled in the General fund on page 1. The Selectboard should look at the Highway funds, Highway Capital Reserve fund, Trails Reserve fund, Improvement and Repair fund and Bridge line items, said Ms. Mead.

Ms. Mead handed out copies of a Bridge fund report for Selectboard review.

Ms. Mead suggested that the Selectboard might want to go over the Trial Balance Report at the next Selectboard meeting. The report would include adjusting entries, said Ms. Mead.

Mr. Morrison asked if there were any changes to the financial reports following Ms. Mead’s meeting with Sullivan and Powers, Auditors. Ms. Mead replied no. The reports were complete, said Ms. Mead.

Ms. Mead said that the Budget Status report additions included the Educational Tax and surplus, and Tax Revenues and surplus.

Mr. Morrison asked if there were any ‘cautions’ that Ms. Mead wanted to highlight. Ms. Mead replied that the line item 100-283, transfer in revenues, had been updated and the numbers will stay at zero, the bridge reconstruction line item will be at zero. These were off-setting entries, said Ms. Mead.

Ms. Mead said that she would place updated reports in the Selectboard boxes for review once a week and a Trial Balance for year-end 2014-2015.

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

FIRST PUBLIC HEARING ON A LEGISLATIVE CHARTER FOR CHANGING THE MUNICIPAL BUDGET APPROVAL PROCESS. Actions under consideration:
1) approve date of vote on Legislative Charter; 2) warn a 2nd hearing.

Mr. Morrison briefly reviewed the process leading up to appointing an Ad hoc committee to research and draft a Legislative Town Charter, and introduced Vince Crockenberg, committee member.

Mr. Crockenberg summarized events leading up to the Charter proposal starting at the 2014 March Town Meeting, and potential legal challenges. The process included holding two public hearings, and a Town wide Australian ballot to adopt the proposed charter in the Fall of 2015. If approved then the charter would go before the state Legislature in January 2016 for approval in time for implementation at the 2016 March Town Meeting. The committee's sense at the 2015 Town Meeting was that the voters supported the Charter concept and timeline. If the Legislature was unable to approve a Charter in 2016, then it would go for approval in 2017, said Mr. Crockenberg.

Mr. Morrison noted that the Town Attorney drafted the Charter language with proper formatting. The Charter would allow the Town to consider adopting a Town budget in a two-step process: #1- a 'put and take' discussion at the March Town Meeting with a Town advisory vote, and #2 - adoption of the Town budget by Australian ballot within 20-30 days following the March Town Meeting. The intent was to engage more people in the process/vote, explained Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Morrison reiterated that this was the First Public Hearing to gather input and comments on the draft Charter. A Second Public Hearing would be warned for mid-October. A November Special Town Meeting would be set to adopt the draft Charter by Australian ballot, and then it would be sent to the Legislature for consideration in the January session, explained Mr. Morrison.

In response to questions, Mr. Morrison explained that the intent was to have a Town 'give and take' discussion on a proposed Town budget at the 2016 March Town Meeting. The voters would have a floor vote that was advisory to the Selectboard. A floor vote was not binding. The Selectboard would retain the right to change the budget numbers if necessary. Within 20-30 days after the March Town Meeting an Australian ballot to adopt the budget would be held and that was binding, clarified Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Russell said that he thought that a floor voted number would be binding on the Selectboard.

Mr. Harvey pointed out that the greatest number of people voting were voting on the school budget by Australian ballot at Town Meeting. Was there the possibility of holding a pre-Town Meeting budget discussion like the school does, asked Mr. Harvey. Mr. Morrison replied that the School Board set the school budget 30 days in advance of the Town Meeting vote, which was by Australian ballot. If the Town adopted the same process then there would be no more Town Meeting. The Charter change was to keep Town Meeting as a viable process. A Town budget would be presented and the voters had a chance to engage in dialog regarding the budget. The Town Meeting floor vote would be advisory. Yes, the voters would be voting twice, but it keeps the integrity of Town Meeting, said Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Harvey asked if there was a history of voter numbers at special elections. Mr. Russell explained that originally the committee talked about holding Town Meeting a different times, or in February. Most people worked, or there were school vacations. In terms of numbers, the school budget had 1,143 ballots cast at the March Town Meeting and 935 for the April re-vote last year. People would turn out if they were excited about something, said Mr. Russell.

Ms. Jaunich said that the committee had talked about moving to a pre-Town meeting so everyone could participate. That meant that the Selectboard would have to finalize a Town budget in December 2015 in order to warn a Town Meeting in January 2016 meeting in time to warn for the Town Meeting vote, said Ms. Jaunich.

Mr. Harvey asked if the intent was that any changes to the proposed Charter would go before the Town. Was the charter strictly for the Town budget, asked Mr. Harvey. Mr. Morrison stated that the intent was to preserve Town Meeting, and have more people vote at Town Meeting on a Town budget. An Australian ballot vote would be held within 20-30 days following Town Meeting to adopt the Town budget only, said Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Spell said that there were more avenues to try to reach out for working people to tune in, such as V-Cam, live streaming, or radio broadcasts by V-Cam. It seems that would allow Charlotte residents to watch and be informed on topics. Town Meeting is an asset. If there was a meeting two weeks before Town Meeting, like the school does, then it could gut Town Meeting, said Mr. Spell.

Mr. Spell said that he was not convinced a Legislative Charter was needed yet, and asked committee members to expand on the issues. Mr. Crockenberg replied that the issue was related to timing and implementing a voting procedure. There were questions on this. The committee was asked explain the process at this meeting, said Mr. Crockenberg.

Mr. Spell questioned the time line to warn hearings and voting. Did state statutes outline the number of days for warning meeting, asked Mr. Spell.

Mr. Spell asked if the Town had a legislative charter now, could it be changed to a town manager style government right now. Mr. Russell replied yes, and explained that the committee learned through this process that you could have a charter to hold a Town Meeting floor vote, and then hold a special meeting to adopt a budget via Australian ballot. Someone could come in and submit a petition to vote the Town budget by Australian ballot, which would do away with Town Meeting, or create a Town Manager style government. The committee worked in cooperation with the Selectboard on this process for voting the Town budget, said Mr. Russell.

Mr. Morrison said that state statute's allowed amendments to a town charter. Ms. Booher clarified that amendments to a town charter has to be voted on by Australian ballot by town voters. Ms. Graham said that charter changes would still go through the legislative process. Charters can't be changed on a whim, said Ms. Graham.

Ms. Mead said that when setting a time line, the Selectboard should look at the date of the Australian ballot vote and work backwards for timing. She was concerned that the notice for this hearing didn't say that the Town would vote in November, December, or at the March Town Meeting. The Selectboard needs to make sure the notice language was correct procedurally so that the Legislature can't say – oops, it was not warned properly and we can't act on it. The City of Burlington does charter changes all the time. Their notices of hearings were for 'this date, this time there is a First Hearing meeting on a charter amendment, and on this date and this time there will be a Second Hearing on a charter amendment and an Australian ballot vote on this date'. Has the Selectboard, in fact, fulfilled the notice of hearings requirement, asked Ms. Mead. Mr. Morrison said that the Selectboard was prepared tonight to vote a date and time for a Second Hearing within 30 days, and no less than 40 days for an Australian ballot. A notice to warn the First Hearing was posted, said Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Yantachka read Title 17, Chapter 55, Section 1645, #6, that outlined the procedure for notice of hearings. Ms. Machavern said that state statute 2642 says you need to warn an actual date and time of an election, and place of an Australian ballot vote.

Ms. Mead said that the Town should double check the procedure to give the Town's people notice that they will be voting on 'something' on a 'date'. Mr. Russell replied that you can't say you are voting on a 'date'. There could be language changes to the Charter at the first hearing, and changes at the second hearing, said Ms. Russell.

Mr. Krasnow said that he understood that the voters at the 2015 March Town Meeting voted 2:1 in favor of an advisory motion to have the Selectboard pursue a change in adopting a Town budget. So, 124 people voted to draft a charter document in lieu of someone else presenting a petition. The Town wants a charter to change the nature of direct democracy at Town Meeting. He did like this document, but as stewards of 253 years of democracy - direct democracy was unique; it is the power of the purse that lies with the people. Times and pressures on people do change. Vermont still has a part-time legislature and keeps that system in place. This document would be a drastic change of direct democracy. It sounds like a similar number of people want to submit a petition to change our governing style. That could do away with Town Meeting. Currently, 9 percent of the tax burden is the municipal budget and is voted on at Town Meeting, and 91 percent of the tax burden is the school budget voted on by an Australian ballot system. A compromise could be considered to the way we vote. There is an opportunity to amend the draft charter at this First Hearing to: create a Sunset Clause that after three years the Town re-votes by Australian ballot to re-affirm that the charter is a better style of government versus the last 253 years; if not, then the Town would revert to a Town Meeting like the last 253 years of direct democracy, suggested Mr. Krasnow.

Mr. Morrison said that if a sunset clause was the consensus of the Selectboard, then we would need to go back to the Town Attorney for an amendment language.

Ms. Jaunich said that there were a lot of people that would question that democracy has worked. The committee's goal was to increase voter participation. How would you define that the current system was 'working for the people'. The idea was to increase the opportunity for every one to vote on increases to the taxes. It wasn't 126 people saying they want this; it was 126 people saying that Town Meeting wasn't working. Let people vote on it versus 5 Selectboard members, said Ms. Jaunich.

Mr. Krasnow asked how to define 'working for the people'. It is not about the value of what's in the document – it is a strong document. After three years a sunset clause would allow the Town a way to re-affirm via an Australian ballot that the charter system was a better style of government. If it doesn't pass in three years then we would revert back to a Town Meeting style of governing as has been done for the last 253 years, said Mr. Krasnow.

Mr. Crockenberg said that you can't say that the 124 people at Town Meeting were representative of the 2,000 people that don't show up. It was just that the people who do attend Town Meeting set up the tax burden for all. The purpose of the charter was to give everyone a chance to vote by Australian ballot. He liked the sunset clause, which gives the opportunity to go back and take a look at the system, said Mr. Crockenberg.

Ms. Machavern said a July 2nd Charlotte News article included a posting of notice for the First Hearing and a Second Hearing for Monday, October 12th. The notice talked about the process, noted Ms. Machavern.

Mr. Spell asked do you think people with the ability to do live streaming of meetings would listen. Ms. Machavern replied that the committee talked about voting on-line for a long time. Streaming only allows you to listen; not vote on-line. Regarding concerns about ill-informed voters, the Annual Report that the Town puts out is a wealth of information. There are a lot of people not at the Town Meeting who read it cover to cover, said Ms. Machavern.

There was discussion regarding the Town Report, and reprinting a budget following Town Meeting.

Mr. Morrison said that the Selectboard needed to take action and could vote on the draft charter in principle, pending an amendment for a Sunset Clause as drafted by the Town Attorney. Or, if there was a new charter then another First Hearing could be held on the amended Charter, suggested Mr. Morrison.

MOTION by Mr. Krasnow, seconded by Mr. Tegatz, to have the Town Attorney draft language for a Sunset Clause and to amend the draft Charter document for consideration as soon as possible.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Yantachka asked if a sunset clause in the Charter would be a change that needed approval by the Legislature, or would it be an amended charter without legislative approval.

Mr. Russell suggested writing into the Charter that every three years the Town would re-vote the charter. The Town would vote on it and the Legislature has to approve it, said Mr. Russell.

Ms. Machavern read State Statute 2645(1), to adopt, or amend a charter.

Mr. Krasnow stated that the sunset clause allows the Town to approve it, or not, every three years. Ms. Machavern said that as a tax payer she could do a petition and present it to the Town if the Town doesn't want a charter system. Does the Town Plan sunset every five years; no, it is re-voted, stated Ms. Machavern.

Mr. Spell asked if the Legislative Charter was approved would it then be signed by the Governor, asked Mr. Spell. Mr. Yantachka replied yes.

Ms. Graham asked suppose the Town Attorney says we can't do this. Town Meeting is sacred. The intent is to get people to vote. If Mr. Krasnow wants a sunset clause and it doesn't work, where does he stand if someone comes in with a petition for an Australian ballot, which would do away with Town Meeting, asked Ms. Graham. Mr. Krasnow replied that if there was no sunset clause in the document he would support it and let the Town decide. He wouldn't want to stop the democratic process, said Mr. Krasnow. Ms. Graham said that she did agree with a sunset clause.

Mr. Krasnow said that the motion said 'as soon as possible'. How quickly could the Town Attorney get back with an amendment, asked Mr. Krasnow.

Ms. Booher read State Statute 2645(a)(4), that no revision could be made within 20 days of a vote.

Mr. Morrison asked if that would that start the clock again. Ms. Jaunich said that changes could be made at the First Hearing, and no changes could be made at the Second Hearing. Mr. Russell suggested finding out if an amended charter would pass muster of the Town Attorney, or not, then hold a Second Hearing on October 12th.

Mr. Krasnow asked if a meeting could be held with a sunset clause as an 'only topic' discussion in the interim to October 12th.

VOTE: 3 ayes, 2 nays (Mr. Morrison, Mr. Spell); motion carried.

Mr. Morrison suggested reviewing the draft sunset clause language at the September 28th Selectboard meeting for an October 12th Second Hearing. Timing was a question, said Mr. Morrison. Mr. Bloch said that hearings have to be warned 30 days in advance.

Ms. Mead read #2, that the Charter has to be lodged, "...the official copy shall be filed as a public record 10 days before the first public hearing..." Mr. Bloch read #4, proposals to amend a Charter - 'the Legislative body...may revise amendments.'

Mr. Morrison suggested the following time line: review the amended Charter at the September 28th Selectboard meeting, hold a Second Hearing, and then set a vote by Australian ballot. Ms. Machavern said that the Selectboard should fast-track this and still hold the October 12th date. The Selectboard could meet in 24 hours if they have the lawyer's opinion, said Ms. Machavern.

Ms. Spear asked how much a November Special Meeting would cost. Ms. Booher replied about \$500 for printing ballots.

JOSEPH MCCARREN AND LAURA PACHECO-REQUEST FOR A LICENSE AGREEMENT TO PLACE UTILITIES UNDER SPEAR STREET. *Action under consideration: approve*

MOTION by Mr. Spell, seconded by Ms. Spear, to approve a request by Joseph McCarren and Laura Pacheco for a License Agreement to place utilities under Spear Street.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Bloch explained that the property owner on the east side of Spear Street wanted cable service. That would require putting a cable under Spear Street. The parties met with the Charlotte Road Commissioner last week. It is a tight location and close to the pavement edge. There was a hill on the east side and a sign on the west side, said Mr. Bloch.

Mr. Cota said that to bore under the road they would have to expose the line and the excavation would be close to the road. Mr. Bloch stated that the Town would require a waiver holding the Town harmless if the line was cut or hit.

Ms. Spear asked what if other people wanted cable; would this set a precedent. Mr. Lewis said that then those people would need to approach the Selectboard for approval.

Mr. Cota said that Comcast would bear the cost to repair the road.
VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

FUND BALANCE POLICY. *Action under consideration: approve*

MOTION by Ms. Spear, seconded by Mr. Spell, to approve the Fund Balance Policy as presented.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Morrison asked if this draft was the one with set aside percentages. Mr. Bloch clarified that it gave a range of percentages.

There was discussion regarding inconsistencies in the policy, such as ranges of 5-15 percent or 8-15 percent in the policy. Mr. Krasnow spoke in support of a 5-15 percent range on a two month schedule.

Mr. Russell said that more than 5 percent was a lot of money to take from the taxpayers. It would be \$450,000 to keep 'just in case'. He was in favor of short term borrowing. Tax money was already coming in. June 1st the Town could borrow money. A concern was that in August the Selectboard gets to decide to keep tax money – how would you know that \$450,000 was needed. A policy locked it in. As a tax payer he didn't want to give more than owed, said Mr. Russell.

The following changes were proposed:

- Line 11, change the word "long" to "short" term borrowing;
- Line 16, replace "Town budget" with "...total budgeted General Fund expenses...";
- Lines 22 and 23, change to read "...8-15 percent on a 1-2 month...";
- Line 31, change to read "...5-15 percent...".

VOTE as amended: 5 ayes; motion carried.

ACCOUNTING, AUDITING AND FINANCIAL REPORTING POLICY. *Action under consideration: approve*

The Selectboard reviewed a proposed Accounting, Auditing and Financial Reporting Policy.

SUGGESTED CHANGES:

- Line 12, leave as is.
- Line 29, under state statute add "... and any other report".

Mr. Krasnow said he would like to review state statutes more.

MOTION by Mr. Spell, seconded by Mr. Krasnow, to approve the proposed Accounting, Auditing and Financial Report Policy as amended:

- Line 12, leave as is.
- Line 29, under state statute add "... and any other report".

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Russell said that Section 4 regarding reporting, line 16, add "...that monthly reports would be cash based for Selectboard review". Ms. Booher pointed out that the Town reported on a cash basis currently, and accrual basis at the end of year. Ms. Mead should review any changes before approval, said Ms. Booher.

Mr. Spell and Mr. Krasnow withdrew the motion.

Mr. Morrison asked staff to add approval of the Accounting, Auditing and Financial Reporting Policy to the September 28th Selectboard meeting agenda.

Further Edits:

- Line 5, insert a space between the words “its” and “own”;
- Line 61, strike the word “and”.

POLICY ON MISUSE OF PUBLIC TRUST AND FRAUD. *Action under consideration: approve*

Action on the proposed Policy on Misuse of Public Trust and Fraud was deferred. The Town Attorney’s opinion would be requested regarding clarification of Lines 36, 39 and 40.

POLICY ON SIGNING OF NON-PAYROLL WARRANTS. *Action under consideration: authorize Chair to sign warrants on weeks when Selectboard doesn’t meet*

It was the consensus of the Selectboard that Selectboard members would appear at the Town Hall every Tuesday of every week to review and sign non-payroll warrants.

(NOTE: the Selectboard Chair called a break from 8:55-9:03 p.m.)

WEST CHARLOTTE VILLAGE WASTEWATER COMMITTEE. *Action under consideration: 1. Re-form the West Charlotte Wastewater Committee for the purpose of A. Developing recommendations for prioritizing the use of limited disposal capacity; B. Determining the preferred method of financing construction of the system, C. Determining user rates, and D. Developing draft sewer allocation and sewer use ordinances. 2. Make the following appointments to the committee for two year terms: David Marshall, Dana Hanley, and possibly others, with Fritz Tegatz to be the Selectboard’s liaison.*

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Mr. Krasnow, to re-form the West Charlotte Wastewater Committee for the purpose of developing recommendations for prioritizing the use of limited disposal capacity, determining the preferred method of financing construction of the system, determining user rates, and developing draft sewer allocation and sewer use ordinances; and to appoint to the committee for two year terms: David Marshall, Dana Hanley, Jacob Spell, Fritz Tegatz, and possibly others, with Fritz Tegatz as the Selectboard’s liaison.

VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

Mr. Morrison noted that the Selectboard would appoint other interested people to the committee.

MUNICIPAL PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION FOR WASTEWATER PLANNING IN THE WEST CHARLOTTE VILLAGE. *Action under consideration: authorize application, including match of \$4,000.*

Mr. Marshall said that at this point the committee would work on general planning items and the Municipal Planning grant would guide the scope of planning.

Mr. Spell asked if the Selectboard should draft an article for a Town vote.

Mr. Krasnow said that there would be enough information for drafting an article by January.

Mr. Mack said that the Selectboard was spending money on another study before voting on an article. What was the project, asked Mr. Mack. Mr. Spell suggested the following article language: "Shall the Town make available money for a gray water or wastewater system."

Mr. Mack expressed a concern that the Selectboard would give away a Town asset that a certain few people would use paid for by everyone. Mr. Tegatz explained that the project would be funded via the asset/service.

Mr. Mack said the Selectboard should have a vote and if it was positive, then do the study. Mr. Bloch clarified that it would come before the Town voters.

Mr. Morrison reviewed that the grant would update a study already done. The approval was for a grant application, and if successful, the work scope would go out to bid.

Mr. Marshall said that the committee would gather general information and input, and a dollar number to present to voters. The Town Plan says that the asset should be shared. It would go to a town wide vote, reiterated Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Spell reviewed e-mail correspondence with Kevin Camera. Was the \$4,000 matching grant needed to proceed, and should the Town Attorney, or an expert, assist in drafting a Wastewater Ordinance to save on money, asked Mr. Spell. Mr. Marshall explained that sewer use and a sewer ordinance starts with a boiler plate document as part of the process. What would be good for Charlotte was then built into the ordinance, said Mr. Marshall.

Mr. Spell asked if the \$3,000-4,000 was to write an ordinance. Mr. Krasnow replied that the \$4,000 was a Town match for a total of \$8,000.

Mr. Bloch reviewed that the Town had submitted a similar grant application last year, which was not awarded. The Town didn't have a Village Designation. The Town was seeking a Village Designation and the granting agency encouraged the Town to re-apply, said Mr. Bloch.

Mr. Spell stated that the Selectboard just went against the Purchasing Policy regarding the Co-housing path repair, citing it was an 'emergency'. He had been approached by Town citizens and contractors that the process did not follow Town policy, said Mr. Spell.

Mr. Marshall said that the committee will be doing some of the work, which would pare down some of the costs. This wasn't a final determination that 'a particular' firm would be used, said Mr. Marshall.

SUGGESTED CHANGES:

Paragraph 2, 4th line down: change to read “greater capacity”.

MOTION by Mr. Spell, seconded by Mr. Tegatz, to approve a Municipal Planning Grant application, and authorize a match of up to \$4,000.

VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

BURNS PROPERTY – DELINEATION OF BOUNDARY WITH WILDFLOWER FARM. *Action under consideration: approve hiring Stuart Morrow to retrace survey for less than \$1,000; approve marking with metal posts at additional cost of \$500.*

Mr. Bloch briefly reviewed a boundary between the Town owned Burns property and adjoining Charlotte Wildflower property on Exhibit A Map. The Charlotte Wildflower property owner on the north has unintentionally mowed over the boundary line up to an existing farm fence put up by the former Burns property owner. The Town could hire Stuart Morrow to resurvey the north and west boundaries and stake the lines with metal stakes for a cost of \$1,000 for labor and \$500 for metal stakes, said Mr. Bloch.

Mr. Spell asked if the neighbor should survey the boundary line since the Wildflower property is up for sale.

Mr. Marshall asked if there was a disagreement on the property lines.

Ms. Booher asked if the deeds were read. Property lines should be delineated in the deeds, said Ms. Booher. Mr. Bloch said that the tax maps were based on previous surveys. The surveyor had certainly reviewed the deeds, stated Mr. Bloch.

Mr. Morrison suggested having a more thorough investigation of the deeds.

Mr. Marshall and Mr. Tegatz were asked to search for any existing stakes between the Charlotte Wildflower Farm and the Burns property, and to investigate deed language related to boundary lines.

Mr. Morrison asked staff to add a Charlotte Wildflower Farm/Burns Property deed report to the September 28th Selectboard meeting.

LEGISLATION REGARDING TAXATION OF UTILITIES UNDER LAKE CHAMPLAIN. *Action under consideration: authorize Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission to work on legislative bill at no cost to the town.*

Mr. Bloch reported that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) has offered to investigate a legislative change to address the taxation of underwater utilities under Lake Champlain. A question was if the Town was in favor of authorizing the CCRPC to pursue an investigation, said Mr. Bloch.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to authorize the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission to work on a legislative bill at no cost to the Town of Charlotte regarding taxation of utilities under Lake Champlain.

VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

MINUTES: August

MOTION by Mr. Spell, seconded by Mr. Tegatz, to approve the Charlotte Selectboard minutes of August 20, 2015 as written.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 abstention (Mr. Krasnow); motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Mr. Spell, to approve the Charlotte Selectboard minutes of August 21, 2015 as written.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 abstention (Mr. Krasnow); motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Krasnow, seconded by Mr. Spell, to approve the Charlotte Selectboard minutes of August 24, 2015 as written.

VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Spell, seconded by Mr. Tegatz, to approve the Charlotte Selectboard minutes of August 25, 2015 as written.

VOTE: 3 ayes, 2 abstentions (Mr. Spell, Mr. Tegatz); motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to approve the Charlotte Selectboard minutes of August 27, 2015 as written.

VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

SELECTBOARD UPDATES

Schedule of Selectboard meetings: September 28, October 1st and 19th, November 16th and 23rd, December 14th and 28th.

Mr. Bloch asked the Selectboard to consider a date for a Volunteers Appreciation party at the next meeting. Mr. Morrison reported that a request for a party date was sent to the Old Lantern. The Charlotte Volunteer Fire and Rescue personnel should be invited as well, said Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Spell asked staff to re-order the proposed September 28th agenda.

Mr. Spell asked if the Co-housing Trail repair project had been started.

Mr. Tegatz reported that the Carpenter Road Bridge project was on schedule.

Mr. Spell thanked V-Cam for recording the Selectboard meeting.

APPROVE WARRANTS TO PAY BILLS

The Selectboard signed warrants to pay bills.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Mr. Krasnow, to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: 5 ayes; motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted, Kathlyn L. Furr, Recording Secretary.