

**CHARLOTTE SELECTBOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
TOWN HALL
JANUARY 22, 2018
(Transcribed from audio recording)**

APPROVED

SELECTBOARD MEMBERS: Matthew Krasnow, Acting Chair; Carrie Spear, Fritz Tegatz, Frank W Tenney, Lane Morrison (via teleconference approximately 8:16 p.m.- 8:38 p.m.)

ADMINISTRATION: Dean Bloch, Town Administrator.

OTHERS: Christina Booher, Hans Ohanion, Susan Ohanion, Jim Donovan, Michael Russell, Liam Murphy, Ed Cafferty, Charles Pughe, Peter Joslin, Marty Illick, Jeff Martin, Peter Schubart, Linda Sampter, and others.

AGENDA ITEMS:

- 6:30 PM Town Plan—2nd public hearing on proposed amendment
- 6:55 PM Placement of Town Plan on 2018 Town Meeting warning for vote by Australian ballot
- 7:15 PM FY19 Budget
- 7:25 PM Town Meeting Warning
- 7:30 PM Town Report
- 7:45 PM Certificate of Highway Mileage
- 8:00 PM Patterson Fuels—preventive maintenance contract
- 8:10 PM Liquor License renewal (to be approved as Liquor Control Board) □ Roland's Place, Incorporated—request for renewal of First Class Restaurant/Bar License to sell malt and vinous beverages □ Whit's End, LLC d/b/a Old Brick Store—request for renewal of Second Class License to sell malt and vinous beverages
- 8:15 PM Land Maintenance and Brush-hogging Contracts

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Krasnow, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m.

TOWN PLAN—2ND PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Mr. Bloch reviewed the process to adopt a draft Town Plan as per 24 VSA Section 4305, and noted that a Planning Commission letter with comments complies with Section 4302.

Public and Town committee comments were received as follows:

- Robin Pierce submitted four comments regarding a scenic view designation for Greenbush Road north to Lake Road
- Rebecca Foster, Energy Committee member
- Letter from Bill Stuono, dated 01/22/2018, regarding a process related to changes made after the first public hearing
- Hans Ohanion regarding the Energy Section.

Mr. Tegatz stated that he supported the draft Town Plan as it exists. He has been involved in rewriting the draft starting when he was on the Conservation Commission. In four years they have not been able to address everyone's concerns. Everyone has had plenty of time to make comments. This is a compromise document, and he would not live long enough if they waited until everyone is satisfied, said Mr. Tegatz.

Mr. Krasnow opened the floor for comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ms. Spear said that she agreed with Fritz. She has followed all the rewrites over the years and understands most of the Town Plan. Since serving on the Selectboard the policy has been to hold two public hearings and then whatever the topic is it is voted on and adopted, or not, as per the Charter. She wants it to say "at least two hearings" and possibly a third hearing to balance things out. Rewriting the Town Plan is a lot of work. She briefly read William Stuono's comments, and it is another way of thinking, said Ms. Spear.

Mr. Joslin, Planning Commission Chair, said that he has served on the Planning Commission for 13 years. The Planning Commission has worked on a rewrite of the Town Plan for the last 5-6 years, and had many work sessions with the public invited to participate. A lot of input has been received. The Selectboard has submitted input. The public will have a month to dissect and read the draft Town Plan before an Australian ballot vote at Town Meeting. At this point the Planning Commission is recommending that the Selectboard approve the draft Town Plan as is and let the public decide. A lot of comments have been made, Town committees have worked hard on sections, and the Planning Commission/Town Planner created a spreadsheet to record all those inputs which have been made available to the Town. Best efforts were done to get everything out to the public including news articles, public hearings, and more, said Mr. Joslin.

Hans Ohanion, resident, reviewed his work experience and education regarding the global energy planning industry and climate change since 1970. He has reviewed the energy section of the draft Town Plan and has found at least a dozen significant errors in the Energy Section, page 4. The plan requires more detail. He understands that the Chittenden County Regional Planning Commission is working on a final Energy Plan, which will not be ready for the March Town Meeting. For example, page 150, Item 4, says that by the year 2025 the town should have 25 percent of renewal energy. There is no state statute to support this statement. It is merely a recommendation plan. Strike the word "statutory" from the energy section. Title 10, §588, only mentions the year 2025. The 2035 and 2050 years are not mentioned in the Article. The section should be reviewed by a copy editor. He has a list of errors that he could send by mail. By not correcting the energy section it could make the document invalid, suggested Mr. Ohanion.

Mr. Joslin explained the intent to work on corrections/amendments over the next year. When the ACT 174 energy plan is complete it will be incorporated into the Town Plan. The Town Plan is a living document; he is sure there are errors in the Town Plan. An

“Oops” list was created for the previous Town Plan 7-8 years ago and the Planning Commission worked on corrections, said Mr. Joslin.

Ms. Illick, Planning Commission member, said is a complicated topic. ACT 174 is a new statute in state law. The Energy Section was written recognizing that a ‘plan’ couldn’t go in the Town Plan as per state statute. You could say it is a ‘next step’ to put in an amendment to the Town Plan to include ACT 174 and energy language. Item #4, Charlotte Tomorrow, is in keeping with 2016 statutory goals. It doesn’t say we are obligated to do it; we are just saying we are doing an energy plan, and not putting in rules at the state level, or regulations on the Town level. We don’t need to change the language, but we can improve on it. The intent is that we are aspiring to meet targets with voluntary measures. ‘Statutory’ means it is part of ACT 174, and what was put in doesn’t have anything to do with regulatory affairs, said Ms. Illick.

Jim Donovan, Charlotte’s CCRPC representative, explained that ‘statutory’ means we have to do this. It is the first steps to following a statutory law of the state, said Mr. Donovan.

Mr. Tegatz said if the Town Plan is not passed at Town Meeting we will not have a Town Plan to reference in support of the regulations or zoning bylaws. Someone could challenge the regulations or zoning bylaws if there is no Town Plan. He agrees that there are things needing amendments. You have to balance having no Town Plan versus possible challenges to the town regulations/zoning, pointed out Mr. Tegatz.

Ms. Spear said, that the Town Planner told her a week ago that the Energy Section would need to be amended.

Mr. Tenney explained that the Town Plan language can’t over ride state statute. State statute language takes over. Regarding zoning bylaws, there could be a question if there is no Town Plan to reference. The Zoning Board of Adjustment looks at the zoning bylaws and to the Town Plan in Deliberative Session in the decision making process. We need a Town Plan approved for Town boards to make a proper decision, said Mr. Tenney.

Mr. Tegatz said that he does not agree with points raised in William Stuono’s letter. At the last Selectboard meeting the Selectboard verbally proposed changes and two Selectboard members voiced changes at Planning Commission meetings, which were noted by the Planning Commission. He takes exception to Mr. Stuono’s claim that the changes were made by the Planning Commission and not by the Selectboard, said Mr. Tegatz.

Jeff Martin, resident, asked if comments can still be accepted at this second public hearing tonight. Mr. Krasnow explained that this is the second public hearing and changes could have been accepted up to 15 days before the final public hearing, which is tonight. If the Selectboard makes any more changes that would preclude voting at the Town Meeting, stated Mr. Krasnow.

Linda Sampter, resident, asked if changes could be made at a third final hearing 15 days before the Town Meeting. Mr. Tenney replied that it is not just 15 days. If changes were accepted tonight, then the Planning Commission has to go through the process of incorporating them, or not, and warn another hearing 15 days for a Selectboard meeting.

Peter Schubart, representing a group of 30 Town residents, said that he understood that the Town Plan has been worked on for years. The group has changes and comments to present - it is possible to warn another public hearing without missing a Town Meeting vote, asked Mr. Schubart. Mr. Bloch suggested voicing the comments and letting the Selectboard decide.

Mr. Schubart read a written list of changes and comments related to Chapter 1, Section 1.6, Agriculture and Forestry, page 1-17, to add a sentence to the end of the Introductory paragraph to 'balance property owner rights to reasonably use their land in keeping with health, safety and welfare'; maintenance and enhancement related to 'the integrity and continued viability of natural features, agricultural soils, steep slopes, flood hazard areas, etc,' and promote a sense of community through 'agricultural economic, environmental and small business enterprises'; and to 'promote access to approved use of open land and resources.' Changes are similar to the current economic development introduction, Chapter 1, page 18, Forestry and Agricultural section to add '...to the extent agriculture use or practices shall meet agriculture uses or practice protection of ground and surface resources that ground water flow, pesticide uses migrate off site, and agriculture use and practices shall be compatible with the scale and nature of surrounding land use' similar to what was adopted in the Shelburne 2016 Comprehensive Plan; and in Chapter 1, page 20, Item 10, strike '...and recognizes the successful application lies with a complaint driven approach.'

Mr. Tegatz asked what was wrong with a complaint driven approach. Mr. Martin replied that the town doesn't have a role until there's a harm and a complaint is generated. The town should be pro-active versus re-active, said Mr. Martin. Mr. Tegatz said that the Town Plan is not recommending enforcement. It is cost prohibitive, said Mr. Tegatz. Mr. Joslin said that it is correct the Town doesn't have a role in agriculture. It is a state role, said Mr. Joslin. Mr. Martin stated that is not relevant. The plan is saying that Charlotte has a partnership with the state's implementation of the RAP's. A second part in the current Town Plan recently added a section that an application can be challenged only on a complaint driven approach. This is the part where it sets the Town up as an enforcer. It should say that Charlotte is just a partner, stated Mr. Martin.

Mr. Martin said that the concept that the Town will only react after a complaint doesn't sit well with the group. Ms. Illick explained the RAP's law as written describes how the Department of Agriculture operates today. It is a pathway for residents, anyone, to come in and fill out a complaint. The intent of ACT 64 is not that all regulations are enforced based on that sentence, said Ms. Illick.

Mr. Martin said he is not sure at what point where making changes means missing Town Meeting Day. Mr. Tegatz explained that the Town Plan has to be approved for a Town

vote by January 29th to get on the Town Meeting Warning; 15 days from January 29th was last week, stated Mr. Tegatz.

Ms. Sampter asked if a Town Meeting Warning could be written with the Town Plan vote by Australian ballot while a 15 day clock runs for a final hearing. Mr. Murphy explained that to have a vote at Town Meeting Day, it is a warned item that has to be available for write-in votes ahead of time. The ballot itself has to be finished by January 29th. The ballot warning must say that it is for “this” specific Town Plan, which has to be approved by a final ‘date’. The warning can’t be changed at a later date than January 29th, said Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Murphy asked if the current Town Plan has been previously extended already. Mr. Bloch replied yes; it was re-adopted once. Mr. Murphy said that you can re-adopt a Town Plan only one time. At issue is adopting new zoning bylaws without a Town Plan. Conditional Use criteria say it has to be consistent with a Town Plan, and if there is no Town Plan then the Town is at risk. Any project in the works under the current Town Plan and regulations can be completed subject to the existing Town Plan. Developers of new projects/plans can challenge Town zoning and land use regulations where there is no Town Plan, or a Town Plan has expired, explained Mr. Murphy.

Ms. Booher said that many people vote by absentee ballot. The Town is restricted by dates when the ballots must be available in accordance with Town Meeting Warning. Articles are reviewed at two Selectboard warned hearings before approved for the Town Meeting Warning. There are state statute responsibilities to meet to have absentee ballots created by a date. We are getting to crunch time for Town Meeting, said Ms. Booher.

Ms. Spear spoke in support of bringing the draft Town Plan up for a Town Meeting vote. There is too much at risk by not having a Town Plan. This speaks to having three hearings, said Ms. Spear.

Mr. Tenney said that there were plenty of meetings where people could submit input as well as many Planning Commission meetings and work sessions.

Mr. Joslin said that he disagreed with holding three hearings. He can assure you that even with 3 or 4 hearings there are people who’d want 4-5 hearings. The Town Plan is a living document and the Selectboard could move the Town Plan forward to a vote. The 2008 Town Plan was re-adopt in 2013. While he would hate for the Selectboard to feel they have to vote a delay on this because we wouldn’t have a Town Plan, it is short sighted. There are a lot of good things in this plan. It is not perfect. It can be update or amend later, said Mr. Joslin.

Mr. Murphy said he had a comment and a question. In his experience, most towns change Town Plans every 7-8 years and that is the norm. His question relates to the Future Land Use map, where there are ‘circles’ in West Village. Does the circle include or exclude the Old Lantern property, asked Mr. Murphy. Mr. Bloch explained that the map is not

intended to be a zoning map. The Land Use Map is a zoning map. The Future Land Use Map is more of a general concept 'bubble' map, said Mr. Bloch.

Mr. Krasnow pointed out that regarding Map 12, there is a disclaimer added to all the maps. He is not sure if the Old Lantern falls within a brown bubble area. A question is do natural and agriculture areas fall in what is a yellow bubble versus a brown bubble. Do other towns use future land use to guide zoning in Towns, asked Mr. Krasnow. Mr. Donovan replied yes; he thinks they do. Planning for future town growth and zoning leads toward that future. The bubble concept comes for from town work sessions and not CCRPC. He did not work on that section so he doesn't know if it is a general area, or not, said Mr. Donovan.

Mr. Murphy reviewed a brief history of the Old Lantern related to zoning. The Old Lantern pre-dates the adoption of zoning and does not appear in the bylaws. If it were proposed today it would never be allowed as a Continued Use or as an event facility. Title 24 says that if new zoning is adopted it has to be consistent with the Town Plan. The Map 12 circles, green for natural areas and brown for agricultural areas, might never expand zoning to include the Old Lantern and be consistent with the Town Plan. There is a concern with the bubble approach. Is there language in the future land use that says the map is conceptual and the lines aren't intended to guide future land use in a concentrated community area in that circle, asked Mr. Murphy. Mr. Joslin said that the Old Lantern has been a continuing issue and should be addressed in the zoning bylaws. The map is a result of a planning session where people stuck pins in a map and the circles are very general in nature. Mr. Pughe said the plan doesn't say brown circles are generic in nature. It does talk about considerations that go into future land areas in Town. For example, page, 1-2, Land Use Policies, are key planning considerations, said Mr. Pughe.

Mr. Krasnow said that Map 12 is a West Village Designation map showing adjoining commercial and civil uses. It is not for commercial/residential uses or for zoning of the Town. It is just information for the State, said Mr. Krasnow. Mr. Joslin said that regarding the future land use map, if there were any proposed changes to zoning it would go before the Town for a vote. Mr. Tenney said that the zoning bylaws are guides to accomplish a result. Maps will be adopted and referenced by the zoning bylaws and are updated all the time, said Mr. Tenney. Ms. Illick reiterated that the map was generated based on a workshop where the intent was to recognize the tension in the village areas. We were trying to show where village/hamlet areas could be developed in the Town, such as a PRD, which are the densest areas today. It is a guidance tool, said Ms. Illick. Mr. Bloch pointed out that there are no perfect circles in the zoning districts. Mr. Tenney said that the map is so broad and general it can only be recommendation of "what can happen in this area".

Michael Russell noted that there is disclaimer sheet at the front of the map section that is intended to apply to all maps, and are not to be used for detailed planning.

Ms. Booher read the disclaimer into the record.

Ms. Sampter asked if the proposed changes could be made and still meet the scheduled dates. These are not significant changes. Section 1-1 and Section 1-6, is just repeating and putting in data that is noted elsewhere and are non-substantial changes, said Ms. Sampter.

Mr. Krasnow explained that the Selectboard looked at changing punctuation and typos at last week's meeting. VLCT recommended making no changes at this point. The Selectboard decided not to make changes and put the Town Plan adoption at risk, said Mr. Krasnow.

PLACEMENT OF TOWN PLAN ON 2018 TOWN MEETING WARNING FOR VOTE BY AUSTRALIAN BALLOT

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to approve the Town Plan Article on the 2018 Town Meeting Warning for vote by Australian ballot as presented.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Krasnow explained that it is up to the Selectboard to steer the document. As one of a 5 member board, he would prefer a document that is accurate and stands a good chance of passing at Town Meeting. If it doesn't pass, the question is how long it will take to adopt, and that is a concern since the current Town Plan is set to expire. That is the risk. We could pause now for adoption later in November. There would be no Town Plan in place until then. A question is how long and which time table would be shorter. A Town Plan is a living document. The Selectboard and Planning Commission with the Town Planner will take more frequent looks at amending it. With a risk of having this draft Town Plan fail he wouldn't vote to bring it before the voters at this time. If it passes it is better then no Town Plan. It could be presented at the April 11, 2018 Australian vote. He would like to take one month more to clean up the draft, said Mr. Krasnow.

Ms. Spear asked why the Selectboard didn't set an April vote. Mr. Krasnow reviewed that it is a short window of not having a plan. Mr. Tegatz pointed out that Mr. Krasnow is working on a Town Municipal policy with a guide to set limits so rewriting drafts don't go on forever. The Town has been working on this draft for the last 5 years. There is no reason why we would change things now. It is good enough, it will never be perfect, and can always be changed, stated Mr. Tegatz.

Mr. Pughe said that if the Selectboard chooses to go back and modify the Town Plan with significant changes then it would go back to the Planning Commission to attain those changes. We would look at restarting the Planning Commission process all over again if not approved tonight. There would be a significant number of months before we could bring it back to the Selectboard again, stated Mr. Pughe.

Mr. Krasnow asked if it would be at least three more months. Mr. Tegatz asked if the Selectboard could live without extending the process. It might be November at the earliest with minor changes, said Mr. Tegatz. Mr. Pughe said that we had this discussion a year ago and it was sent back to the Planning Commission last year. Now we are here a year later, stated Mr. Pughe.

Mr. Russell asked if the Selectboard thinks it would fail a Town Meeting vote. Mr. Krasnow replied no. He had considered the risk at the December 11, 2017, public hearing where there was a flood of comments/additions. It was a quick attempt to address people's concerns. The Planning Commission and Selectboard considered the comments and put them into the plan. A second hearing was scheduled tonight to put it on the 2018 Town Meeting for a vote. Lane Morrison said if seemed like a Selectboard vote wouldn't pass at the second public hearing then he would call in and vote. A question is should we call in Lane, asked Mr. Krasnow.

Ms. Spear spoke in support of a Town Meeting vote.

Mr. Tenney said he was on the fence, and then said it should go to a vote. It is up to Mr. Krasnow to call Lane, said Mr. Tenney.

Mr. Tegatz spoke in favor of the motion.

Mr. Murphy suggested that contacting the Town Attorney regarding the legality of Lane Morrison voting on the motion without having participated in the discussion tonight, which might cause a later challenge.

Mr. Tegatz asked Mr. Morrison that if he is watching VCAM live stream to please call in. There is a 15 minute delay in the VCAM broadcast, noted Mr. Tegatz.

Ms. Booher used her iPhone to contact Lane Morrison and asked him to call into the Town Hall, extension 217.

Mr. Krasnow asked for a straw poll of Selectboard support, or not for the motion. Mr. Spear, Mr. Tenney and Mr. Tegatz spoke in support.

Mr. Morrison called into the Town Hall line at 8:16 p.m.

Mr. Krasnow explained the motion and public discussions. He said that he was not willing to vote favorably on the motion. There was a lengthy 2-hour discussion regarding factual errors, state statutes, typo and punctuation errors, proposed changes to the agricultural and forestry issues and the legal strength of the maps driving zoning and regulations, said Mr. Krasnow.

Mr. Morrison asked what the Planning Commission recommended. Mr. Krasnow replied it is to move forward and warn an Australian ballot vote on the schedule agreed to. Mr. Joslin added that there are errors in the Energy Section. There are not a lot of other errors in the plan, said Mr. Joslin.

Ms. Illick said that it is a problem of voting this way, and clarified that there were not substantive errors - it is more grammatical. Regarding a Future Land Use map,

the Planning Commission feels it is a simple planning vision map. We have clarified it as a guidance piece, It is fine to go forward with the plan, said Ms. Illick.

Mr. Morrison said that he has sat in on many Planning Commission sessions and understands that it is a working document and a work in progress. It is not good to have an invalid plan, and we need a valid plan. There are some changes, and the Energy Section can be amended in November, or a year from now. The Selectboard should proceed with the Town Plan, although not perfect, said Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Krasnow said that Liam Murphy has suggested that the Selectboard consider asking for a legal council opinion related to the validity of your voting and not here for the hearing discussion. That was the last thing before calling you, said Mr. Krasnow.

Mr. Morrison asked if the Selectboard vote is 2-2. Mr. Krasnow replied that a straw poll indicates a 2-1 and a questionable vote to approve it. There is a group of residents who want to add to the discussion, said Mr. Krasnow.

Mr. Schubart questioned calling someone to vote without that person participating in the hearing. There are two discussion points that puts the process on its head. He objects pursuant to 24 VSA 4385(b). It is not clear why the Selectboard can't incorporate changes up to 15 days prior to a final public hearing, said Mr. Schubart. Mr. Krasnow reiterated that this is the final public hearing tonight.

Mr. Tenney explained if the changes are accepted now then the draft goes back to the Planning Commission to do. They make changes and it would be another 15 days from tonight. That goes past the time to warn a March Town Meeting vote to adopt by Australian ballot, print an Annual Town Report and create ballots. We don't have the time in order to do it all for a March vote if we don't approve it tonight, said Mr. Tenney.

Mr. Schubart stated that it made sense to re-warn.

Mr. Murphy reviewed choices/options:

- On the January 29th date to make a vote, Lane could watch VCAM for the discussion
- Or approve the Town Plan for a shorter time; for example, to expire on November 15th, or March 15, 2019, which will allow for changes without expiring the Town Plan.

Mr. Morrison said that if the Planning Commission intends to update what is approved tonight then the plan could be amended in 12 months. That brings it to almost at the same place, said Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Joslin restated that if the Selectboard chooses to consider new/added changes then the draft would go back to the Planning Commission. The Planning

Commission could make those changes, or not, said Mr. Joslin. Mr. Morrison said that the process has taken several years already.

Mr. Tegatz called the question, seconded by Ms. Spear.

VOTE to call the question: 5 ayes; motion carried.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Tegatz reviewed the Motion to bring the draft Town Plan to the 2018 Town Meeting for an Australian ballot vote. Mr. Krasnow noted that the question has been called. Did Lane Morrison understand the Motion, asked Mr. Krasnow. Mr. Morrison replied yes.

VOTE on the Motion as presented: 4 ayes, 1 nay (Mr. Krasnow); motion carried.

(Mr. Krasnow called a break at 8:20 p.m. – 8:35 p.m.)

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

SELECTBOARD UPDATES

None.

FY19 BUDGET

Mr. Bloch reviewed a draft FY19 budget and tax rate. Items to reconsider are as follows:

- The \$40,000 approved for the Trails Article last year does not show in the approved budget
- The Year-To-Date column shows the actual tax rate that was set in August based on the actual Grand List
- Some of the revenues taken in is sent back to the state
- There are two proposed Articles for the Town Meeting Warning: \$50,000 for generators, and \$30,000 for Recreation improvements

Ms. Booher said that Mary Mead created the Town Report last in 2013. The \$40,000 represents how much money went to the Trails line and it shouldn't be separated out, said Ms. Booher.

Mr. Tegatz suggested adding two line items under "Additional Articles" to show the two Articles for \$50,000 and \$30,000. A question is how to tie the Australian ballot articles into the budget, said Mr. Tegatz.

Mr. Krasnow suggested that each additional article would be named:

- Trails Reserve Fund - \$40,000
- Recreation Capital Reserve Fund - \$30,000
- Town Improvement and Maintenance Fund: Generators - \$50,000

Following further discussion the Selectboard asked staff to update the budget spread sheet.

Ms. Booher asked to have an additional \$589 dental rider added to the Delta Dental Insurance Plan.

Staff to add \$589 in FY2018 under Employee Benefits – Delta Dental.

TOWN MEETING WARNING

There was discussion regarding the following draft Town Meeting Warning articles:

- Article 1 – no changes
- Article 2 – no changes
- Article 3 – figure amounts to be updated
- Article 4- no changes (generators for \$50,000)
- Article 5 – change to read “...for the purpose of Recreational Capital Improvements to be added to the Recreation Reserve Fund, which approval shall not become effective until further approval by Australian ballot.”
- Article 10 – no changes

Mr. Krasnow noted that an e-mail from Mary Mead received this date states that the Town Clerk’s signature is required on provisional ballots for same day voter registration.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to approve the 2018 Town Meeting warning as amended.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

Mr. Bloch said that the warning document will be available for Selectboard signatures on Tuesday, January 23, 2018.

TOWN REPORT

Ms. Booher said that as per state statutes, all petitions need to be turned into the Town Clerk’s office by January 29, 2018, 5:00 p.m., and all ballots are set on Wednesday, January 31, 2018.

Mr. Bloch reported that the Town Report will be sent to the printer on January 30th, and there is a one-day window for changes by February 1, 2018.

CHANGES/SUGGESTIONS:

- The April 10, 201 warning has two Article 2’s, changes will bring the articles consistent with the March Town Meeting Warning
- Article 2 (2nd of the two articles) – same as the one above it
- “sufficient funds” add language as article approved
- Add page numbering to the Table of Contents

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Mr. Tenney, to approve the Town Report with edits.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Tenney said in back have another table of contents. Mr. Bloch explained there is a Table of Contents at the front of the report and an Index in the back. Mr. Krasnow said to leave it as is.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

CERTIFICATE OF HIGHWAY MILEAGE

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to approved Certificate of Highway Mileage with changes.

- Staff to add Selectboard signature lines.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

PATTERSON FUELS—PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

MOTION by Ms. Spear, seconded by Mr. Tegatz, to approve a preventative Maintenance Contract with Patterson Fuels as presented, and to authorize the Charlotte Acting Chair to sign the document on behalf of the Town of Charlotte.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

Mr. Krasnow signed the contract.

LIQUOR LICENSE RENEWAL (to be approved as Liquor Control Board) □ Roland's Place, Incorporated—request for renewal of First Class Restaurant/Bar License to sell malt and vinous beverages □ Whit's End, LLC d/b/a Old Brick Store—request for renewal of Second Class License to sell malt and vinous beverages

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to recess the regular Selectboard meeting and to convene as the Charlotte Liquor Control Board.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to approve a request for Roland's Place, Incorporated for renewal of First Class Restaurant/Bar License to sell malt and vinous beverages as presented.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

The Selectboard signed the license document.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Mr. Tenney, to approve a request by Whit's End, LLC d/b/a Old Brick Store—request for renewal of Second Class License to sell malt and vinous beverages.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

The Selectboard signed the license document.

MOTION by Mr. Tegatz, seconded by Ms. Spear, to adjourn as the Charlotte Liquor Control Board and to reconvene the regular meeting as the Charlotte Selectboard.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

LAND MAINTENANCE AND BRUSH-HOGGING CONTRACTS

Mr. Bloch reviewed Land Maintenance and Brush hogging contract proposals to be sent out in February for a March deadline. Edits/comments on the proposals are due by the next Selectboard meeting, February 12, 2018.

MINUTES: November 13

Approval deferred to the next Selectboard meeting.

APPROVE WARRANTS TO PAY BILLS

The Selectboard members reviewed and signed warrants to pay bills.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Ms. Spear, seconded by Mr. Tenney, to adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: 4 ayes, 1 absent (Mr. Morrison); motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

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