

TRUSTEES SPECIAL MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA THURSDAY, JUNE 14, 2018 at 7:00 PM LINCOLN HALL MEETING ROOM, 2 LINCOLN STREET

1. CALL TO ORDER/ PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG

[7:00 PM]

- 2. AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES
- 3. APPROVE AGENDA
- 4. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD
 - a. Comments from Public on Items Not on Agenda

5. JOINT MEETING WITH ESSEX JUNCTION BOARD OF TRUSTEES

[7:05 PM]

- a. Extension of Memorandum of Agreement for Consolidation of Public Works Services Evan Teich
- b. Approval of definitions of commonly-used words around governance and consolidation Elaine Sopchak & Irene Wrenner
- c. Setting goals for evaluation of Unified Manager Andrew Brown, Irene Wrenner, Lori Houghton, and Mike Plageman
- d. Discussion of next steps for governance structure options and timeline Evan Teich

6. READING FILE

- a. Memo from Evan Teich and Greg Duggan re: Priorities to be accomplished through consolidation
- b. Essex Community Tax History
- c. Memo from Travis Sabataso re: Fiscal Year End 2019 Delta Dental Rates
- d. Memo from Travis Sabataso re: Revised employment application
- e. Memo from Will Moran re: Essex Rescue Response Statistics

7. ADJOURN

Meetings of the Trustees are accessible to people with disabilities. For information on accessibility or this agenda, call the Village Manager's office at 878-6944.

MINUTES SUBJECT TO CORRECTION BY THE ESSEX JUNCTION BOARD OF TRUSTEES. CHANGES, IF ANY, WILL BE RECORDED IN THE MINUTES OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE BOARD.

VILLAGE OF ESSEX JUNCTION BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING June 14, 2018

TRUSTEES: George Tyler, President, Dan Kerin, Elaine Sopchak, Andrew Brown, Lori Houghton.

SELECTBOARD: Max Levy, Chair, Irene Wrenner, Andrew Watts, Elaine Sopchak.

OTHERS PRESENT: Evan Teich, Unified Manager; Greg Duggan, Deputy Town Manager; Paul Austin; Diane Clemens; Paula DeMichele; Betsy Dunn; Jerry Fox; Mary Lou Hurley; Bruce S. Post; Marybeth Redmond; Margaret Smith.

1. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG

18 Mr. Tyler called the Trustee meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

19 M

Mr. Levy called the Selectboard (SB) meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Levy invited those present to join him in reciting the "Pledge of Allegiance."

2. AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

Mr. Duggan provided the following addition: an updated version of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Town and Village regarding the Public Works Services.

3. APPROVE AGENDA

GEORGE TYLER MOVED AND DAN KERIN SECONDED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDED AGENDA. THE MOTION PASSED 4-0.

IRENE WRENNER MOVED AND ELAINE SOPCHAK SECONDED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDED AGENDA. THE MOTION PASSED 5-0.

4. PUBLIC TO BE HEARD

There were no comments from the public.

5. JOINT MEETING WITH ESSEX SELECTBOARD

 a. Extension of Memorandum of Agreement for Consolidation of Public Works Services - Evan Teich

Mr. Teich introduced the issue of whether the SB and Trustees will approve Amendment Number One to the MOA between the Town and the Village regarding Consolidation of Public Works Services. Mr. Teich explained that changes were made to clarify vague language and to ensure that both boards will

47 have th

have the final say and approval of any actions towards consolidation of the public works services. Both attorneys have agreed on these changes.

- With regard to #5 Termination, Mr. Watts pointed out that if one party wants to terminate and it goes to
- a vote, the Village and the Town annual meetings are held at different times. He wondered about adding
- language to clarify when one party has to notify the other if it wants to terminate the agreement. Mr.
- 53 Teich agreed because staff would rather know before going into the budget season if one party would
- 54 like to terminate the agreement. Members discussed having a specific deadline of December 1 so that
- 55 the other party has enough notice for the next budget process. Additionally, if there is a termination by
- one party, staff will need as much time as possible into the following year to make the full separation.
- 57 Members discussed how this would impact both budgets, and decided on a deadline of October 1 of
- any year for notification in order to implement the separation for the following fiscal year. Ms.
- 59 Houghton wondered if termination language was needed since the boards are continuing with the status
- quo at this time. Mr. Kerin was in favor of keeping the termination language in the MOA because there
- 61 could be different members serving on the boards in the future.

 Mr. Teich explained that if approval from the boards did not occur tonight, the original agreement would stand until approval of a new agreement is made. Members decided to continue separate discussions with their respective boards, once the attorneys have made these updates, and return at a joint meeting for a vote. There were no objections from any member to continue the existing agreement.

Mr. Bruce Post questioned a comment earlier regarding line reductions or increases at the Annual Meeting being only advisory. He wanted to know if there was a statutory prohibition against this practice or if it was an unwritten policy. Mr. Levy understood that the voters at Town Meeting can vote to add or subtract dollars from the budget and can request where they would like those dollars cut or added. It would be at the peril of the members not to follow the voters' requests. Members and staff could not provide a statute related to this issue, but the Moderator has stated at annual meetings that voters can propose a change to the budget, but not to a specific number line.

Ms. Betsy Dunn wondered if the public understood everything surrounding the term MOA. She felt that a simple merger is a lot cleaner than all these MOAs. Mr. Levy stated that there have been explanations about this MOA at the Town Annual Meeting. Ms. Dunn noted that not many people attend the Annual Meeting. Ms. Sopchak clarified that there is a MOA for the public works services because it is a budgetary issue. She reminded Ms. Dunn that the budget meetings are open to the public at all times, with multiple public hearings. Also, both boards attended numerous public events to provide outreach about the MOA and placed an article in the Essex Reporter. Ms. Paula DeMichele felt this was a good argument for having a Communications Position for the Town.

Mr. Paul Austin suggested getting the highlights of this proposal efficiently disseminated out in the community. Ms. Houghton pointed out that the boards are deciding to keep everything as it has been for the past three years. She felt that residents also have the obligation to find out what is going on. Mr. Jerry Fox stated that there was significant discussion in both the Village and Town reports, which are available to the public.

GEORGE TYLER MOVED AND ELAINE SOPCHAK SECONDED A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT WITH PUBLIC WORKS UNTIL A NEW AGREEMENT IN JULY. THE MOTION PASSED 4-0.

IRENE WRENNER MOVED AND ANDREW WATTS SECONDED A MOTION TO

CONTINUE THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT WITH PUBLIC WORKS UNTIL A NEW

97 AGREEMENT IN JULY. THE MOTION PASSED 5-0.

b. <u>Approval of Definitions of Commonly-Used Words Around Governance and Consolidation</u> - Elaine Sopchak & Irene Wrenner

Ms. Sopchak introduced the issue and explained that any big process like this should have a clear, common language to avoid any potential pitfalls of defining words.

Mr. Watts was concerned about the language under "consolidation" because it says, "as well as maintaining and preserving the quality of services." In his opinion, the community could still have quality services with fewer services and thought that should be considered as they are discussing consolidation. Ms. Sopchak felt that the definition did not describe how to maintain and preserve the quality of services and that ultimately it was up to the residents. Mr. Kerin commented that it was difficult to quantify "quality." Mr. Brown liked the definition as presented and felt that it did not preclude a reduction of services. Mr. Watts suggested striking that phrase as part of the definition for "consolidation." Ms. Houghton didn't think that language was specific to changing the level of service if needed and suggested referencing "appropriate level of service in the consolidation." Ms. Sopchak felt that quality was an important aspect of consolidation. Mr. Tyler suggested saying "including the elimination of duplicate services or unnecessary services." Mr. Watts favored the language suggested by Ms. Houghton. Ms. Houghton agreed, but thought it should be referenced. Mr. Teich understood the definition of "consolidation" as follows: "Combining of two or more departments, committees or service areas with a goal of efficiency and cost effectiveness as well as maintaining appropriate levels of services, so that the resulting entity operates under a single point of authority." The members all agreed.

With regard to "governance", Mr. Watts wondered if the structure of governance, such as number of members, representation, etc. should be included. Ms. Sopchak replied that they streamlined the definition because there are so many different ways to define it. Mr. Levy suggested, "the act of governing to establish, implement and monitor policies by members of a governing body who exercise authority on behalf of the electorate." Mr. Watts didn't think it answered his original question of the structure of the government. Mr. Kerin felt that the definition should be broad and liked how Mr. Levy defined "governance." Mr. Brown did not like using "governing" in the governance definition. Mr. Levy suggested they ask the subcommittee to continue work on this definition, and members agreed.

With regard to "tax equity," Mr. Watts suggested adding language about access to the services everyone is paying for. Mr. Tyler suggested adding "and have access to all those services, regardless of where they live" after "municipal."

With regard to the definition of "transparency," Mr. Watts wanted to make sure there were no barriers to access for anyone, including the members. Mr. Levy suggested adding "in accordance with freedom of information legislation" at the end of the definition. Ms. Sopchak suggested simply saying, "according to law," and members agreed.

Ms. Wrenner noted that she and Ms. Sopchak forgot to add the definition for "community," which was requested by Mr. Mark Banks at the last joint meeting. Members decided to table this discussion and have Ms. Wrenner and Ms. Sopchak update the definitions based on the deliberations.

Mr. Austin, with regard to tax equity, noted that if the Village wants to have a service that the Town does not provide, it can raise the revenue on its own. He thought it was fair and reasonable to Village residents to charge additional fees to those outside the Village for services paid for by the Village only.

- 146 The problem he saw was that the tax rate today is probably higher for the Town outside the Village
- residents because of the smaller consolidation efforts, which is conflictual. Mr. Tyler clarified that for a
- service like Planning and Development, the Village is paying for its own, but also paying for the
- 149 Planning and Development in the Town, which doesn't do anything for the Village. The same example
- 150 could be found with capital funds for roads and infrastructure. Therefore, the issue in the Village is that
- it is funding two different fundamental services in both communities.

152

Mr. Fox suggested listing the finalized definitions in the Essex Reporter. He felt that the future is the Village and that the Town is becoming an urban area like the Village, but with bigger lots.

155

156 Ms. DeMichele suggested adding a disclaimer because from a legal standpoint these definitions are not all-inclusive.

158

Ms. Dunn asked if they have defined the future governance that operates under a single point of authority. Ms. Sopchak replied that "governance" is deliberately unspecific as there could be different options in the future.

162

Mr. Post stated that it would be helpful to elaborate the definitions with examples. He agreed with Mr. Watts' remarks about "transparency." He thought they should give people some understanding of how they arrived at the definitions.

166 167

168

169

Ms. Sopchak liked the idea of a disclaimer because these definitions won't be all-inclusive. She clarified that the meaning of the definitions is to help the two boards understand what each other is referring to so they can communicate more clearly. She added that it is a tool for the boards to start the conversation on the same footing.

170171172

c. <u>Setting Goals for Evaluation of Unified Manager - Andrew Brown, Irene Wrenner, Lori Houghton, and Mike Plageman</u>

173174175

176

177

178

The issue is whether, and when, the SB and Trustees will set goals for the evaluation of the Unified Manager. A subcommittee was created on May 14 to identify goals and priorities for approval by both boards. Due to scheduling difficulties, the subcommittee will not be able to meet until June 21. Staff identified the following three options: 1) Extend the 2018 deadline from July 1 to August 1. 2) Have a special meeting prior to July 1. 3) Choose and prioritize goals reviewed at past meetings.

179 180 181

Mr. Tyler commented that the boards need to give Mr. Teich his goals in a timely manner. Members further deliberated on this issue and whether the work would be completed by the next joint meeting.

182 183

184 Ms. DeMichele asked if Mr. Teich has given a list of his goals to the boards, other than general 185 consolidation. She believed that there were critical and urgent economic goals, such as affordable housing to be addressed. She wanted one of the Unified Manager's goals to be the creation of an 186 187 Affordable Housing Trust for the community. Mr. Teich did not think this could be achievable in the 188 next 6 months and thought the first step would be to see if the Trustees and SB want to work on this 189 issue together. He did not think it should be a goal for the Unified Manager since it is a policy decision, 190 and Mr. Tyler agreed. Mr. Tyler added that it would take the staff and citizens to carry an Affordable 191 Housing Trust forward with the Unified Manager involved and having some oversight. However, they 192 can't put it under the Unified Manager's purview if he does not have control over it.

193

ANDREW WATTS MOVED AND IRENE WRENNER SECONDED A MOTION TO EXTEND THE 2018 DEADLINE FROM JULY 1 TO AUGUST 1. THE MOTION PASSED 4-0.

ANDREW BROWN MOVED AND DAN KERIN SECONDED A MOTION TO EXTEND THE 2018 DEADLINE FROM JULY 1 TO AUGUST 1. THE MOTION PASSED 5-0.

d. Discussion of Next Steps for Governance Structure Options and Timeline - Evan Teich

The issue is whether the Trustees and SB form a subcommittee to research and present options for governance structure and timelines to the rest of the boards. All members of the boards, at joint meetings on April 25 and May 14, have said they would like the current consolidation efforts to result in end goals of one community/municipality, one legislative body with equal representation, one budget and one tax rate. Opinions differ in regard to how and when to meet those goals. Representation and a tax equity plan seem to be the highest priority issues.

Mr. Tyler discussed the concept he suggested at the last joint meeting of a seven-member council, but that he realized it would probably not work and would take a significant amount of legal work to get a solid answer. Mr. Watts stated that his idea from the last joint meeting would also not work. He suggested using the school district as a model. Ms. Sopchak suggested having someone from the Secretary of State's office invited to the next joint meeting. Mr. Tyler noted that the school created a new entity from four school districts and three municipal entities. Ms. Houghton was in favor of doing the same thing as the school district and having one new community. She announced at the last Trustee meeting that she will no longer be voting on smaller consolidation efforts.

Ms. Wrenner was in favor of a ten-member board where everyone votes at large on everything and told Ms. Sopchak that an attorney is necessary to determine the charter for that model.

Mr. Watts suggested that his original idea of creating a Union Municipal District may be a way to temporarily keep the two charters intact while working together. Mr. Tyler commented that counsel will need time to provide answers for these questions. Mr. Teich suggested sending questions that he could forward to the Vermont League of Cities and Towns (VLCT) and the State.

Mr. Tyler asked if members wanted a subcommittee for this issue to take the pressure off the staff. Ms. Sopchak was in favor of a subcommittee. Members discussed the timing for a ballot question for this issue and agreed that they could not meet a November ballot deadline. They also agreed to meet as individual boards to discuss who would like to serve on the subcommittee. Mr. Tyler also suggested that the SB create a survey for the residents outside the Village to find out what they are concerned about with regard to governance, tax equity, representation and consolidation, etc.

Mr. Fox asked Ms. Houghton what she felt was wrong with the Town charter. Ms. Houghton thought that the school district did it right by creating one new entity with one new charter. Mr. Fox did not see why they needed a new charter if they were just consolidating all the services under single department heads. Ms. Houghton appreciated Mr. Fox' comments, but stated that many Village residents are concerned with being "eaten up" by the Town in the same way the Town, outside the Village, residents felt about the Essex Junction Recreation Department.

Mr. Post suggested asking the VLCT about the legal authority for this alignment process so they are clear. Mr. Post agrees with Ms. Houghton about creating one new charter. It was confirmed for Mr. Post

- that the subcommittee meetings are all subject to the Open Meeting Law. Mr. Post was also concerned about the legality of the inter-municipal agreements.
- Ms. Dunn suggested the boards go back to what was discussed during the all-day workshop on
- 245 governance, which had a good cross-section of representation from the Village and the Town, outside
- the Village, residents. She didn't think they had to "recreate the full wheel," but could work from past
- 247 templates of merger efforts and discussions. She was in favor of a vote no later than next March and
- also agreed with Ms. Houghton about having one charter and a ten-member board, all at large.

Ms. Marylou Hurley agreed with Ms. Houghton that a whole new charter was needed.

Mr. Austin stated that the people outside the Village are concerned about the board being balanced and with taxes increasing, which he felt would happen to a greater extent if they continue to consolidate little by little. He was also in favor of a new charter.

Mr. Fox stated that the voters have authority about consolidation when they approve the Town and Village budgets.

ELAINE SOPCHAK MOVED AND ANDREW WATTS SECONDED A MOTION TO APPOINT
 TWO MEMBERS TO A SUBCOMMITTEE TO RESEARCH GOVERNANCE ISSUES FOR
 CONSOLIDATION AND COME BACK TO A JOINT MEETING FOR SUGGESTIONS AND
 DISCUSSION ON GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE.

Ms. Wrenner wanted to be sure that the assumption going forward with a subcommittee is to only appoint an equal number of people inside and outside the Village. Mr. Watts was concerned about whether two members who lived outside the Village would volunteer. Mr. Levy thought that would be for the SB to discuss.

THE MOTION PASSED 4-0.

DAN KERIN MOVED AND ANDREW BROWN SECONDED A MOTION TO APPOINT TWO MEMBERS TO A SUBCOMMITTEE TO RESEARCH GOVERNANCE ISSUES FOR CONSOLIDATION AND COME BACK TO A JOINT MEETING FOR SUGGESTIONS AND DISCUSSION ON GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE.

Mr. Tyler felt that if they couldn't make any progress at the separate meetings, then they could revisit this issue. Mr. Brown felt that it was unfortunate that the subcommittee couldn't be formed tonight, which pushes things further back. Ms. Houghton asked that the members be realistic in what could be accomplished as staff already has a full plate with consolidation efforts underway. She wanted the Trustees to discuss this and start looking at other issues of importance, such as economic development. Mr. Tyler stated that having a subcommittee to discuss this issue could reduce the number of joint meetings. Ms. Houghton wanted the framework for that work to be outlined.

THE MOTION PASSED 5-0.

It was confirmed that the next joint meeting is on July 18 to discuss Unified Manager goals and the MOA of public works. In October, a joint meeting time will be arranged to discuss Governance. Consultants from VLCT and the State will be invited to attend.

290	6. READING FILE
291	
292	a. Memo from Evan Teich and Greg Duggan re: Priorities to be accomplished through consolidation
293	b. Essex Community Tax History
294	c. Memo from Travis Sabataso re: Fiscal Year End 2019 Delta Dental Rates
295	d. Memo from Travis Sabataso re: Revised employment application
296	e. Memo from Will Moran re: Essex Rescue Response Statistics
297	
298	There were no comments on the Reading File.
299	
300	7. <u>ADJOURN</u>
301	
302	IRENE WRENNER MOVED AND ELAINE SOPCHAK SECONDED A MOTION TO
303	ADJOURN AT 9:50 P.M. THE MOTION PASSED 4-0.
304	
305	GEORGE TYLER MOVED AND DAN KERIN SECONDED A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT
306	9:50 P.M. THE MOTION PASSED 5-0.
307	
308	Respectfully submitted,
309	
310	Saramichelle Stultz
311	Recording Secretary