

Agenda for the Selectboard meeting Wednesday, January 25, 2017 at 6:30 PM
(Times Are Approximate)

- 1) Approval of Agenda (Action Item) 2 minutes
- 2) Public Comments (Discussion Item) 5 minutes
- 3) Finance
 - a) Recreation Department request to expend up to \$3,500 from the Recreation Facilities Fund for the purchase of a used commercial grade snow machine to be used to groom the ski trails at Huntley Meadows (Discussion/Action Item) 10 minutes
 - b) Update on short-term financing for the Police/Fire project (Discussion Item) 5 minutes
- 4) Pool Committee presentation (Discussion/Action Item) 20 minutes
- 5) Town Meeting Warning (Discussion/Action Item) 10 minutes
- 6) Town Manager Search – executive session may be needed
 - a) Evaluation Process (Discussion/Action Item) 30 minutes
 - b) Contract Language (Discussion/Action Item) 30 minutes
- 7) Interim Town Manager Report (Discussion Item) 5 minutes
- 8) Correspondence (Discussion/Action Item) 5 minutes
 - a) Ann Greenwald
 - b) Hope Hussey
 - c) Claudette Brochu
 - d) Stephen Flanders
 - e) Nancy Dean
 - f) VLCT, Special Membership Meeting
- 9) Selectboard
 - a) Board to sign accounts payable/warrants (Discussion/Action Item) 5 minutes
 - b) Approval of the minutes of the 1/4/2017, 1/11/2017, and 1/18/2017 Selectboard meetings (Action Item) 5 minutes
 - c) Review of Next Agendas (Discussion/ Action Item) 5 minutes

Next Meeting – February 8, 2017 at 6:30 PM

To receive email notices of Selectboard meetings and hearings, agendas, minutes and other notices, send an email to manager-assistant@norwich.vt.us requesting to be placed on the Town Email List.

3a.

Dear Town Manager, David Ormiston,

January 12th, 2017

In recent years, Norwich resident, Bernard Haskell's family has allowed use of their 1970 (single ski) snowmobile to pull our ski tracking groomer and roller. About five years ago Bernard generously took over as volunteer to set ski tracks at Huntley Meadow. Historically, Bob Fisker was our original ski tracking pioneer.

The 47 year old machine has provided us a wonderful service but its age has been showing and it has needed frequent repairs the last couple of years. Unfortunately it just broke down and the replacement part to repair it is no longer available. Andy has been hunting long and hard (vendors who deal with older machines, e-bay, etc.) but has been unable to find the needed part. He and his crew have since been searching for a second hand snowmobile in good condition and found a commercial grade machine for \$3,500.

At our Tuesday night meeting earlier this week, the Recreation Council unanimously voted to recommend to you to move forward with this purchase using monies from our Recreation Facilities Fund. This fund is specifically designated to be spent on Recreation facilities and/or Recreation improvements for the community. It was set up from private donations raised for this purpose. There is currently \$33,000 available in this fund.

Because of these circumstances we would like to request permission to spend up to a maximum of \$3,500 from the Recreation Facilities Fund for a second hand snowmobile to pull our cross country ski tracker.

I will be happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank-you for your consideration of this request / purchase.



Jill Kearney Niles - Norwich Recreation Director

649-1419 x.5 or Recreation@norwich.vt.us

David Ormiston

3a.

From: Jill Kearney
Sent: Thursday, January 12, 2017 5:10 PM
To: David Ormiston; Manager Assistant; Miranda Bergmeier; (ccwintersport@gmail.com); Amy Tuller; Bill Tine (bill.tine@kingarthurfleur.com); Gered Dunne (gereddunne@gmail.com); Jill Collins (jillcollins1@comcast.net); John Girard (cgirard16@comcast.net); Kristin Fauci-Pontecorvo (kriscorvo@yahoo.com); Laura Duncan (latd71@gmail.com); R P Tompkins; Rebecca Matteo; Ryan Johnson (ryanola72@gmail.com); ryan.gardner@gmail.com
Subject: Norwich Recreation Council Meeting Minutes from 1/10...

Norwich Recreation Council Meeting Minutes from 1/10 '17

Present: Jill Kearney-Niles, Jill Collins, Ryan Gardner, Page Tompkins, Gered Dunne & Amy Tuller

Discussed possible AED training for coaches and those interested. Jill will look into lining this up. Reviewed minutes of December 6th meeting. Approved.

Overview of Norwich Pool Committee work and proposals.

Jill reviewed cover page of description of what the Norwich Recreation Department budget supports.

Andy has been trying to find a part to fix the old snowmobile that is used to groom the trails at Huntley Meadow. We now need a plan for something new. We do have money in the Rec Facilities Improvement Fund, which is entirely made up of previous private donations. Andy has found a machine for \$3,500.00, which could hopefully be used for at least the next 10 years. Laura brought up the idea of having a Rec cross country skiing program at Huntley. Discussion followed about strategic plan of Rec department and priorities. All council members present agreed that having cross country skiing at Huntley is a priority and if this is needed in order to uphold this priority, then it is a worthwhile way to spend this money. The recreation council discussed the importance of the recreation facilities improvement fund to provide for the unanticipated facility needs. A motion was put forth to endorse spending \$3,500 out of the Rec Facilities Improvement Fund, pending all other required approvals. The motion passed unanimously. This money is outside of the town budget.

Basketball season: Discussed change in game schedule for one game of just 6th graders and one for just 5th graders. Some members of the council are not comfortable with this and feel it does not fit with our recreation philosophy. Tournament schedule discussed and Laura is helping to line up tournament enrolments. Discussed AAU options for post season and where practices could be held. AAU teams can't have open gym time' Gym time at Marion Cross needs to be paid for. Dora should be able to let us know about times available and costs. Unsure about cost of Tracy Hall if team were all Norwich players.

Upcoming Mud Season: fill is planning for upcoming mud season indoor lacrosse warm up and setting up coaches. Also for baseball warm up.

Strategic Plan and Recreation Philosophy: (presented by Laura) Committee looked at several youth sports philosophies on the internet. Want to make reference to childhood development. Discussion about what makes kids enjoy and participate in youth sports and what makes them quit. Team wants to develop a Norwich Rec coaches' brochure about criteria for expectations for coaches, with bullet points. The Upper Valley Recreation Association (UVRA) which we are a part of, has a brochure about expectations for coaches, players, and spectators. Committee members will continue to build this philosophy, which could be sent out with Norwich Rec Council information. Jill Collins discussed that Empower

3a.

Lacrosse has a brochure with information about what parents should/might say to their kids after a game (with positive messages).

Next Meeting Scheduled for: Tuesday, February 7th @ 7pm in the Tracy Hall Conference Room

Norwich Pool Options Committee

Final Report

December 20, 2016

The Norwich Pool Options Committee met almost biweekly since August 30, 2016. At the direction of the Selectboard, the Committees met to further investigate installing a "streamside pool" at the former Norwich Pool site accessed from Beaver Meadow Road. The Committee presents this final report and recommendations to the Town of Norwich (Town) Selectboard as a result of its findings.

The Committee review of work presented to the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources (VANR) indicates that the Town only considered dam options to restore the Norwich Pool after Tropical Storm Irene (Irene), which were rejected by the VANR. The Committee understands that in-stream dams to create water impoundments has not been reviewed favorably for approximately two decades, including a court case in the mid-2000s that established precedent for the VANR denial of the Town's post-Irene dam proposal.

The Committee was informed that the Town and the Norwich Fire District would like to remove the dam for the former Charles Brown Brook Reservoir above the former Norwich Pool site. With the Committee's understanding that the VANR encourages the removal of dams and the restoration of streams, wetlands, and natural resources, the Committee would like to pursue permitting and work for both projects simultaneously. The Committee received input that the VANR might be more favorably disposed to a stream-side pool in the context of holist plans and permitting.

Although the Committee was not provided with any past stream-side pool information, the Committee understands that it may be possible to permit such an amenity, while maintaining the stream channel as the most environmentally sensitive, least impacting alternative to recreating a pool to continue long term recreational benefit of the existing site. The Committee understands that previous work to design a dam includes most of the base information for planning, regulator interaction, and design based on regulator input.

The Committee recommends:

1. That the Selectboard appoint a Committee to assist with the proposed project from VANR interaction through engaging a project team for implementation.
2. That the Selectboard endorses an open and transparent process throughout project implementation. This recommendation includes consideration of public forums.
3. That the Committee approaches the VANR holistically with respect to stream, natural resource, and recreational facility restoration (particularly in the context of Recreation as a value in the 13 functions and values promulgated but the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the VANR). This recommendation should embrace at least a stream side pool and removal of the Charles Brown Brook Reservoir Dam (with restoration), and may consider other corridor elements such as the pedestrian bridge between the Legion property and Huntley Meadows.
4. That the Committee seek alternate sources of public funding since the Committee understands that the Town cannot realize the benefit of FEMA funding that should have been allocated to replacing the Norwich Pool subsequent to Irene. Such alternatives may include in-kind donations or volunteer organization work. Funding considerations discussed by the Committee:
 - a. Incorporating FEMA funds the Town receives to prepare the site for a real project.
 - b. Considerations of grant options available for this type of project, ranging from The Byrne Foundation to Trout Unlimited.

Norwich Pool Options Committee

Final Report

December 20, 2016

- c. Incorporating volunteer efforts from organizations such as Team Rubicon, a national volunteer organization with the ability to provide significant construction expertise.
- d. Volunteer effort from Town and Upper Valley residents.
- e. Local donations from private individuals.

Respectfully Submitted
Norwich Pool Options Committee
Anne Goodrich, Chair

**TOWN OF NORWICH, VERMONT AND
NORWICH TOWN SCHOOL DISTRICT
WARNING OF ANNUAL MEETING, MARCH 7, 2017**

The legal voters of the Town of Norwich, Vermont and the Norwich Town School District are hereby notified and warned to meet in Tracy Memorial Hall, Norwich, Vermont at 7:00 pm on Monday, March 6, 2017, to transact business not requiring a vote by Australian ballot. Voting for Town Officers and for all articles on the Warning will be by Australian ballot. The polls will be open Tuesday, March 7, 2017 from 7:00 am to 7:00 pm.

This meeting is called to determine if the Town will:

Article 1. Elect a Moderator of the Town and School District meeting for one year.

Article 2. Elect Town and School District Officers for terms starting in 2017.

Article 3. Hear and act on the reports of the Officers of the Town and Town School District.

Article 4. Authorize the Board of School Directors to borrow money by issuance of bonds or notes not in excess of anticipated revenues for the next fiscal year in accordance with the provisions of 16 VSA § 562(9)?

Article 5. Shall the voters of the Norwich Town School District determine and fix the salaries of the School Board members in the sum of \$500 each per year in accordance with the provisions of 16 VSA § 562(5)?

Article 6. Shall the voters of the Norwich Town School District appropriate \$ _____, necessary for the support of its school for the year beginning July 1, 2017 and ending June 30, 2018?

Article 7. Transact any other business that may legally come before the annual meeting of the Norwich Town School Board.

Article 8. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich approve a gross spending General Town Budget of \$4,462,378 plus state and federal grants and gifts consistent with budgeted programs for the period July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018?

Article 9. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich approve the borrowing of up to \$70,000 to be used for contingency funding, if needed by June 30th, 2017, for the Norwich Public Safety Building Project?

Article 10. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$13,120 to Advance Transit to be used to help cover operating costs and providing matching funds for grants, such amount being reasonably necessary for the support of providing public transportation services?

Article 11. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$3,000 to Good Beginnings to be used for those operating expenses that are reasonably necessary for the support of programs?

Article 12. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$1,693 to the Green Mountain Economic Development Corporation to be used to offer support for new, growing and relocating businesses?

Article 13. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$500 to the Green Mountain RSVP & Volunteer Center of Windsor County to develop opportunities for people age 55 and older to positively impact the quality of life in the community through volunteer services?

Article 14. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$2,500 to Headrest to be used for the operation of a crisis 24/7 hotline?

Article 15. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$1,500 to the Norwich American Legion, to be used for the Legion's Memorial Day observance?

Article 16. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$15,000 to the Cemetery Commission under 18 VSA § 5361 to supplement the interest from the Perpetual Care Trust Fund for maintenance of the Town Cemeteries?

Article 17. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$4,348 to The Child Care Center of Norwich to be used for income sensitive scholarships to Norwich children?

Article 18. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$8,000 to the Norwich Historical Society and Community Center to support those programs that support the celebration of historic events?

Article 19. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$3,000 to the Norwich Lions Club to be used to underwrite the fireworks for the Norwich Fair in celebration of the 256th year of the Town's Charter?

Article 20. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$272,950 to the Norwich Public Library Association, to be used for the operating expenses of the Library?

Article 21. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$3,750 to SEVCA (Southeastern Vermont Community Action) to be used for emergency needs, referral to and assistance with accessing needed services, financial counseling and food and nutrition education?

Article 22. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$6,000 to The Family Place to be used for general program support, such amount being reasonably necessary for the support of programs such as direct service through early intervention, child care payment assistance, healthy baby visits, reach up, welcome baby, parent education, playgroups and other services?

Article 23. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$2,000 to the Upper Valley Trails Alliance to be used for trail planning and work?

Article 24. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$15,600 to the Visiting Nurse Association & Hospice of VT and NH to help support the home health, maternal and child health and hospice care provided in patients' homes and in community settings?

Article 25. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$5,300 to the White River Council on Aging to be used for home delivered meals, transport and social services?

Article 26. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$1,000 to Windsor County Partners to be used for mentoring youth?

Article 27. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$2,500 to WISE (Women's Information Service) to be used to support WISE's crisis intervention and support services and prevention education?

Article 28. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich appropriate \$3,000 to Youth-In-Action to be used for operating expenses that support our community service efforts?

Article 29. Shall the voters of the Town of Norwich require that taxes be paid in U.S. funds in two installments? The first installment will be due and accepted at the Town of Norwich Finance Office on or before 4:30 pm August 18, 2017 and the balance will be due at the same location on or before 4:30 pm February 16, 2018. An official United States Post Office postmark/cancellation (not a postage machine date) will determine the payment date for all mailed payments. Interest on overdue taxes will be charged at 1% per month for the first three months and 1½% per month thereafter. All delinquent taxes will be subject to an 8% collection fee in accordance with Vermont Statutes after February 16, 2018.

Article 30. Transact any other business that may legally come before the annual Norwich Town Meeting.

Norwich Selectboard

Norwich School Board

Christopher Ashley

Justin Campfield

Linda Cook

Thomas Candon

Stephen Flanders

Kelley Hersey

Dan Goulet

James Mackall

Mary Layton

Neil Odell

A simple approach to evaluating the performance of the Town Manager

JC 10 Jan 17

Twice a year, the Selectboard meets together to rate the Town Manager's performance during the preceding six months, using the simple rating sheet attached. (next page)

Using the rating sheet, each member of the Selectboard rates the TM's performance in each of the five main responsibilities of the TM position:

1. Serves and supports the Selectboard
2. Manages annual budget process
3. Oversees town departments and programs
4. Controls expenditures and revenues
5. Manages special projects (agreed each year)

For each of these five areas of responsibility, Members score the TM's effectiveness in two different dimensions:

- Rate the TM's functional effectiveness: to what extent is the TM's work thorough, timely, and productive?
- Rate the TM's interpersonal effectiveness: to what extent does the TM create a positive and inclusive climate, one that builds consensus and empowers others?

Use a simple rating scale of 1 to 5, where:

- 1 = unsatisfactory
- 2 = mediocre
- 3 = satisfactory
- 4 = very good
- 5 = outstanding

At the time, in addition to scoring the TM's performance with the rating sheet, have each Member answer in writing two open-ended questions:

- Describe the most important thing the TM *did well* during the past evaluation period.
- Describe the most important thing the TM *needs to do better* in the coming evaluation period.

Answers are brief (a paragraph or two) and specific.

Town of Norwich: Town Manager Performance Evaluation evaluation period _____ date: _____ by: _____			
	Functional effectiveness	Interpersonal effectiveness	
	Enter score of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 in each box below		For each row, total the scores, divide by 2, and enter here ↓
Serves and supports Selectboard			=
Manages annual budget process			=
Oversees town departments and programs			=
Controls expenditures and revenues			=
Manages special projects (agreed each period)			=
In each column, add the scores, divide by 5, and enter here →	_____	_____	=
	Technical effectiveness combined score	Interpersonal effectiveness combined score	OVERALL SCORE

After each Selectboard member has completed her/his form, total on a separate form all Members' scores for each box and calculate the average (consensus) score for each box and for the row totals and for the column totals.

For each box and for totals:

- any consensus score of 1 to 2.25 indicates *deficient* performance.
- any consensus score of 2.26 to 3.74 indicates *satisfactory* performance.
- any consensus score of 3.75 to 5 indicates *exemplary* performance.

Results are shared promptly with the Town Manager, and agreement reached on what corrective actions, if any, should be taken and/or next course of action.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Norwich Select Board
FROM: Mary Layton
SUBJECT: TM Evaluation Process
DATE: 01/05/2017
CC: David Ormiston, Miranda Bergmeier

I think performance evaluation is an important topic. I think we should work on it as essential management policy. It will provide clarity for both the Town Manager and the Selectboard.

I do not think performance evaluation should be narrowly defined if it is to be a term in the Town Manager contract, because we might wish to modify the policy. If included as a contract term I think we should state that the Town Manager will be evaluated annually according to the current Selectboard policy, and that a step increase will be awarded conditional upon a satisfactory evaluation.

The template that we have used in the past is a good basic guide but could be edited and simplified. It is based on the job description, which is logical and gives both broad areas and specific points for evaluation purposes. The system of evaluation seems to progress in terms of the length of the planning process, so that a superlative level reflects thought given to what would be beneficial to the Town over a number of

years. The achievement of this performance level seems dependent upon consistent direction and long term planning by the Selectboard. If the Manager is able to attain this level the Selectboard should be performing similarly.

I think the template could be improved by adding two additional categories for evaluation. One is that the Town Manager has a cordial and professional working relationship with elected Town officials such as the Town Clerk or Treasurer. Another is networking with other managers and ongoing education such as coursework or attendance at conferences. In regard to the latter, the language should be framed so that the Town Manager has the opportunity for professional development but does not spend an excessive amount of time with these activities.

In terms of how and when the Town Manager is evaluated, I think that the initial phase of the evaluation should be done in executive session. The written evaluation is a public document and should remain so. If there is a serious problem or conflict there should be a public hearing so that both sides can state their case. I think an annual evaluation is sufficient. I think an evaluation period of January 1st to December 31st would give sufficient time between the close of the evaluation period and possible election of new Selectboard members at Town Meeting to have informed discussions and to write up the evaluation.

Mary Layton

Performance Expectations and Review

Performance evaluation:

The town manager evaluation period shall be from 1 January to 31 December, or a fraction thereof. The selectboard will hold a public discussion of the manager's prior-year performance with reference to this **Performance and Review** document in January and set the performance expectations for the current year in that month with reference to the goals that the town manager submits to the selectboard, and updates as needed during the year, and with reference to those goals of the selectboard that require town manager support for implementation.

The selectboard performance evaluation of the town manager during the prior calendar year is due by 28 February of each year. If none has been completed by that date, the town manager's performance for the prior year shall be deemed to have been satisfactory.

The selectboard shall schedule public reviews of town manager performance, with any changes in goals, for the months of July, and January—more frequently, if performance is unsatisfactory. Members are expected to provide individual feedback, which is merely advisory, at any time. Performance feedback, which is the vote of the board and is consistent with 24 V.S.A. § 1236, shall be considered mandatory.

If the board by vote finds the manager's performance to be less than satisfactory at any point, *it shall schedule a public discussion at the earliest appropriate opportunity*. The board may, in case of severely deficient performance, give the manager a 28-day performance improvement period, after which the manager may be dismissed for cause, if the performance was not improved to the satisfactory level.

If the board by vote fails to provide input in time for correction of performance during the evaluation period, the town manager's performance shall be deemed to be satisfactory for that period.

The town manager shall receive a step increase with the first payroll period in March, subject to a selectboard finding of satisfactory performance for the prior year, either by a performance review or by default in the absence of a review.

This form may be used as an individual worksheet to help develop the voted evaluation by the board.

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

Instructions:

Unless the board votes otherwise at an interim review, the town manager's performance shall be deemed to be satisfactory and the incumbent shall be deemed eligible for a step increase as of the first payroll in March.

The following pass-fail rating system is available to assist the board in determining the level of performance; its use is optional if the manager's performance is deemed to be satisfactory. Board members individually rate performance elements as satisfactory/unsatisfactory. If a majority of the board individually scores the TM's performance as unsatisfactory in any element, the board should intervene immediately with the TM to improve the employee's performance.

The board should give its feedback in the form of commendations, recommendations and needs improvement, as follows.

Commendations:

This is an opportunity to show a board-voted appreciation for the manager's accomplishments during the rating period.

Recommendations:

This is an opportunity to articulate a board-voted shift in priorities for the future or other board-voted advice to the town manager.

Needs improvement:

If, at any point, the board votes the town manager's performance to need improvement, it shall give the town manager a specific amount of time to achieve improvement before being reflected in the annual performance review that follows the end of the improvement period. The board shall clearly articulate the area that requires improvement and how performance is measured to determine a satisfactory level. If the performance has not reached the satisfactory level, it shall be reported here.

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

Norwich Town Manager: (Name)

Review Period: (Date 1) - (Date 2)

Performance: Meets expectations / does not meet expectations

Comments :
<i>Commendations:</i>
<i>Recommendations:</i>
<i>Needs improvement:</i>

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

Discussion:	Initial:	Interim:	July:	Interim:	January:
Dates:					

Selectboard

Signatures

(Name), Chair:
(Name), Vice-Chair:
(Name):
(Name):
(Name):
(Name), Interim Town Manager:

Position Description Requires Update:

Yes

No

Signature acknowledges receipt only.

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

The following rating system is to *assist* the board in determining the level of performance; *its use is optional* if the manager's performance is deemed to be satisfactory. It is not intended to be part of the feedback to the employee.

Element	Supporting Goals (Recurring goals shown. <i>Add specific goals for the rating period.</i>)	Technical	Interpersonal
A. <i>Develops Budget</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assists Selectboard in development of budgetary guidelines. 2. The proposed budget meets voted board guidelines as set by September 15. 3. Budgetary briefing provides clear justifications and options. 4. Assists SB in developing final budget for Town Meeting approval. 5. <i>Specific goals (if applicable)</i> 		
B. <i>Manages Expenditures and Income</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Controls expenditures against budget. 2. Adapts to emergencies within the budget. 3. Applies appropriate controls to town financial obligations, consistent with SB financial policies. 4. Collects delinquent taxes. 5. <i>Specific goals (if applicable)</i> 		
C. <i>Manages Town Departments</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plans and approves departmental programs within budget. 2. Assures that departmental programs meet town expectations. 3. Assures that the town's fixed assets are maintained to expectations. 4. Assures that the town's capital assets are maintained to expectations. 5. Productive interactions with other town and state officials. 6. <i>Specific goals (if applicable)</i> 		

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

Element	Supporting Goals (Recurring goals shown. <i>Add specific goals for the rating period.</i>)	Technical	Interpersonal
D. <i>Manages Personnel Policies</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conducts documented interim and annual performance reviews of department heads. 2. Reviews and approves annual performance reviews, performed by department heads. 3. Promotes and supports policies that encourage staff development. 4. Pursues own development through courses and networking. 5. Assures compliance with personnel policies, EEO laws and other statutory requirements. 6. <i>Specific goals (if applicable)</i> 		
E. <i>Assists the Selectboard</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Selectboard in policy development. 2. Effectively conveys SB policy to departments and departmental concerns to SB. 3. Effectively implements policies and decisions. 4. Assists the SB in the development of a capital plan and budget. 5. Assists the SB in other strategic initiatives. 6. Effectively assists SB decision-making and problem solving. 7. <i>Specific goals (if applicable)</i> 		

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

Scoring Level of Performance: “Meets” is based on the level at which a similarly compensated, manager of average competency would perform. Any unsatisfactory **final** rating must be rendered only after the board has advised the town manager, by vote, of sub-standard performance and the performance still was sub-par after the time given for improvement, as voted by the board.

Term: Rating:	Meets ¹ Satisfactory (S)	Needs Improvement ² Unsatisfactory (U)
A. <i>Develops Budget</i>	<i>Technical:</i> Proposes budget that anticipates the town’s needs and that is likely to meet budgetary guidelines and maintain the UFB ³ and Capital Reserve Funds at target levels. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Budget properly reflects board and public input.	<i>Technical:</i> Proposes budget that fails to incorporate the resources for planned operations and projects and is likely to diminish the town’s finances in a few areas. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Budget fails to reflect elements of board and public input.
B. <i>Manages Expenditures and Income</i>	<i>Technical:</i> Adjusts spending among accounts and considers income and other factors to allow for the smooth operation of the town. Maintains the UFB and Capital Reserve Funds at target levels. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Provides timely updates to board. Provides timely guidance to departments.	<i>Technical:</i> Actions require moderate reduction of the UFB and Capital Reserve Funds from target levels. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Fails to provide timely updates to board or timely guidance to departments. Communications are unclear.
C. <i>Manages Town Departments</i>	<i>Technical:</i> Planning and execution of the roles of the town departments is consistent with town expectations. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Provides timely updates to board and public. Provides timely guidance to departments. Public satisfied with interactions. Productive interactions with other officials.	<i>Technical:</i> Planning and execution of the roles of the town departments overlooks foreseeable events. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Fails to provide timely updates to board and public or timely guidance to departments. Communications are unclear. Public dissatisfaction. Interactions with other officials create dissatisfaction.
D. <i>Manages Personnel Policies</i>	<i>Technical:</i> Contract negotiations, staffing and staff development are consistent with expectations. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Provides timely updates to board. Provides timely guidance to departments.	<i>Technical:</i> Elements of contract negotiations, staffing and staff development overlook foreseeable events. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Fails to provide timely updates to board or timely guidance to departments. Communications are unclear.

¹ To the degree, which a similarly compensated manager of average competency would be able to do so.

² Requires explanation in **Needs Improvement**.

³ Undesignated Fund Balance.

ba

Performance Expectations and Review

Term:	Meets ¹	Needs Improvement ²
Rating:	Satisfactory (S)	Unsatisfactory (U)
E. <i>Assists the Selectboard</i>	<i>Technical:</i> Proposes strategies, policies and other initiatives that are consistent with expectations. Provides timely and complete information on SB agenda items, including analysis on various options. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Provides useful support information to board.	<i>Technical:</i> Requested information provided to the Selectboard omits some readily available, pertinent data. <i>Interpersonal:</i> Support information to board lacks important elements. Supporting information is unclear or incomplete.

6a

Performance Expectations and Review

Standards: Reflect how a similarly compensated, manager of average competency would perform.

Standard	Knowledge, Skill or Ability from Job Description
<p>Technical: Addresses how well the TM conducts the basic duties of the position.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. Thorough knowledge of municipal management and community problems and potential solutions. 4.2. Thorough knowledge of municipal, state and federal programs and decision-making processes. 4.3. Thorough knowledge of financial administration and the design of financial accounting and reporting system. 4.4. Thorough knowledge of the theory and practice of public personnel administration. 4.5. Thorough understanding of administrative organization, design, and evaluation. 4.6. Thorough knowledge of computers programs and systems, including word-processing, spreadsheets, databases, networks and email. 4.7. Knowledge and skill in municipal processes and techniques. 4.8. Knowledge of collective bargaining procedures and practices. 4.9. Knowledge of road, drainage and bridge maintenance programs. 4.19. Ability to organize and use time effectively, and handle several significant responsibilities simultaneously. 4.21. Knowledge of municipal management practices.
<p>Interpersonal: Addresses how well the TM promotes teamwork, documents decisions, and responds to the needs of all those whom the TM's position affects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.10. Commitment to town's purposes and objectives, as determined by the voters and its boards and commissions. 4.11. Ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing with the Board, town officers and employees, the media and the public. 4.12. Ability to motivate and engender innovation and assumption of appropriate responsibility and decision-making by staff. 4.13. Ability to resolve conflict. 4.14. Ability to be creative and analytical. 4.15. Ability to direct, supervise and evaluate staff. 4.16. Ability to react quickly to changing situations that may be physically taxing. 4.17. Possession of public relations skills and publication knowledge. 4.18. Ability to motivate selectboard, other town boards and commissions, community groups, legislators, etc. 4.20. Ability to listen to and accept criticism.

MEMORANDUM

TO: NORWICH SELECTBOARD
FROM: STEPHEN N. FLANDERS
SUBJECT: COMPARISON OF PERFORMANCE RATING METHODS
DATE: JANUARY 17, 2017
CC: TOWN MANAGER

1. *Background* – John Carroll forwarded a template to the selectboard, dated 10 January 2017, that the board did not have time to review at its 11 January meeting. John spoke briefly to the item and explained that it was based on an approach that the selectboard had been using, of which there is a *new* proposed modification in the SB packet for 25 January, which reflects the *pass-fail* nature of our review process to determine the town manager's eligibility for a step increase.
2. *Summary of changes* – The revised Flanders method uses the performance matrix when there is doubt about the satisfactory performance of the town manager. Each element is rated by selectboard members as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If a majority finds an element to be unsatisfactory, that starts a discussion with the town manager.

The elements include two new items, as suggested by Mary Layton, one on relations with other officials and one on town manager networking and skill development.
3. *Comparison* – The purpose of this memo is to compare the two approaches and reflects input from John. This comparison is laid out in the following table.
4. *Thanks* – I thank John for his interest in and careful thought about this topic, which is included in an attached e-mail exchange.

Comparison between two performance rating approaches

Topic	Carroll	Flanders (Revised)	Commentary
Approach to deciding whether performance is satisfactory.	Have board members perform a numerical rating exercise.	Assume performance to be satisfactory, <i>unless the board identifies it to be otherwise</i> and acts on the unsatisfactory performance promptly and allows sufficient time for correction.	Carroll requires a numerical exercise. Flanders does not, <i>unless the board cannot agree</i> on satisfactory performance.
Main responsibilities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Serve</i>/support SB 2. Manage budget process 3. Oversee departments & programs 4. Control expenditures & revenues 5. Manage special projects (agreed each year). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop budget 2. Manage expense & income 3. Manage town departments 4. Manage personnel policies 5. <i>Assists</i> SB <p>Note: Non-recurring items are inserted in the above structure, as appropriate.</p>	24 V.S.A. § 1236 says: "To perform all duties now conferred by law upon the selectboard, ... , render the selectboard such assistance as it shall require."
Rating dimensions for each responsibility	<i>Functional</i> effectiveness and <i>interpersonal</i> effectiveness.	<i>Technical</i> and <i>Interpersonal</i> .	Either one is fine, as long as it is defined.
Rating scale for each responsibility	Scale of 1 through 5, based on the SB member's <i>subjective</i> opinion.	<i>Satisfactory</i> or <i>Unsatisfactory</i> , based on a two-column table of examples.	The Carroll method assumes that, on the average, justice will prevail. The Flanders method requires a majority.

Topic	Carroll	Flanders (Revised)	Commentary
Narrative	<i>Each member describes the most important thing done well and thing to be done better.</i>	<i>The board agrees on language for commendations and recommendations. If improvement is still needed, the board describes that.</i>	The board, as a body, is the TM's supervisor. Member input should only contribute to the decision of the body.
Tabulation of scores	Averages all scores and assumes the result will constitute a consensus. Band for satisfactory performance is above 2.25. Scores are shared with TM.	Majority rules on whether a performance element is <i>satisfactory</i> or <i>unsatisfactory</i> . Scores are for SB discussion only.	Carroll provides a composite score to TM. Flanders' majority votes serve to identify problem areas for discussion, but are not in feedback.
Summary	Method is the sum of individual input, both in narrative and score, which the TM receives.	Method is the result of deliberation of the body. No tabulation of votes is required unless there is lack of consensus about satisfactory performance.	Carroll method requires more steps, unless performance is unsatisfactory, then Flanders method requires reference to standards of performance in a table.

6a

From: Stephen Flanders <stephen.flanders@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: DRAFT comparison between two performance rating schemes--Pass-fail alternative--Steve's reply
Date: January 18, 2017 at 5:18 PM
To: Carroll John <jc@ompom.us>
Cc: Layton Mary <mary@layton.org>, Miranda Bergmeier



Dear John,

Thank for this response.

In the main, I concur with your concerns and thought that they were already expressed in previous discussions. I will check my now further-revised material to look for ways it might be interpreted, as it spoke to you.

I've annotated your text, below.

Cheers, Steve

On Jan 18, 2017, at 11:12 AM, John Carroll <jc@ompom.us> wrote:

Dear Steve,

Thanks for your thoughtful response to my email of 15 January.

I've reviewed the changes you made to your proposal. It seems to me that your proposal is still fundamentally flawed by its "break-glass-in-case-of-emergency" approach. My concern continues unaddressed:

"... your approach doesn't provide any feed-back or guidance to the TM at all — unless and until the Board can reach a consensus that the TM's performance is unsatisfactory. This is like closing the paddock gate after the horse has wandered off."

My approach *emphasizes written feedback*. It doesn't use the matrix method of scoring/rating, unless the board can't concur whether TM's performance is satisfactory. If some find an element of performance to be unsatisfactory, then the use of the matrix will help focus the discussion on where and what. It will also identify whether a majority of the board agrees on the hypothesized deficiency.

I'm sure that you don't intend to, but your approach sets up the Board for failure in its duty to provide evaluative oversight and guidance to the Town Manager on a regular basis. Your proposal has the Board wait until the TM's performance is unsatisfactory before it begins any systematic evaluation and feedback process. That's 'way too late.

My approach posits a minimum of two assessments of performance annually, more if there is perceived unsatisfactory performance. I have longed stressed that, as soon as there is an issue of unsatisfactory performance, it's time to act *immediately*.

Perhaps that's the approach used in your work for the federal government, but I can tell you for certain that it's not the way that highly effective organizations in the the non-profit and private sectors in the Upper Valley — like King Arthur Flour and Hypertherm, VNH and Kendal — go about evaluating and guiding their key employees. As I said in my earlier email, these organizations ...

"...don't wait for performance to get unsatisfactory before they start evaluating a key employee. They monitor and evaluate the employee's performance from the get-go and on a regular basis — say, twice a year — and they provide feed-back and guidance on a regular basis. This approach keeps lines of communication open, avoids surprises, and supports continuous

improvement.”

I concur completely and believe that my past and revised methods achieve that. It’s just that, on occasion, past boards have not convened to address perceived deficient performance promptly. It wasn’t a function of what assessment method that they were using. Bi-ennial reviews are standard in the federal government and timely advice of substandard performance is required of each supervisor.

A further concern: your proposal seems more interested in guaranteeing that the TM gets an annual, virtually automatic, "step-increase" in pay — than in encouraging the Board to do timely and effective evaluations. Under your proposal, the TM automatically gets a step-increase if the Board doesn’t complete its evaluation by a date certain. This sets up a perverse incentive: you give the TM a financial incentive to hope that the Board *fails* to do its evaluation on a timely basis. In other words, *the TM wins if the Board fails!* Not exactly what one would call “organizational alignment”.

I see this in mirror image. There is no “perverse incentive” for the town manager—he/she can’t delay the board’s timely review. Instead, it’s an incentive for the board to act on time, or to forever to hold its peace. The expectation among all employees should be that they are doing a satisfactory job, unless there is timely advice from the supervisor that they are not.

Finally, you’ve advocated that the TM’s contract include language that spells out the Board’s evaluation process. This seems to me wrong-headed. It sets the Board up for “breach of contract” claims by the TM should the Board decide to conduct its evaluation process in a different manner. This cannot possibly be in the Town’s best interest.

The intent is to make the board’s responsibilities explicit over the length of the contract. The contract would only specify *when* the review would take place, not *how* it would be conducted—that would remain flexible, based on the desired approach of future boards.

As always Steve, I appreciate your invitation to share my views. I hope they are helpful to you and to the Board.

kind regards,

JC

On Jan 16, 2017, at 10:18 AM, Stephen Flanders <stephen.n.flanders@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear John,

I would not fault the form of the board’s assessment scheme in the past, so much as its failure to provide *any* assessment as soon as a majority felt that the employee's performance was not to its liking. Instead, negative individual assessments were saved until the end of the performance period, before being expressed. The correct procedure would have been for the board to give the employee *prompt* notice of unsatisfactory performance and an opportunity to correct it. The lack of prompt notice from the board with such an opportunity was the primary cause of impasse, in my opinion.

Past practice has been for individuals to provide both narrative and scoring input. However, there’s been a reluctance of some on the board to have their individual voices come out in the narrative or scoring, which is just as well, since the performance rating should be the voted voice of the board.

Thinking about it, the use of a numeric system is probably a red herring, since this is really a *pass-fail* system that determines whether the employee receives a step increase, not a numerical rating that determines the size of a bonus. With that in mind, I have drafted a revised pass-fail system that meets my desire for comparative objectivity (which you find unconvincing) and is much simpler than before. I would appreciate your thoughts on the attached.

Cheers, Steve

<Performance Expectations and Review-Generic 2017-01-16.doc>

On Jan 15, 2017, at 10:52 PM, John Carroll <jc@ompom.us> wrote:

dear Steve,

Thanks for your note.

I've reviewed your comparison of the two performance-rating schemes. Many of your characterizations strike me as accurate.

However, your analysis seems to me flawed to the degree that you characterize one approach (mine) as producing "*subjective*" results, while you characterize the other approach (yours) as producing "*objective*" results. To put it kindly, I'd say that your analysis itself is pretty subjective.

In fact, the approach I've offered is neither subjective nor objective: it is *inclusive*. My approach allows for each member of the Selectboard to have an equal and individual voice in the evaluation of the Town Manager. Certainly, Board members should have opportunity to present to each other their views on the TM's performance, and to learn of others' concerns, even to debate. But in the end, each Member deserves the opportunity to vote his or her own assessment of the TM's performance. The scoring process I've proposed allows each Member's perspective to weigh equally. Taken together, the composite of the Members' ratings constitutes the Board's evaluation of the Town Manager.

As I described to the Selectboard at Wednesday's meeting, the Board would review its resulting composite scoring sheet with the Town Manager, thus informing the TM of the Board's assessment of each of the key dimensions of the TM's work. This detailed feed-back affords the TM the opportunity to understand the parts of his/her work the Board considers to be strong, and those parts that the Board thinks need improvement.

This approach is consistent with widely-recognized best practices in performance evaluation. Today, most effective organizations in the non-profit and private sectors don't wait for performance to get unsatisfactory before they start evaluating a key employee. They monitor and evaluate the employee's performance from the get-go and on a regular basis — say, twice a year — and they provide feed-back and guidance on a regular basis. This approach keeps lines of communication open, avoids surprises, and supports continuous improvement.

By contrast, your approach doesn't provide *any* feed-back or guidance to the TM at all — unless and until the Board can reach a consensus that the TM's performance is unsatisfactory. This is like closing the paddock gate after the horse has wandered off.

Your approach seems not have worked very well in the last few years. My guess is that Board disagreements become so acrimonious that the Members avoid dealing with concerns about the TM's performance until things reach a boiling point. By that time it's too late for consensus among Board members and 'way too late for improvement by the Town Manager.

I grant you that in a more homogeneous organization — say, a small company or non-profit — your let's-debate-it-'til-we-agree approach may work okay. But not here. This Selectboard is anything but homogeneous! As you know from experience, the Selectboard brings together a changing cast of five people of very different backgrounds and experience. What works for one or two may not work at all for the others.

I think it's time to "dance with the ones that brung ya" — meaning, *find a way forward that can work for everyone on the Board*. I'll be the first to acknowledge that the simple approach I've proposed is not perfect. But it's workable, and more importantly, it can make sense to all members of the Board. I'd suggest that the Board run for a year or so with the approach we discussed last Wednesday. Then, if need be, the process can be improved by future Boards.

best regards,

JC

On Jan 13, 2017, at 4:48 PM, Stephen Flanders <stephen.n.flanders@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi John,

Thank you for your interest in and thoughtful input on this topic. I gave your approach (as I understand it) a careful look and compared it to my revised proposal that was in the 11 January SB packet. Here's my first look at how the two compare. I'm hoping that you'll correct any mischaracterizations that I may have made, before I include it in the next SB packet.

<Memo comparing rating systems 2017-01-13.docx>

Sincerely, Steve F.

Stephen Flanders, Member of the Norwich Selectboard
317 Hopson Road
Norwich, Vermont 05055

802-649-1134 (Home)

Any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to the Vermont Public Records Act. Any views expressed in this e-mail are mine and may not reflect those of the board. Vermont statutes confer no special powers to individual selectboard members. Statutory selectboard powers arise from actions of the body at warned, public meetings with a few exceptions.

MEMORANDUM

TO: NORWICH SELECTBOARD
FROM: STEPHEN N. FLANDERS
SUBJECT: CONCEPTS FOR INCORPORATION INTO A TOWN MANAGER CONTRACT
DATE: JANUARY 4, 2017
CC: TOWN MANAGER

1. On drafting a town manager contract, I propose that the following concept be incorporated by an attorney, who is *knowledgeable in Vermont municipal and employment law*:

Conclusion of contract term – Upon conclusion of the contract term, the employee will vacate the town manager position, unless a continuing contract is agreed upon.

This clarifies what happens at the end of the contract in light of Nelson vs. St. Johnsbury. *A resolution to this issue is untested in case law.* Because this is a matter that *we shouldn't take as routine*, I recommend engaging either Susan Gilfillan¹ of McNeil Leddy & Sheahan P.C. or Paul Gillies² of Tarrant, Gillies & Richardson to address the conclusion of the contract term.

Possible motion: I move to authorize _____ to engage attorney, _____, to draft language pertaining to "*Conclusion of contract term*", as discussed.

2. The following concepts are sufficiently routine that they can be incorporated by whomever the board wishes to engage for the basic contract:

a. *Notice for changes to infrastructure* – The town manager shall advise the selectboard of any planned changes to the town's infrastructure at least 28 days before they are scheduled and, simultaneously, provide public notice of the same, in order to receive feedback from the selectboard and the public. Shorter notice may be given in case of urgent repair of damage to the town's infrastructure. Restoration to an original state would not constitute "change", whereas increase in extent or alteration of design would constitute "change".

b. *Performance evaluation* – The town manager evaluation period shall be from 1 January to 31 December, or a fraction thereof. The selectboard will hold a public discussion of the manager's prior-year performance with reference to the most recently adopted *Performance and Review* document in January and set the performance expectations for the current year in that

¹ Vermont employment law expert

² Vermont municipal law expert

month with reference to the goals that the town manager submits to the selectboard, and updates as needed during the year, and with reference to those goals of the selectboard that require town manager support for implementation.

The selectboard performance evaluation of the town manager during the prior calendar year is due by 28 February of each year. If none has been completed by that date, the town manager's performance for the prior year shall be deemed to have been satisfactory.

The selectboard shall schedule public reviews of town manager performance, with any changes in expectations, for the months of April, July, and October. Members are expected to provide individual feedback at that time, which is merely advisory. Performance feedback, which is the vote of the board and is consistent with 24 V.S.A. § 1236, shall be considered mandatory.

If the board by vote finds the manager's performance to be less than satisfactory at any point, it shall schedule a public discussion at the earliest appropriate opportunity. The board may, in case of severely deficient performance, give the manager a 28-day performance improvement period, after which the manager may be dismissed for cause, if the performance was not improved to the satisfactory level.

If the board by vote fails to provide input in time for correction of performance during the evaluation period, the town manager's performance shall be deemed to be satisfactory for that period.

The town manager shall receive a step increase with the first payroll period in March, subject to a selectboard finding of satisfactory performance for the prior year, either by a performance review or by default in the absence of a review.

c. *Misconduct* – Should an allegation of conduct incompatible with the town manager position arise, the selectboard may schedule an executive session under the disciplinary or dismissal action against a public officer or employee provision of 1 V.S.A. § 313. A serious breach of the public trust may result in immediate dismissal for cause.

My rationale for each is, as follows, keyed to the proposed concepts:

a. Helps the town manager avoid negative reactions from the public or the board on proposed changes to the town's infrastructure. The feedback received is advisory and does not inhibit the manager's ability to execute the job properly, but it would be a performance issue, if the manager failed to give appropriate advanced notice. *Alternatively, this could be in the selectboard performance expectations of the town manager.*

b. Clarifies the selectboard's responsibility to give timely feedback on the town manager's performance and to intervene promptly, when correction is required.

c. Clarifies the distinction between *performance* and *conduct* issues as causes for corrective action.

Possible motion: I move to authorize _____ to engage attorney, _____, to draft language pertaining to “*Notice for changes to infrastructure*”, “*Performance evaluation*”, and “*Misconduct*” as discussed.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Norwich Select Board
FROM: Mary Layton
SUBJECT: Town Manager Contract Elements, pages 1 & 2
DATE: January 5, 2017
CC: David Ormiston, Miranda Bergmeier

The following are my thoughts about essential elements to include in a Town Manager contract, and an opinion of whom to ask to draft the contract. I think the contract should be simple, clear, and well thought out. It should be written with clarity to avoid litigation.

I do not think a large law firm needs to be engaged to do this work. I think it would be prudent to ask the Norwich Town attorney Frank Olmstead to create the draft. Our Town attorney is familiar with and loyal to the Town. A larger firm may be more expensive as they do not have a relationship with Norwich and may not expect much repeat business with the Town.

I recently read summaries of termination cases brought to the VT Supreme Court provided to me by a local retired attorney. The cases included Nelson vs. St Johnsbury (2015), Sarvis vs. VT State Colleges (2001), Taylor vs. National Life (1993), and Ross vs. Times Mirror (1995). The summaries suggest to me that the following elements are essential to avoid litigation: offer a term contract, with earlier termination for good cause, offer terms that are clear, and include a clause that states that the contract supersedes all other documents, promises, conversations, or offers. In addition I have noticed that VLCT has recommended a severability clause. The recent Interim Town Manager contract was based in part on the Personnel Policy. If we use the policy as a basis we should explicitly state that

the manual is not binding on the employer and can be changed at any time. Use of arbitration instead of litigation to resolve disputes would be efficient and economical.

Whom to Work With to Draft the Contract:

Work with Town Attorney Frank Olmstead to create a draft contract.

Essential Terms:

Offer a term contract of three years. A year before the end of the contract the parties discuss renewal.

State that all conversations, written statements, personnel policy rules, and promises are superseded by the contract.

Include a severability clause.

Termination is for good cause.

Use Arbitration to resolve disputes.

Some specific contract terms:

Offer a term of three years. The contract is renewable within six months of the end of the term by mutual agreement. The contract can only be amended or changed by a new written express amendment. Termination may be issued at any time for good cause, specifically: dishonesty, criminal conduct, harassment, incompetence, or insubordination. Annual pay raises are contingent upon a satisfactory evaluation by the Selectboard.

The Norwich Personnel Policy will be the basis for the contract to the extent that it is appropriate for the Town Manager position. Terms of the Personnel Policy that conflict with terms of the employment contract shall be superseded by the contract terms. The employee manual is not binding on the employer and the employer can change the manual at any time.

Miranda Bergmeier

From: Ann Greenwald <anngreenwald@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 2:07 PM
To: David Ormiston; Miranda Bergmeier
Subject: I support a new Norwich swimming hole

Dear Town Manager and Selectboard Members,

There was not much better on a hot summer day than jumping into the clear waters of the Norwich pool. I miss it and would love to see this wonderful town asset be restored to its former life. I hope that a solution can be found to restore the pool in such a way as to make everyone happy. My children grew up swimming there and memories of time on the float are priceless.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ann Greenwald

David Ormiston

From: Hope Hussey <hhussey11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 4:56 AM
To: David Ormiston; Miranda Bergmeier
Subject: Norwich Pool

To the manager and Selectboard,

I am writing in support of replacing the "old Norwich Pool" with a new streamside pool. I grew up in Norwich and spent every summer swimming at the Norwich Pool. I learned to swim there and spent countless days swimming with friends and family. It would be a shame if the kids and families now could not have the same experience.

Even though I know live in Maine, I would be willing to donate (as would so many others who live near and far) to have a new Norwich Pool.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hope Hussey
325 Greely Rd
North Yarmouth, ME 04097

Sent from my iPhone

David Ormiston

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 07, 2017 10:59 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: unassigned fund balance

Hi Dave,
Wondering if you were able to obtain the unassigned town fund balance as of Dec 31, 2016?
Claudette

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 11:16 AM
To: 'claudette brochu'; Miranda Bergmeier
Cc: lcook2825@gmail.com; 'Christopher Ashley'; dangoulet53@gmail.com; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: Fund Balance

Claudette,

Here is the information pertaining to fund balance for the year ending June 30th, 2016. It is very important that you understand what these numbers mean and what they pertain to. To use these numbers loosely and without a full understanding is a misuse of the information provided.

The Town of Norwich Selectboard Financial Policy #2 states that the Town of Norwich should maintain an Undesignated General Fund Balance. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) and the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) recommends an Undesignated General Fund Balance of 15% of the General Fund operating expenditures

Fund Balance (June 30, 2016)	= \$1,272,948
<u>Prepays & Inventory (2016 Actual)</u>	= \$ <u>41,827</u>
Total Fund Balance (June 30, 2016)	= \$1,231,121

Used in 2016-17 to offset taxes	= \$ <u>267,800</u>
	\$ 963,321
Proposed offset to 2017-18 taxes	= \$ <u>189,317</u>
	\$ 774,004

16% of total FY18 Budget	= \$ 774,004
--------------------------	--------------

Thank you,

Dave Ormiston
Interim Town Manager
Town of Norwich
P.O. Box 376
Norwich, VT 05055
802-649-1419 x102

Please note that any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Vermont Public Records Act.

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 11:25 AM
To: 'claudette brochu'; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: RE: unassigned fund balance

Claudette,

The unassigned fund balance either increases or decreases depending on whether the municipal budget runs a surplus or deficit. Since it is not known whether the budget runs a surplus or deficit until the Fiscal Year End this is calculated only at year end.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston

From: claudette brochu [<mailto:cbrochu30@gmail.com>]
Sent: Saturday, January 07, 2017 10:59 PM
To: David Ormiston; Linda Cook; Miranda Bergmeier; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton; Stephen Flanders
Subject: unassigned fund balance

Hi Dave,
Wondering if you were able to obtain the unassigned town fund balance as of Dec 31, 2016?
Claudette

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston
Interim Town Manager
Town of Norwich

From: claudette brochu [mailto:cbrochu30@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 11:48 PM

To: Linda Cook; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders; Christopher Ashley

Cc: David Ormiston; Miranda Bergmeier

Subject: health care costs-new info

I wanted to update the board with healthcare info based on Linda's questions to Dave and his response. I did not crunch the numbers to show the total amount the town is overpaying, especially since the info on which employee is enrolled in which plan is not available to me but you can do the rough math. The enclosed table does NOT include Platinum plans since we are not paying 100% of premiums for those plans.

Make NO mistake, with the EXCEPTION of employees in Platinum plans, the town is paying significantly more than what VT HealthConnect is charging. The difference between what VT HealthConnect is charging versus what the town is paying is going into an employee HRA account. To the best of my understanding, the HRA accounts do not need to be spent down by the end of the year but are similar to Health Savings Accounts in which the balance is cumulative over time similar to a traditional savings account. I am unaware of ANY company or town paying similar healthcare costs.

I am submitting this info the the board as an FYI only. No more Listserve posts.

Respectfully,
Claudette Brochu

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 10:18 AM
To: 'claudette brochu'; Linda Cook; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders; Christopher Ashley
Cc: Miranda Bergmeier
Subject: RE: health care costs-new info

Claudette,

As you point out, under the answers that I gave to both Linda Cook and the Norwich Selectboard, the employees of the Town of Norwich are enrolled with several different health plans all of which are through Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Vermont. As a matter of fact, the employees have a choice of ten different types of health plans. These plans are set up and offered through Vermont Health Connect and offer differing deductibles, benefits and in return have different premiums. The fact that the employees may choose from ten different health care plans is not a choice of the Town of Norwich but is instead mandated through the Affordable Care Act and the State of Vermont.

Under this scenario, the trick becomes - how to provide health insurance equally to each employee and still follow the spirit of the law. A law that encourages them to pick between ten different health care plans with each plan having a different premium and deductible. To do so, we presently offer an "allowance" to the employee for health care benefits. If the employee chooses a plan that has a premium that is greater than the "allowance" then the employee needs to pay the difference. If an employee chooses a plan that has a premium that is less than the "allowance" then the difference between the "allowance" and premium goes toward an HRA or HSA account. The employee does not get the extra "allowance" as a wage but instead the difference goes to the HRA or HSA account. Both the HRA and HSA's can only be used for health related expenses allowable by the IRS. In the case of an HRA, if the money is not used in any given year then the employee then loses it. In the case of an HSA, the money can be carried over year to year. However, in order to be able to pair an HSA account with a health benefit plan you need to choose a High Deductible Health Care Plan. A person with a high deductible plan will pay more "out of pocket" expenses compared to a person with a low deductible plan such as the Platinum or traditional Gold Plan. The HRA or HSA accounts pay for the "out of pocket" expenses as allowable under IRS rules.

What I haven't heard is any complaints as to how the Platinum or traditional Gold Plan work. In this case, the premium is high enough that the employee needs to pay for the difference between the "allowance" and the premium. Although, if all our employees are on the Platinum Plan we then open ourselves up to the "Cadillac Tax".

If you only want to pay for the premiums and with no differential going towards an HRA or HSA for the high deductible plan that an employee actually chooses - than there is very little incentive for an employee to pick a high deductible plan. Therefore, every employee will pick the Platinum or traditional Gold Plan leaving us no better than we are now. We would still be paying the same "allowance" to everyone.

Therefore, to comply with the spirit of the law, the Town of Norwich allows each employee to choose a plan. The Town then pays an "allowance" for a plan. This allows the employee to choose the plan that works best for him or her. What I also haven't heard is a viable alternative to this method that still functions under the Affordable Care Act and the Vermont Health Connect. However, I also would not spend much time thinking about it because there is a strong consensus that the health care laws will change under the incoming President, President-Elect Trump. If that is the case this whole discussion may become a moot point.

Finally, this is also outlined in our collective bargaining agreement with our unionized employees and is part of our contract with them.

David Ormiston

From: claudette brochu <cbrochu30@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 8:33 PM
To: David Ormiston
Cc: Linda Cook; Mary Layton; Dan Goulet; Stephen Flanders; Christopher Ashley; Miranda Bergmeier
Subject: Re: health care costs-new info

Dave,
Just some background... retired RN with a Master's degree and consumer of healthcare. I am well aware of how health insurance works.

My rationale for providing the board with what we are spending on health insurance costs is so that the full board can see exactly what we are spending and not just percentage increases as a line item. It is my understanding that until my specific questions re: health insurance costs were asked, the board (or certain members) had not seen this information so were not aware of exactly how much money were are spending.

The employees not covered under the collective bargaining agreement are being provided the same benefits as employees covered under contract. Thus far, the consensus of the board has been to continue this practice but who is to say it can not be changed? For example, the board could vote to allocate what VTHealthConnect charges in each category(single, couple, etc) for a Gold or Silver plan (the precise dollar amount would be up to the board). If the employee chooses a higher priced plan, the employee covers the difference. This is not a new concept. Cut the allowance for employees not covered under an employment contract.

I beg to differ with you on the HRA. Everything I read is that a HRA CAN be rolled over, it just can not be transferred if an employee ends their employment. Also, HRAs are employer funded, not employee.
Claudette

On Tue, Jan 10, 2017 at 10:17 AM, David Ormiston <DOrmiston@norwich.vt.us> wrote:

Claudette,

As you point out, under the answers that I gave to both Linda Cook and the Norwich Selectboard, the employees of the Town of Norwich are enrolled with several different health plans all of which are though Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Vermont. As a matter of fact, the employees have a choice of ten different types of health plans. These plans are set up and offered through Vermont Health Connect and offer differing deductibles, benefits and in return have different premiums. The fact that the employees may choose from ten different health care plans is not a choice of the Town of Norwich but is instead mandated though the Affordable Care Act and the State of Vermont.

Under this scenario, the trick becomes - how to provide health insurance equally to each employee and still follow the spirit of the law. A law that encourages them to pick between ten different health care plans with each plan having a different premium and deductible. To do so, we presently offer an "allowance" to the employee for health care benefits. If the employee chooses a plan that has a premium that is greater than the "allowance" then the employee needs to pay the difference. If an employee chooses a plan that has a premium that is less than the "allowance" then

David Ormiston

From: Stephen Flanders <stephen.n.flanders@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 3:24 PM
To: David Ormiston
Cc: Miranda Bergmeier; Ashley Christopher; Cook Linda; Layton Mary; Goulet Dan
Subject: Re: Draft Contract w/Jay White--Flanders' comments

Dave,

Here are my comments on what you you sent, which I will bring up at the meeting:

- Project description should mirror program.
- Should include no additional costs, including permitting.
- Professional liability for single occurrence should exceed the expected construction cost and be kept in place until the statute of limitations has run out it is either six or eight years in Vermont.
- Section 3.2 has already been completed.
- Section 3.5.3 is not applicable, if we're bidding.
- Section 3.6.3 should include a provision that, during the construction phase, waivers of lien shall be submitted with any request for payment by the contractor.
- Section 4. Itemization should be included in Article 3 of the contract for a fixed price, not in additional services. If there's a change in scope, it should be negotiated between the parties. Here are some questions about what I see:
 - Detailed cost estimating has only been done for the preliminary design, not for the final design with any changes in scope. It's important to know the itemized cost in order to structure the bid properly to include features above the most basic option. •
 - Telecommunications design. The tower and the data entry point to a rack-mounted telecommunications system are the architect's responsibility. The nature of the antennas and the rack-mounted equipment are the owner's responsibility. Placement of the equipment will be in consultation with the owner. •
 - Security evaluation. I don't know what this is about—it seems to be that any security systems should be included in the electrical design.
- Article 7 should include:
 - Ownership of Documents: All data, including research and information gathered, project analyses, data and materials, as well as reports, plans, drawings and specifications prepared or furnished by Consultant and the Consultant's subcontractors for the Project under this Agreement, together with all materials and data furnished to the Consultant by the Owner under the provisions of the Agreement, shall be the property of the Owner. The Consultant retains the right to retain a copy of such analyses, data and materials for its professional uses and defense against any claim. The Owner shall not be limited in its use thereof at any time.
- Article 8 should include:
 - Disputes: If a claim or dispute arises out of this Agreement or its performance, the parties agree to endeavor in good faith to resolve it equitably through negotiation, or if that fails, through non-binding mediation under the rules of the American Arbitration Association, before having recourse to the courts. However, prior to or during negotiation or mediation, either party may initiate litigation that would otherwise become barred by a statute of limitations.
- Article 11 Should be fixed scope and cost, including Pathways. Any additions to scope negotiated.
- Section 11.4 should be in base price.

- Section 11.10: Should have 10% retainage.
- Article 12 Sprinkler design mechanical design should be specified in contract.
- RD instructions should be deleted.
- Have an attorney draft a clean contract.

You may wish to pass these on to Jay, so that he has time to think about a response prior to the meeting.

Sincerely, Steve F.

Stephen Flanders, Member of the Norwich Selectboard
 317 Hopson Road
 Norwich, Vermont 05055

802-649-1134 (Home)

Any response or reply to this electronic message may be subject to the Vermont Public Records Act. Any views expressed in this e-mail are mine and may not reflect those of the board. Vermont statutes confer no special powers to individual selectboard members. Statutory selectboard powers arise from actions of the body at warned, public meetings with a few exceptions.

On Dec 28, 2016, at 12:27 PM, David Ormiston <DOrmiston@norwich.vt.us> wrote:

BCC – Norwich Selectboard

Good Afternoon,

I have attached a draft of the contract with Jay White for the remaining services pertaining to the Public Safety Building. This is a draft that is not yet final but very close. The overall content should give you a very good idea as to where we are at and prepare you for the meeting on January 4th. There are some small changes that Jay White needs to correct and then we can finalize this. He has indicated that he does not have any issues with the remaining edits to this draft. However, I wanted to get this into your hands for today.

The following are the items I have outlined to him that need clarification before this can be final. Again, he has indicated that he will clarify these. We will have a "final" draft next week.

§ 1.1 – I think the outline of specifications and architectural basis of design and specific cost estimates from Engineering Services of Vermont, Upland Construction and Pathways Consulting, dated 8/19/2016, should be a part of the attachments along with the summary of cost estimates. Included should be the handout from 8/24/2016 of Net Zero vs. Min. Code Building Comparison.

Also, need in § 1.1 the language including the "outline of services and costs" as presented by Jay White to the Norwich Selectboard on Nov. 16th and amended on December 20th, 2016.

§ 5.5 – We've talked about this briefly but isn't 5.5 a basic service of the civil engineering provided by the Architect's Sub-Contractor, Pathway's Consulting?

§ 7.1 – 7.4 - should all say "See Attachment 2".

David Ormiston

From: Nancy Dean <nhdean@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2017 12:36 AM
To: Miranda Bergmeier
Cc: David Ormiston
Subject: FEMA money

Dear Board Members,

Since it is exceedingly difficult for me to attend your Wednesday night meetings, I am sending you my questions.

It was my understanding that the FEMA dollars, roughly half a million, were to be assigned to the fire and police buildings. Recently, I heard that the money would/could be used for the proposed pool replacement. So, how can it be used twice? Or which would take precedence, if both could not be financed by the same dollars? And, then, how would the losing project be funded?

I will appreciate your reply.

Sincerely,

Nancy H. Dean

David Ormiston

From: David Ormiston
Sent: Sunday, January 15, 2017 11:34 AM
To: Nancy Dean
Cc: Miranda Bergmeier
Subject: Re: FEMA money

Good Morning Nancy,

Actually, the FEMA money is for neither the Police/Fire Building or the proposed pool replacement. Instead, the FEMA money is specifically for three "Alternative Proects" which include 1) cleaning up the old pool site, 2) renovating and putting an addition on the Highway Garage Building and 3) Purchasing a new loader for the highway department. The "Alternative Projects" we're a substitution for the rebuilding of the original Norwich Pool Dam when it was learned that the town would not be able to get a permit for the rebuilding of it.

The Police/Fire Building is being financed through a 30 year bond note. The latest proposed "pool" idea at the old Pool Site is just that - a proposal. No financing has been determined yet and no formal action has been taken by the Selectboard on the idea - as of now.

Thank you,
Dave Ormiston
Interim Town Manager
Town of Norwich

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 14, 2017, at 12:36 AM, Nancy Dean <nhdean@comcast.net> wrote:

Dear Board Members,

Since it is exceedingly difficult for me to attend your Wednesday night meetings, I am sending you my questions.

It was my understanding that the FEMA dollars, roughly half a million, were to be assigned to the fire and police buildings. Recently, I heard that the money would/could be used for the proposed pool replacement. So, how can it be used twice? Or which would take precedence, if both could not be financed by the same dollars? And, then, how would the losing project be funded?

I will appreciate your reply.

Sincerely,

Nancy H. Dean

RECEIVED
JAN 12 2017
TOWN MANAGER'S



To: Members of the Vermont League of Cities and Towns

From: Maura Carroll, Executive Director

Re: Warning of VLCT Special Membership Meeting, Wednesday, Feb. 15, 2017

Date: January 10, 2017

Following our annual meeting at Town Fair last October, the VLCT Board of Directors discussed how the conduct of the meeting might be improved so as to make the adoption of the Municipal Policy less confusing. This has been a recurring issue for several years, and the Board has now decided to ask the membership to address it.

Enclosed with this memo is a warning for a special meeting of the VLCT membership on Wednesday, February 15, 2017, at the Capitol Plaza Hotel and Conference Center, 100 State Street, Montpelier, Vt., at 1:30 in the afternoon. The special meeting is called by the VLCT Board of Directors pursuant to Article VI, Section 2, of the Bylaws of the Vermont League of Cities and Towns. The purpose of the meeting is to vote upon a proposal to amend the VLCT Bylaws as they pertain to adoption of the VLCT Municipal Policy.

Also enclosed is a voting delegate form for the special meeting. Please take time to appoint a current local official as voting delegate, and then return the form to info@vlct.org.

Pursuant to Article VI, Section 3, of the Bylaws, the presence of representatives from ten percent of the full member towns and cities shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Vermont League of Cities and Towns.

The special membership meeting will take place as part of Local Government Day in the Legislature. Should your voting delegate plan to attend only the special meeting, please inform us at info@vlct.org or by calling the VLCT offices at 800-649-7915.

If you have any questions regarding the amendment itself, please contact me at mcarroll@vlct.org. We look forward to seeing you at the special meeting.

Sponsor of:

VLCT Employment
Resource and Benefits
Trust, Inc.

VLCT Municipal
Assistance Center

VLCT Property and
Casualty Intermunicipal
Fund, Inc.

enclosures

RECEIVED
JAN 12 2017
TOWN MANAGER'S OFFICE

Serving and Strengthening Vermont Local Governments

**VLCT SPECIAL BUSINESS MEETING
Local Government Day in the Legislature
Wednesday, February 15, 2017
Capitol Plaza**

1:30 - 2:00 p.m. (immediately following luncheon speaker)

DELEGATE DESIGNATION FORM

**We, the Selectboard/City Council of _____,
designate the following individual as the voting delegate for our city/
town at the 2017 Special Business Meeting for the purpose of
amending the VLCT Bylaws:**

Name (please print)	Position

**We understand that the above individual will represent the city/town
as a voting member of the VLCT membership.**

Signed,

Chairperson

Date

**Please complete and return by Friday, February 10, 2017, to VLCT, 89 Main Street,
Suite 4, Montpelier, VT 05602 or email to info@vlct.org. If you prefer, you may fax it to
us at 802-229-2211 or submit it at the special meeting on Local Government Day.**

**Please note that this is not a Local Government Day registration form. Visit our
website, www.vlct.org/eventscalendar/, to register on-line.**

**If you plan to attend only the VLCT Special Meeting please check below. There is no
charge to attend just the special meeting.**

I will *only* be attending the VLCT Special Meeting.

WARNING
VERMONT LEAGUE OF CITIES AND TOWNS
SPECIAL MEETING
1:30 PM, Wednesday, February 15, 2017
Capitol Plaza Hotel and Conference Center
100 State Street, Montpelier, Vt.

Pursuant to Article VI, Section 2, of the Bylaws, the Board of Directors of the Vermont League of Cities and Towns (VLCT) hereby warns and notifies the VLCT town and city members to meet at the Capitol Plaza Hotel and Conference Center, 100 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont, on Wednesday, February 15, at 1:30 in the afternoon, to act upon the following amendment to the VLCT Bylaws, which concerns the method of adopting the Vermont Municipal Policy. No other business shall be considered at this special meeting.

ARTICLE X
LEGISLATIVE POLICY

SECTION 1. VERMONT MUNICIPAL POLICY – The broad outline of policies to be supported by the Vermont League of Cities and Towns during the ensuing legislative session will be developed by the legislative committees; reviewed, amended as needed, and approved by the Board of Directors; and adopted at ~~the~~ an annual or special meeting. Suggested policy amendments may also be presented by full members in writing prior to the meeting, or on the floor at the meeting. ~~The existing language of the Municipal Policy shall remain unchanged from year to year unless amended by two-thirds of the votes cast at a meeting. The draft policy shall be presented at a duly warned meeting of the membership and shall become the legislative policy of VLCT if approved by a majority of votes cast at the meeting.~~

SECTION 2: SPECIFIC LEGISLATION. – The ~~Legislative~~ legislative Committees ~~committees~~ may recommend specific proposals of legislation within the adopted Vermont Municipal Policy for consideration by the Board of Directors.

SECTION 3: POLICY CHANGES. – The Board of Directors may, from time to time during the ~~Legislative~~ legislative session, modify the Vermont League of Cities and Towns' Municipal Policy within the guidelines adopted by the membership; determine which legislative proposals are consistent or counter to the Policy; adopt positions on issues not addressed in the Policy; resolve apparent conflicts within the Policy; and adopt positions on pieces of legislation that contain both proposals consistent with the Policy and proposals that are counter to the Policy. The Board may only take such actions when it finds that it would result in improving the ability of municipal government to serve its citizens.

01/20/17
11:08 am

Town of Norwich Accounts Payable
Check Warrant Report # 17-18 Current Prior Next FY Invoices For Fund (General)
All Invoices For Check Acct 01(General) 01/18/17 To 01/26/17

Vendor	Invoice Description	Invoice Date	Invoice Number	Account	Amount Paid	Check Number	Check Date
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/02/16	B&G--STOCK FILTERS, FLUID 084630704452	01-5-704403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	135.52		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/03/16	HWY--55 GALS 15W-40 084630869902	01-5-703405.00 PETROLEUM PRODUCTS	509.00		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/03/16	FD--MUFFLER CLAMP 084630869912	01-5-555528.00 FIRE TRK R & M	8.52		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/03/16	HWY--TRK #8 AIR FILTERS 084630874413	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	121.80		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/04/16	HWY--TRK#12 WIPER BLADES 084630910553	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	25.90		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/04/16	HWY--TRACTOR OIL FILTER 084630969975	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	8.92		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/04/16	HWY--TRK#8 OIL FILTER 084630969976	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	21.00		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/04/16	HWY--TRACTOR OIL/AIR FILT 084630969979	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	28.91		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/07/16	HWY--OIL FILTER 084631204691	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	15.92		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/16/16	HWY--WIPERS, ACETONE 084632105127	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	34.62		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/18/16	B&G--MOWER FILTER 084632310801	01-5-704403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	3.71		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/18/16	HWY--PART EXCHANGE 084632354786	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	-2.38		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/18/16	HWY--TRAILER BALL 084632360445	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	14.72		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/18/16	HWY--WIPER BLADES 084632360475	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	17.98		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/23/16	B&G--RETURN CREDIT 084632805487	01-5-704403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	-23.80		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/23/16	HWY--BUNGEE CORDS 084632810871	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	45.00		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/23/16	HWY--TARP, STRAPS, CORDS 084632860617	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	25.72		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/25/16	HWY--RETURN CREDIT 084633010890	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	-3.60		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/29/16	HWY--WIRE STRIPPERS 084633460774	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	22.06		
ADVANCE	ADVANCE AUTO PARTS	11/29/16	HWY--GASKET MAKER 084633475064	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	13.78		
BROWN	CHARLIE BROWN'S	01/12/17	HWY--CHAINSAW PARTS 38132	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	92.35	4141	01/26/17
BROWN	CHARLIE BROWN'S	01/12/17	HWY--SAW CHAIN 38203	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	20.00	4141	01/26/17
CASELLA	CASELLA WASTE SERVICES	01/03/17	SW--DEC 16 RECYCLING FEES 0303729	01-5-705305.00 RECYCLING	4249.08		
CASELLA	CASELLA WASTE SERVICES	01/03/17	SW--DEC 16 TRASH FEES 0303730	01-5-705303.00 MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE	4426.33		
CHILDSUPP	OFFICE OF CHILD SUPPORT	01/17/17	CHILDSUPPORT PEND1-14-17 PEND1-14-17	01-2-001115.00 CHILD SUPPORT PAYABLE	920.98	4139	01/18/17

01/20/17

Town of Norwich Accounts Payable

9a

11:08 am

Check Warrant Report # 17-18 Current Prior Next FY Invoices For Fund (General)

RRobinson

All Invoices For Check Acct 01(General) 01/18/17 To 01/26/17

Vendor	Invoice Date	Invoice Description Invoice Number	Account	Amount Paid	Check Number	Check Date
COMCAST	12/06/16	TH--FIXED IP 12/6/16	01-5-275632.00 SERVER MAINTENANCE	19.95	4142	01/26/17
COMCAST	12/06/16	FD--FIXED IP & INTERNET 12/6/16 #2	01-5-550235.00 TELEPHONE & INTERNET	34.90	4142	01/26/17
DAVES	01/06/17	B&G--TRK#9 BATTERY 10066680	01-5-704403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	120.00	4143	01/26/17
DEADRIVER	12/27/16	TH--393.5 GALS #2 FUEL 39735	01-5-706103.00 HEATING	798.41	4144	01/26/17
DEADRIVER	12/22/16	PD--148.3 GALS #2 FUEL 79935	01-5-475234.00 HEATING	300.90	4144	01/26/17
DEADRIVER	12/20/16	FD--298.7 GALS #2 FUEL 79942	01-5-550234.00 HEATING	606.06	4144	01/26/17
DESMEULES	01/04/17	TADMIN--MISC LEGAL 60826	01-5-005300.00 PROFESS SERV	165.00	4145	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-005531.00 ADMIN TELEPHONE	37.74	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-100531.00 TELEPHONE	37.74	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-200531.00 TELEPHONE	37.74	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-275531.00 TELEPHONE	60.92	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-300531.00 TELEPHONE	37.74	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-350531.00 TELEPHONE	37.74	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-425127.00 TELEPHONE	37.75	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-475238.00 ADMIN TELEPHONE	206.97	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-550235.00 TELEPHONE & INTERNET	30.94	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-705505.00 TELEPHONE	35.09	4146	01/26/17
EARTHLINK	01/10/17	DECEMBER 2016 PHONE 1/10/17	01-5-703505.00 TELEPHONE	54.08	4146	01/26/17
EVANSMOTO	01/03/17	HWY--700 GALS BIODIESEL 602208	01-5-703405.00 PETROLEUM PRODUCTS	1524.98	-----	--/--/--
EVANSMOTO	01/12/17	HWY--625 GALS BIODIESEL 602846	01-5-703405.00 PETROLEUM PRODUCTS	1344.22	-----	--/--/--
FOGGS	12/02/16	REC--RINK COUPLINGS 787945	01-5-425330.00 REPAIRS & MAINT	1.78	4147	01/26/17
FOGGS	12/08/16	PD--DRILL BITS, HARDWARE 788450	01-5-500306.00 CRUISER MAINT	13.40	4147	01/26/17
FOGGS	12/16/16	TH--PAINTING SUPPLIES 789101	01-5-706113.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	11.94	4147	01/26/17
FOGGS	12/17/16	SW--SNOW SHOVELS 789146	01-5-705403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	46.98	4147	01/26/17
FOGGS	12/22/16	HWY--WALLPLATES 789484	01-5-703511.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	6.36	4147	01/26/17

01/20/17
11:08 am

Town of Norwich Accounts Payable
Check Warrant Report # 17-18 Current Prior Next FY Invoices For Fund (General)
All Invoices For Check Acct 01(General) 01/18/17 To 01/26/17

9a

Vendor	Invoice Date	Invoice Description Invoice Number	Account	Amount Paid	Check Number	Check Date
FOGGS	12/27/16	FOGG'S HARDWARE AND BUILD HWY--RETURN CREDIT 789733	01-5-703511.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	-4.77	4147	01/26/17
FOGGS	12/27/16	FOGG'S HARDWARE AND BUILD TH--PAINTING SUPPLIES 789735	01-5-706113.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	3.18	4147	01/26/17
FOGGS	12/28/16	FOGG'S HARDWARE AND BUILD TH--PAINTING SUPPLIES 789752	01-5-706113.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	17.47	4147	01/26/17
GATEWAY	01/11/17	GATEWAY MOTORS INC FGD--CAR#1 LIGHT PARTS 34865	01-5-555528.00 FIRE TRK R & M	95.18	4148	01/26/17
GATEWAY	01/13/17	GATEWAY MOTORS INC FD--CAR#1 LIGHT HARDWARE 34911	01-5-555528.00 FIRE TRK R & M	18.64	4148	01/26/17
GIRARD	01/19/17	JOHN GIRARD SR REC--BBALL OFFICIATING 1/19/17	01-5-425214.00 REFERREE/UMPIRE	196.00	4149	01/26/17
GMPC	12/30/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP PD--BEAVER MDW SPEED SIGN 24966DEC16	01-5-500204.00 SPEED SIGNS	13.50	4150	01/26/17
GMPC	12/30/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP PD--CHURCH ST TAGLET 55726DEC16	01-5-500204.00 SPEED SIGNS	2.45	4150	01/26/17
GMPC	12/30/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP PD--RTE10A SPEED SIGN 65726DEC16	01-5-500204.00 SPEED SIGNS	12.35	4150	01/26/17
GMPC	12/30/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP PD--TURNPIKE RD SIGN 75726DEC16	01-5-500204.00 SPEED SIGNS	3.48	4150	01/26/17
GMPC	12/30/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP PD--UNION VILL RD SIGN 85726DEC16	01-5-500204.00 SPEED SIGNS	6.74	4150	01/26/17
GMPC	12/29/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP EVCS DECEMBER 16 92150DEC16	01-5-706115.00 BANDSTAND & SIGN ELECTRIC	31.12	4150	01/26/17
GMPC	12/30/16	GREEN MOUNTAIN POWER CORP TH--BANDSTAND 95726DEC16	01-5-706115.00 BANDSTAND & SIGN ELECTRIC	50.08	4150	01/26/17
GNOMON	01/09/17	GNOMON COPY FIN--REMINDER POSTCARDS 46675	01-5-200550.00 PRINTING	74.00	4151	01/26/17
GOODWIN	01/12/17	AIMEE J GOODWIN REC--BOOT CAMP 1/12/17	01-5-425200.00 INSTRUCTOR FEE	829.50	4152	01/26/17
GRAYLIN	01/02/17	LINDA GRAY ENCOM--PROMOTION REMIB 1/2/2017	01-5-005701.20 ENERGY COMMITTEE	30.31	-----	--/--/--
GREATWEST	01/19/17	GREAT-WEST TRUST COMPANY, DEFERRED COMP JAN 17 JAN 17	01-2-001116.00 DEFERRED COMPENSATION	620.00	4153	01/26/17
GREATWEST	01/19/17	GREAT-WEST TRUST COMPANY, DEFERRED COMP JAN 17 JAN 17	01-2-001116.10 ROTH PLAN 457	1994.54	4153	01/26/17
HANOVERRE	01/19/17	TOWN OF HANOVER REC--BBALL TOURNEY 1/19/17	01-5-425216.00 ENTRY FEE	65.00	4154	01/26/17
HARTFORD	12/30/16	TOWN OF HARTFORD PD--BROADBAND NOV 2016 8026	01-5-500535.00 VIBRS	119.87	-----	--/--/--
HAUN	01/01/17	HAUN WELDING SUPPLY, INC. HWY--DEC 16 CYLINDER RENT O554869	01-5-703401.00 OUTSIDE REPAIRS	15.58	-----	--/--/--
HERBERT	01/06/17	MATTHEW HERBERT FD--BLS CLASSES 1/6/17	01-5-500538.00 TRAINING	20.00	4155	01/26/17
HOMEDEPOT	01/11/17	HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICE TH--GYM FLOOR SEALER 2022832	01-5-706113.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	17.97	4156	01/26/17
IRVINGOIL	11/23/16	IRVING ENERGY DISTRIB. & HWY--191.7 GALS PROPANE 541617	01-5-703503.00 PROPANE	239.63	-----	--/--/--
IRVINGOIL	01/04/17	IRVING ENERGY DISTRIB. & SW--24.6 GALS PROPANE 751508	01-5-705503.00 PROPANE	30.75	-----	--/--/--

01/20/17
11:08 am

Town of Norwich Accounts Payable
Check Warrant Report # 17-18 Current Prior Next FY Invoices For Fund (General)
All Invoices For Check Acct 01(General) 01/18/17 To 01/26/17

9a

Vendor	Invoice Date	Invoice Description Invoice Number	Account	Amount Paid	Check Number	Check Date
IRVINGOIL	01/04/17	IRVING ENERGY DISTRIB. & SW--59.7 GALS PROPANE 751833	01-5-705503.00 PROPANE	74.63	-----	--/--/--
MAYER	01/19/17	MAYER & MAYER JAN 17 JUDGEMENT ORDER JAN 17	01-2-001120.00 EMPLOYEE JUDGEMENT ORDER	50.00	4157	01/26/17
MAYO	01/19/17	JIM MAYO REC--BBALL OFFICIATING 1/19/17	01-5-425214.00 REFERREE/UMPIRE	112.00	4158	01/26/17
MCNEIL	12/31/16	MCNEIL, LEDDY & SHEAHAN, TADMIN--UNION LEGAL 27994	01-5-005300.00 PROFESS SERV	52.50	4159	01/26/17
MIS1	01/19/17	SAM BELIVEAU REC--BBALL OFFICIATING 1/19/17	01-5-425214.00 REFERREE/UMPIRE	84.00	4160	01/26/17
MORTON	12/27/16	MORTON SALT HWY--98.51 TONS SALT 5401218922	01-5-703201.00 SALT & CHEMICALS	6893.73	4161	01/26/17
MORTON	12/28/16	MORTON SALT HWY--35.70 TONS SALT 5401220571	01-5-703201.00 SALT & CHEMICALS	2498.29	4161	01/26/17
MORTON	01/04/17	MORTON SALT HWY--66.63 TONS SALT 5401225537	01-5-703201.00 SALT & CHEMICALS	4572.82	4161	01/26/17
NEMUNCONS	01/02/17	NEW ENGLAND MUNICIPAL CON ASSESSOR--DEC 16 2017-004	01-5-300300.00 PROFESS SERVICES	5500.00	4162	01/26/17
NORSCHOOL	01/19/17	NORWICH SCHOOL DISTRICT REC--SAU RENTAL FY17 2/2 1/12/17	01-5-425219.00 M.CROSS SCHOOL RENTAL FEE	6615.00	4163	01/26/17
NORSOLAR	01/18/17	NORWICH SOLAR PROJECT I, PD/TH/SW/FD--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-500204.00 SPEED SIGNS	82.14	-----	--/--/--
NORSOLAR	01/18/17	NORWICH SOLAR PROJECT I, PD/TH/SW/FD--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-706115.00 BANDSTAND & SIGN ELECTRIC	51.34	-----	--/--/--
NORSOLAR	01/18/17	NORWICH SOLAR PROJECT I, PD/TH/SW/FD--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-705501.00 ELECTRICITY	78.72	-----	--/--/--
NORSOLAR	01/18/17	NORWICH SOLAR PROJECT I, PD/TH/SW/FD--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-475233.00 ELECTRICITY	203.63	-----	--/--/--
NORSOLAR	01/18/17	NORWICH SOLAR PROJECT I, PD/TH/SW/FD--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-550233.00 ELECTRICITY	109.64	-----	--/--/--
PBA	01/19/17	NEW ENGLAND PBA, INC JAN 2017 UNION DUES JAN 17	01-2-001117.00 UNION DUES PAYABLE	483.00	-----	--/--/--
PRIMMER	12/31/16	PRIMMER PIPER EGGLESTON & TAD--BONDING LEGAL 12/31/16	01-5-005300.00 PROFESS SERV	375.00	4164	01/26/17
REDPMA	01/12/17	MARGARET C REDPATH REC--SNOWSHOE INSTRUCT 1/12/17	01-5-425200.00 INSTRUCTOR FEE	714.00	4165	01/26/17
RICHARDSO	01/07/17	TAD RICHARDSON GADMIN--SERVER MAINT 1334	01-5-275632.00 SERVER MAINTENANCE	131.25	-----	--/--/--
SHERWIN	01/11/17	SHERWIN-WILLIAMS TH--STAIRWAY PAINT 0140-9	01-5-706113.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	58.99	-----	--/--/--
SIMPLEX	01/04/17	SIMPLEXGRINNELL SW--EXTINGUISHER INSPECT 83271273	01-5-705515.00 ADMINISTRATION	116.00	-----	--/--/--
SIMPLEX	01/04/17	SIMPLEXGRINNELL TH--EMER LIGHT INSPECT 83271278	01-5-706113.00 REPAIRS & MAINTENANCE	612.00	-----	--/--/--
SIPLAY	01/10/17	SI PLAY LLC REC--NOV/DEC 16 REGISTR 277772	01-5-425218.00 REGISTRATION FEES	575.00	-----	--/--/--
SOLAFLECT	01/18/17	SOLAFLECT SOLAR PARK I, L TH/HWY--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-706101.00 ELECTRICITY	783.60	-----	--/--/--
SOLAFLECT	01/18/17	SOLAFLECT SOLAR PARK I, L TH/HWY--SOLAR JAN 17 JAN 17	01-5-703501.00 ELECTRICITY	64.53	-----	--/--/--

01/20/17

Town of Norwich Accounts Payable

11:08 am

Check Warrant Report # 17-18 Current Prior Next FY Invoices For Fund (General)

RRobinson

All Invoices For Check Acct 01(General) 01/18/17 To 01/26/17

Vendor	Invoice Date	Invoice Description Invoice Number	Account	Amount Paid	Check Number	Check Date
STAPLES.	01/13/17	PL--MOUSE 12994	01-5-350610.00 OFFICE SUPPLIES	24.99	4166	01/26/17
TARRANT	12/31/16	TAD-DRAKE APP/ILLSLEY RD 44186	01-5-005300.00 PROFESS SERV	560.00	4167	01/26/17
TEBBETTS	01/07/17	B&G--MILEAGE REIMBURSE 1/7/17	01-5-704405.00 PETROLEUM PRODUCTS	9.15	4168	01/26/17
TENCO	12/22/16	HWY--TRK#8 CYLINDERS 5623687	01-5-703401.00 OUTSIDE REPAIRS	993.92	-----	--/--/--
TENCO	01/03/17	HWY--TRK#4 BED CHAIN 5626472	01-5-703403.00 PARTS & SUPPLIES	782.09	-----	--/--/--
TENCO	01/03/17	HWY--TRK#10 REPAIRS 5626512	01-5-703401.00 OUTSIDE REPAIRS	677.50	-----	--/--/--
TENCO	01/03/17	HWY--TRK#4 REPAIR 5626515	01-5-703401.00 OUTSIDE REPAIRS	520.50	-----	--/--/--
VALLEYNEW	12/21/16	DRB--CLASSIFIED 01258849	01-5-350540.00 ADVERTISING	47.18	4169	01/26/17
VMERSDC	01/17/17	FD/FIN/ASS--RETIREMENT PEND1-14-17	01-2-001112.00 VMERS DEF CONTRB PAY	230.82	4140	01/18/17
VMERSDC	01/17/17	FD/FIN/ASS--RETIREMENT PEND1-14-17	01-5-555125.00 VT RETIREMENT	148.15	4140	01/18/17
VMERSDC	01/17/17	FD/FIN/ASS--RETIREMENT PEND1-14-17	01-5-200126.00 VT RETIREMENT	55.28	4140	01/18/17
VMERSDC	01/17/17	FD/FIN/ASS--RETIREMENT PEND1-14-17	01-5-300126.00 VT RETIREMENT	33.16	4140	01/18/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-005126.00 VT RETIREMENT	208.51	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-100126.00 VT RETIREMENT	434.28	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-200126.00 VT RETIREMENT	276.32	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-350126.00 VT RETIREMENT	276.32	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-425126.00 VT RETIREMENT	281.85	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-500126.00 VT RETIREMENT	184.36	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-703126.00 RETIREMENT	1529.42	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-704126.00 RETIREMENT	365.34	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-5-500126.00 VT RETIREMENT	1511.90	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-2-001111.00 VEMRS GRP B PAYABLE	3152.27	4170	01/26/17
VMERS	01/19/17	JAN 2017 RETIREMENT JAN 17	01-2-001113.00 VEMRS GRP C PAYABLE	2085.38	4170	01/26/17
VTTREASUR	01/05/17	4TH QTR 2016 MARR LICNS 4TH QTR 2016	01-2-001124.00 DUE TO VT-VITAL RECORDS	200.00	4171	01/26/17
WAWECO	11/08/16	B&G--TRK#9 INSPECTION 22441	01-5-704401.00 OUTSIDE REPAIRS	50.00	4172	01/26/17

01/20/17
11:08 am

Town of Norwich Accounts Payable
Check Warrant Report # 17-18 Current Prior Next FY Invoices For Fund (General)
All Invoices For Check Acct 01(General) 01/18/17 To 01/26/17

9a

Vendor	Invoice Date	Invoice Description Invoice Number	Account	Amount Paid	Check Number	Check Date
WAWECO	01/13/17	WAWECO, INC. HWY--TRK#6 MUFFLER/INSP 22945	01-5-703401.00 OUTSIDE REPAIRS	548.50	4172	01/26/17
WRPC	01/10/17	SWISH WHITE RIVER LTD TH--SOAP DISPENSER W159459	01-5-706109.00 BUILDING SUPPLIES	42.75	4173	01/26/17
Report Total				66965.69		

To the Treasurer of Town of Norwich, We hereby certify that there is due to the several persons whose names are listed hereon the sum against each name and that there are good and sufficient vouchers supporting the payments aggregating \$ ****66,965.69
Let this be your order for the payments of these amounts.

FINANCE DIRECTOR 
Roberta Robinson

TOWN MANAGER: _____
Dave Ormiston, Interim Town Manager

SELECTBOARD:

Christopher Ashley

Linda Cook
Chair

Stephen Flanders

Dan Goulet

Mary Layton

DRAFT Minutes of the Selectboard Meeting of Wednesday, January 4, 2017 at 6:30 pm

Members present: Linda Cook, Chair; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton, Vice-Chair; Stephen Flanders; Dave Ormiston, Interim Town Manager; Miranda Bergmeier, Assistant to the Town Manager.

There were about 3 people in the audience.

Also participating: Jay White

Cook opened the meeting at 6:33 pm.

1. Approval of Agenda (Action Item). Selectboard agreed to proceed with the agenda as drafted.
2. Public Comments (Discussion Item). There were no public comments offered.
3. Jay White contract (Discussion/Action Item). Interim Town Manager, David Ormiston, summarized progress on the negotiations for a contract with Jay White for architectural services on the Public Safety building project. An American Institute of Architects (AIA) contract is being used with several modifications, as outlined for the Board by Ormiston. The current draft has been posted online with the Selectboard packet. Jay White answered the Board's questions about provisions in the contract draft. White explained that not all of the schematics are completed, so there will be a \$7,000 charge for that work. This will not increase the cost of the building over the bond amount, however. After the Board's questions had been answered, Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to approve Jay White's architectural and engineering fee structure, dated 11-16-2016 and amended by \$7,000 on 12-20-2016, for the amount of \$56,454. **Motion passed unanimously.** Flanders **moved** (2nd Goulet) to authorize the town manager to sign a contract based on the version received on January 4, 2017 with Jay White, architect, for professional services regarding the Norwich Public Safety Building. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Ormiston told the Board the Vermont Bond Bank (VBB) has set a bond sale in February 2017 with favorable rates. Ormiston recommended that Norwich pursue a VBB bond, as it will allow the town to proceed more quickly with the building project than financing through USDA Rural Development. After discussion, Flanders **moved** (2nd Layton) to direct the Interim Town Manager to prepare paperwork for the February bond sale by the Vermont Municipal Bond Bank. **Motion passed unanimously.**

4. Interim financing bond anticipation note (Discussion/Action Item). Ormiston reported that interim financing bid requests have been put out and we should receive two to three quotes from banks. Because we now have the option of the February VBB sale, we will not need as much money as we originally thought. Therefore, we may not need an interim line of credit at all; we may have what we need temporarily in the unassigned fund. Ashley asked Ormiston to find out if a February bond will require any payment or allocation for the FY18 budget.
5. FEMA Alternative Projects update (Discussion/Action Item). Ormiston notified the Board that the FEMA Alternative Projects have been approved for a November 2017 completion date.
6. Correspondence – Stuart Richards (Discussion/Action Item). Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders)

to receive correspondence from Stuart Richards concerning the Planning Commission and Development Review Board. **Motion passed unanimously.**

7. Selectboard

a. Finance – Board to sign accounts payable/warrants (Discussion/Action Item). Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders) to approve Check Warrant Report #17-16 for General Fund in the amount of \$84,961.25. **Motion passed unanimously.**

b. Approval of the Minutes of the 12/14/2016 Selectboard meeting (Action Item). Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2016 Selectboard meeting with revisions put forward. **Motion passed (yes- 4; no- Cook).**

c. Review of Next Agendas (Discussion/Possible Action Item). The board agreed to include items on the agenda for the next Selectboard meeting on January 11, 2017:

1. Budget Hearing
2. Budget discussion and action
3. Town Manager search update
4. Town Manager contract
5. Town Manager evaluation process
6. Correspondence

At this point, Goulet **moved** (2nd Flanders) to adjourn. **Motion passed unanimously.** Meeting adjourned at 9:08 pm.

by Miranda Bergmeier, Assistant to the Town Manager

Approved by the Selectboard on _____.

Linda Cook, Selectboard Chair

Next Meeting – January 11, 2017 at 6:30 PM

PLEASE NOTE THAT CATV RECORDS ALL REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE NORWICH SELECTBOARD.

Memorandum

To: David Ormiston, Interim Town Manager

Cc: Norwich Selectboard

From: Miranda Bergmeier, Assistant to the Town Manager

Date: January 18, 2017

Re: Typographical error in Selectboard minutes from January 11, 2017 meeting

It has come to my attention that there is a typographical error in the January 11 minutes on the third page under item 9.b., "Approval of the Minutes of the 12/7/2016 Selectboard meeting".

The current draft reads: "Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders) to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2016 Selectboard meeting ~~with revisions put forward.~~" (*strikethrough added*)

CHANGE TO: "Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders) to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2016 Selectboard meeting."

This proposed change accurately reports the motion made by Chipper.

DRAFT Minutes of the Selectboard Meeting of Wednesday, January 11, 2017 at 6:30 pm

Members present: Linda Cook, Chair; Christopher Ashley; Dan Goulet; Mary Layton, Vice-Chair; Stephen Flanders; Dave Ormiston, Interim Town Manager; Miranda Bergmeier, Assistant to the Town Manager.

There were about 8 people in the audience.

Also participating: Jim Gold, Stuart Richards, Claudette Brochu, Lily Trajman, Abby Friedman (Vermont League of Cities and Towns), John Carroll, and Demo Sofronas

Cook opened the meeting at 6:30 pm.

1. Approval of Agenda (Action Item). Selectboard agreed to proceed with the agenda as drafted.
2. Public Comments (Discussion Item). **Jim Gold** thanked Christopher Ashley for his service to the town. Gold suggested to the Board that they consider addressing the issue of town workers smoking in town vehicles. **Stuart Richards** asked the Board to level-fund the budget because Norwich is becoming unaffordable for some people. **Claudette Brochu** also thanked Christopher Ashley for his service, and stated that the Board should level-fund the budget.
3. Women's Club alcohol policy waiver request (Discussion/Action Item). **Lily Trajman** appeared on behalf of the Women's Club and explained the waiver request was in connection with the club's Spring Gala event. Ashley told Trajman that the club's request contained all of the necessary information sought by the Board. Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to waive the Town ordinance regulating the possession and consumption of alcohol so that the Norwich Women's Club may serve alcohol in Tracy Hall on the evening of March 17, 2017 during its Spring Gala. **Motion passed unanimously.**
4. Town Manager Search – executive session may be needed (Discussion/Action Item)
 - a. Update (Discussion/Action Item). **Abby Friedman** said that she was prepared to give her report on the Town Manager applicants to the Board in executive session. Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders) to find that discussing the application materials and status of applicants for the position of Town Manager in public session would violate the applicants' rights to confidentiality. **Motion passed unanimously.** Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to enter executive session to discuss applicants for the position of Town Manager, pursuant to Title 1 VSA §313(a)(3) of the Vermont Statutes, and to invite Abby Friedman of VLCT into the executive session. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Selectboard moved into executive session at 6:42 pm.

Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to enter public session. **Motion passed unanimously.** The Selectboard moved into public session at 7:35 pm.

b. Town Manager Evaluation Process (Discussion/Action Item). The Selectboard discussed the question of how often evaluation of the Town Manager (TM) should happen. The Board reached consensus that the TM should receive some form of evaluation twice a year. The Selectboard then discussed what would happen if the Board fails to complete an evaluation at

least once a year – would the TM receive a step increase, or no? Flanders also suggested that if any problems arise with performance, they should be addressed right away. Ashley said that if the Board does not complete a timely evaluation and the TM does not get a step increase, then the Board might be vulnerable to liability. Ashley said that would be an effective incentive for the Board to complete evaluations. Goulet pointed out that the Selectboard must do the evaluation; it is the Board's duty to complete the evaluation.

John Carroll, who had submitted a proposed form for the Selectboard to use for evaluations, was asked to provide his input. Carroll said that it is true the Selectboard has the duty to complete an evaluation. Part of Carroll's proposal is a set of scoring sheets which are compiled without Board discussion and the scores averaged. The other piece of Carroll's evaluation proposal is that each Board member would answer the questions of what has the TM done well, and what needs improvement. These forms will allow the Board to complete its evaluation(s) in an expeditious manner.

c. Draft Provisions of Town Manager Contract (Discussion/Action Item). The Board agreed to move this agenda item to later – Item 9, just before 9(a).

5. Public Hearing on Proposed FY18 Budget (Discussion/Action Item). **Claudette Brochu** said that she has commented previously and now it's up to the Selectboard to decide. Brochu stated that she thinks there is room for changes and reductions in the budget. **Demo Sofronas** said that he has seen about ten years of budget discussions, and he has seen a lot worse years than this one. Sofronas asked what will the per taxpayer increase amount to. Ormiston answered that there would be an increase of \$13 per \$100,000 valuation. Sofronas said that the Board has worked very hard to come up with the best possible budget.

6. The Board discussed what to do with the money that was set aside for purchasing a frontloader for the Public Works Department, now that the FEMA money has been approved for the purchase of that frontloader. After discussion, Cook **moved** (2nd Layton) to take the funds from the frontloader designated fund and apply them toward lowering the town tax rate. Ashley pointed out that some of the designated fund must be spent on the frontloader as a condition of the FEMA grant. **Motion failed 4 to 1** (no – Ashley, Goulet, Layton, Flanders; yes – Cook). Flanders then **moved** (2nd Layton) to reduce the appropriation proposed for the highway equipment fund by \$100,000 and apply \$50,000 to the town garage designated fund and \$50,000 to the highway bridges fund in the FY18 budget. **Motion passed 4 to 1** (yes – Ashley, Goulet, Layton, Flanders; no – Cook).

The Selectboard then discussed whether to use tower bond leftover money to pay down the tower debt. Flanders **moved** (2nd Goulet) to reduce the line item for debt service on the tower bond to \$32,661. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to recommend that the Town Meeting approve a gross spending General Town Budget of \$4,462,378. **Motion passed 3 to 2** (yes – Ashley, Layton, Flanders; no – Cook, Goulet)

7. Interim Town Manager Report (Discussion Item). The contract with Jay White, architect for the Public Safety Building project, will be signed; it has been sent to White for his signature. Mary Andes, with the Vermont Department of Public Safety, suggests that the Town ask for an extension for the completion of the FEMA alternative projects past November 1, 2017. The Department of Public Works has hired a temporary worker to cover for an employee who will be out on leave. Interim financing bids went out to banks and Merchants Bank submitted the best rate. The Town will obtain a line of credit for use in case the Town has a cash flow issue with

multiple projects occurring.

8. Correspondence – various items (Discussion/Action Item). Flanders told the Board that his correspondence was erroneously included in the packet. Flanders’s email was merely discussion about agenda setting, and therefore not properly considered correspondence.

Flanders **moved** (2nd Ashley) to receive correspondence from National School Choice Week regarding a requested proclamation; State of Vermont Department of Taxes regarding the 2016 Equalization Study results; Claudette Brochu regarding budget questions, with answers from Interim Town Manager; and John Farrell regarding construction on Turnpike Road. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Selectboard instructed Ormiston to verify that the building permit questioned by John Farrell was properly granted.

9. Selectboard

a. Finance – Board to sign accounts payable/warrants (Discussion/Action Item). Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders) to approve Check Warrant Report #17-17 for General Fund in the amount of \$18,199.48. **Motion passed unanimously.**

b. Approval of the Minutes of the 12/7/2016 Selectboard meeting (Action Item). Ashley **moved** (2nd Flanders) to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2016 Selectboard meeting with revisions put forward. **Motion passed (yes- 4; no- Cook).**

c. Review of Next Agendas (Discussion/Possible Action Item). The board agreed to hold a special meeting on January 18, 2017 for the purpose of discussing the Town Manager contract.

For the January 25, 2017 meeting, agenda items will include:

1. VLCT Special Meeting to change bylaws
2. Town Manager evaluation process
3. Pool Committee presentation
4. Approve Town Meeting warning

At this point, Goulet **moved** (2nd Flanders) to adjourn. **Motion passed unanimously.** Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

by Miranda Bergmeier, Assistant to the Town Manager

Approved by the Selectboard on _____.

Linda Cook, Selectboard Chair

Next Meeting – Special Meeting on January 18, 2017 at 6:30 PM

PLEASE NOTE THAT CATV RECORDS ALL REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE NORWICH SELECTBOARD.

Norwich Selectboard Special Meeting
January 18, 2017

Persons present: Linda Cook, Mary Layton, Steve Flanders, Christopher Ashley, Dan Goulet, Town Manager Candidate #34 (left at 7:40 pm)

The public meeting opened at 6:30pm.

Layton moved, seconded by Goulet, to find that interviewing applicants for the position of Town Manager and discussing their application materials and status in public session would violate the candidate's confidentiality. Vote: 5 Yes

Layton moved, seconded by Goulet, to enter into executive session to consider applicants for the position of Town Manager, pursuant to Title 1 VSA sec 313(a)(3) and to invite the candidate to be interviewed. Vote 5 Yes

The Selectboard moved into Executive Session at 6:33pm.

Flanders moved, seconded by Goulet, to enter public session. Vote 5 Yes.

At 7:40 the Selectboard moved into public session.

Layton moved, seconded by Ashley, that a clear, substantial disadvantage to the Town would exist by revealing a discussion about the proposed Town Manager contract. Vote: Ashley, Layton, Goulet, Cook: Yes. Flanders: No

Layton moved, seconded by Ashley, pursuant to Title 1 VSA sec 313(a)(2)(1) to enter into executive session to discuss contract terms. Vote: Cook, Layton, Ashley, Goulet: Yes. Flanders: No

The Selectboard moved into Executive Session at 7:50pm.

Ashley moved, seconded by Flanders to enter public session. Vote 5 Yes.

At 8:50 pm the Selectboard moved into public session.

The Selectboard delegated Cook and Layton to compile possible contract terms and to bring the compilation to the January 25th meeting.

Goulet moved, seconded by Ashley, to adjourn public session.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55pm.

Minutes taken by Mary Layton