

Town of Norwich, Vermont
Minutes of the Selectboard Meeting
Wednesday, June 10th, 2026

Active Participants at Tracy Hall: Brendan Classon (SB Vice Chair), Matt Swett (SB member), Mary Layton (SB member), Rob Gere (SB member), Steven True (Planning and Zoning Director), Jeff Lubell (Affordable Housing Subcommittee)

Active Participants on Zoom: Kimo Griggs (SB Chair), Brennan Duffy (Town Manager), Jaan Laaspere (Planning Commission), Matthew Romei (Police Chief), Aaron Lamperti (Town member), Linda Gray (Town member), Jack Cushman (Town member), Cheryl Lindberg (Treasurer and Town member), Peter Orner (Town member)

Key: *Motions noted in italics.* [Public comment noted in blue.](#)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kimo Griggs at 6:37 pm.

[YouTube](#) **Timestamp: 0:00**

1. Agenda

Timestamp: 1:25

Selectboard members discussed the inclusion of documentation for agenda item nine in the packet.

I move to approve the agenda as presented. – Layton moved (2nd Swett) Vote: yes (unanimous)

2. Chair's Report

Timestamp: 3:02

The Chair (1) examined the Moore Lane bridge construction, (2) spoke with citizens about the condition of the Huntley Meadows baseball and softball field, (3) worked with the Town Manager's office on setting the agenda, (4) met with Steven True about upcoming Planning Board proposals, (5) made a fundraising sign for the Grange, (6) watched a baseball championship, (7) worked on understanding and preparing responses to the Katucki lawsuit and complaint, and (8) worked on proposed Town Manager goals.

3. Public Comments for Items not on the Agenda

Timestamp: 4:04

No comments.

4. Moore Lane Bridge Project Update and Cost Estimates

Timestamp: 4:42

Duffy shared that they were in good shape with the timing of the bridge work and expected it to be reopened the next week. Duffy noted that they were looking to spend more than the original \$150,000 allocated in a designated fund, due to additional issues found during the construction process.

Public Works Director Chris Kaufman reminded the Selectboard of his original February 17th memo that highlighted that some uncertainties with the emulsion on the bridge would not be known until the construction process. Kaufman explained that there was some spalling of concrete found in the work, requiring removal and replacement, which was part of the additional cost. Kaufman noted that Clean Harbors had visited the site multiple times for additional cleanup, contributing further to cost.

Kaufman explained the work done so far on the bridge and the work planned for the next week. Kaufman requested the approval of an additional \$20,500 from the DPW operation fund to fund the additional \$18,500 in work.

Duffy added that the original \$150,000 that was approved came out of the designated fund and that the source of the additional possible funds was an operational fund that otherwise likely would not be used by the end of the year.

I move to approve additional expenditures required to complete and supplement the Moore Lane Bridge Project as proposed in a memorandum from the DPW Director Chris Kaufman dated June 2, 2026, specifically up to \$20,500.00 to be used from the Bridges account 01-5-703321.00 in the DPW Operational Budget. – Gere moved (2nd Swett) Vote: yes (unanimous)

Swett asked about the location of the emulsion found on the wood of the bridge and whether it was positive that it was mostly on top of the wood; Kaufman shared that he thought it was a positive thing and explained the process of the work.

Griggs asked if the work was being documented in an organized way; Kaufman shared that he had only taken a few pictures “here and there” but that they could take photos.

Griggs noted a layer of plywood underneath the bridge and asked what the plan was for that; Kaufman explained that it was put under the layers of absorbance and would stay there until the bridge is eventually replaced.

Swett asked about the allotment of annual funding for additional remediation; Kaufman explained the system for catching residual contaminant.

Classon asked about the thinking behind the elimination of the elevated wooden sidewalks; Kaufman explained that he thought the decision was made to eliminate the sidewalk due to the narrowness of the bridge. Duffy added that there would be a clear visual marking for pedestrian and vehicle.

5. Planning Commission 2026 Bike/Pedestrian Grant Application
Timestamp: 24:13

Griggs shared his excitement for the project.

Planning and Zoning Director Steven True shared that over 100 residents had signed a letter urging the Planning Commission to pursue the project. True requested signatures from the Selectboard that night and shared that a decision on the application would be expected in the fall.

Layton asked about coordination with VTrans and the status of other similar projects.

True explained that they would work closely with the Regional Planning Commission and that there was documentation in the application alerting VTrans. True noted a concerted effort to develop a bike/pedestrian corridor throughout the state along the Connecticut River.

Jaan Laaspere highlighted the kickoff of the Village Master Plan Steering Committee that would pull together discussion of the village, including all the way to the Hartford line, which could be designated a focal area. Laaspere noted that a bike/pedestrian connection would fit in well with that plan.

True noted a similar study previously conducted on Beaver Meadow Road.

Gere spoke in favor of improving the safety around Route 5.

I move to support agreeing to the requirements and obligations of the application for a 2026 Federal Aid Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant and to sign the Municipal Resolution letter presented in the packet for this meeting. – Gere moved (2nd Layton) Vote: yes (unanimous)

6. Affordable Housing Committee Recommendation for Revolving Loan Fund Award
– Starlake Village
Timestamp: 31:18

Layton shared that she supported affordable housing and thought this would be a good way to show support for it. Layton noted the high cost of construction and infrastructure improvements and reflected on the small size of the town's affordable housing fund.

Jeff Lubell of the Affordable Housing Subcommittee emphasized that the money had been sitting in the fund for years and that the proposed use of funds would align with the goals of the fund.

Swett noted that one person had not voted for the recommendations on the Affordable Housing Subcommittee; Lubell shared that that person was also on the Planning Commission and voted for it at that stage, reflecting that their concerns had been allayed.

Griggs shared that he supported the use of the funds but asked if anyone had concerns about providing the funds at a 0% repayment rate, which would significantly reduce the fund's future value.

Lubell explained that the subcommittee actively tried to make the loan as close to a grant as possible and intentionally gave them generous repayment terms.

Layton wondered if there could be ways of building up the fund.

Selectboard members discussed what amount of money to loan. Lubell spoke in favor of putting all the funds towards the loan. Duffy suggested providing a rounded number to simplify the eventual repayment schedule planning.

I move that, having considered the Affordable Housing Revolving Fund guidelines approved by an earlier Selectboard on April 24, 2019 and the lack of any prior formal requests for the funding, and considering the pros and cons of the funding application by the Twin Pines Housing Trust on behalf of the Starlake Trust, the Selectboard believes that the request satisfies enough of the guidelines to merit funding. Accordingly, we approve a loan to the Twin Pines Housing Trust for \$51,000 from the Affordable Housing Revolving Fund #23 (see note) at a rate of 0% and a term of 12 years, with no payments for the first 2 years, followed by a 10-year repayment period. No security is required. These terms to be formally agreed upon in a legally binding Loan Repayment Contract with the Town and borrower. – Layton moved (2nd Swett) Vote: yes (unanimous)

Layton read an additional note from the motion sheet:

Fund #23 balance is currently \$51,539.86. The applicant is seeking \$45,000 (Feb. 9 2026 request) or “original \$45,000 plus any interest that has accrued in the fund” (March 29, 2026 Norwich Affordable Housing Subcommittee Analysis)

7. NPD Request for Purchase of Speed/Messaging Sign
Timestamp: 44:48

Layton spoke in favor of having two units instead of one.

Police Chief Matthew Romei shared that he would prefer the Wanco model due to its larger model, physical maneuverability, and longer warranty.

Swett spoke in favor of purchasing the speed signs and advocated for purchasing the smaller sign to fit with the aesthetic of the town.

Laaspere echoed Swett’s comments relating to the size of the signs.

Griggs shared that he was not concerned about the visual size of the signs but that he wondered if wind would impact it.

Romei explained that wind should not be a concern, advocated for the larger signs due to greater flexibility with the sign positioning, and shared that Wanco signs would come with local service.

Classon shared that he was agnostic about size but wondered about theft; Romei explained that the units had real-time GPS tracking.

Layton shared that she would support the larger unit due to the positioning flexibility and local service.

Gere stated that he would favor going with the Police Chief's recommendation.

I move to approve the expenditure of \$38,000 for the purchase of two Wanco model combination radar and Variable Messaging Trailers as requested in a memo from Police Chief Romei on 4 June 2026, funding to be taken equally from the 2026 and 2027 Police Operational Budget 1-5-500204. – Layton moved (2nd Gere) Vote: yes (unanimous)

8. Proposal for Reactivation of Article 36 Task Force

Timestamp: 59:28

Gere explained that some of the technology mentioned in the 2019 report from the Article 36 Task Force may have changed in the years since the report, and the goal of the task force would be to review and update them as needed for consideration.

Layton asked if it would be a working group. Gere explained that it would be whatever format as that previously.

Swett reflected that a lot of technology had matured over the past few years and that there was a lot of “low hanging fruit” in moving towards more efficient technology.

Aaron Lamperti asked that the task force only be revived with a modified charge to make specific actionable recommendations for the recommendations that were already in the previous report “to take it to the next step.”

Layton pointed out that the motion included language about an updated action report and asked whether that was sufficient to capture Lamperti's goals.

Lamperti asked that it be specific proposals for each item in the previous report rather than broad, general recommendations.

Linda Gray thanked Gere for bringing up the matter but asked that it go further and suggested instructing staff to update and act on recommendations.

Jack Cushman advocated for taking climate change seriously. Cushman recounted that the task force had encouraged the town to purchase electric mowing equipment but that the purchase never came to fruition despite Selectboard support at the time.

Classon spoke about the significant popular shift towards electric lawn equipment and the town support for it and asked about the budget and process for intervening in equipment lifecycle management.

Griggs stated that he liked the conversation but that it was not on the agenda. Griggs suggested returning at the next meeting to approve some other actions for moving the efforts forward.

Gere clarified that his intent in reactivating the task force was specifically to update the summary recommendations for action to make them in line with current technology.

Gray suggested that the Selectboard task the Energy Coordinator Harry Falconer with the updates. Lamperti echoed this suggestion.

I move to give the Shared Energy Coordinator the task of updating the Article 36 Task Force recommendations with contemporary technology and then bringing them separately to the Selectboard for action. – Gere moved (2nd Layton) Vote: yes (unanimous)

Griggs encouraged continuing to bring forward suggested items for action.

9. Data Recording Request from Rob Gere

Timestamp: 1:19:10

Layton asked if this could be incorporated into the review discussed above.

Gere wondered about how the Selectboard should direct the Town Manager to have the data collected.

Gere explained that the goal was for the departments of the town to report their fossil fuel consumption and report it to the Shared Energy Coordinator and Energy Committee at least quarterly to allow for the tracking of progress on reducing fossil fuel usage.

Duffy referenced Harry Faconer’s memo in the packet and that Falconer might be able to contribute to putting together a dataset. Gere explained that he was looking to have data on fuel consumption and where the use was coming from.

Duffy suggested that he talk with Falconer about his ability to assist with the request and return at a later meeting with a proposal for data tracking. Gere shared his hope for starting data recording at the start of the next fiscal year on July 1st.

Lamperti suggested putting the data on the website to promote transparency and allow people to engage with the data.

Gray shared that Falconer was on vacation until the next week.

10. Review and Approval of Sullivan, Powers, & Co., P.C. Audit Scope and Objectives

Timestamp: 1:25:02

Swett referenced a suggestion at a previous meeting that the Selectboard receive a draft of the town audits. Swett shared his reflection that it would be helpful. Griggs noted that that was how the document was written and should therefore be possible. Classon agreed that it would make sense for the Selectboard to receive a draft version of the audit.

Cheryl Lindberg asked if there was a timeline established for the completion of the audit.

Classon shared that he asked that it be shared earlier than normal but that it was a loose request.

Lindberg shared that she thought the submission deadline could be sooner.

Duffy explained that there was a limited number of municipal auditors in the area, which likely contributed to their inability to specify an exact date for an audit report, but that the town could request it be shared at the earliest opportunity.

Classon asked who was responsible for missing the deadline of the 2022 audit in the 2023 town meeting, as well as the dates of submission for the following years.

Duffy shared that it was the town that was responsible for missing the deadline and that he did not have the dates of submission for the following two years immediately available, but that both were after the first of the year. Selectboard members and Duffy discussed the timeline of the audit submission.

Duffy shared that Finance Director Barrie Rosalinda and Finance Assistant Jonathan DeLaBruere would be meeting with the auditors and that he would suggest they bring up this topic.

Classon asked if Duffy would be in favor of renewing the auditors' contract.

Griggs stated that that was outside the scope of the agenda item.

*I move to approve the Sullivan, Powers, & Co., P.C. Audit Scope and Objectives. – Layton moved (2nd Classon)
Vote: yes (unanimous)*

11. Town Manager Goals

Timestamp: 1:37:08

Griggs stated that he thought there had been a misunderstanding that he would like to clarify. Griggs explained that they were not asking for changes but instead trying to catch up with setting goals, which he did not think had been done properly but were required in the Town Manager's contract.

Layton shared that she had mixed feelings about the process so far and that she would like to table the discussion since Griggs was attending the meeting remotely and it was late at night for him in Denmark.

Classon voiced reluctance at “kicking the can down the road” and the difficulty with falling between the appointment date in late September and the switchover of Selectboards in early March.

Griggs explained that he did not find the matter that complicated and that he found the contract requirements to clearly require the annual definition of goals and performance objectives.

Classon explained that Selectboard members made their contributions months ago and that individual Selectboard members’ contributions inevitably varied significantly due to their different professional backgrounds. Classon asked for the contributions to be reflected in the document.

Duffy voiced frustration about the process and referenced his memo in the packet. Duffy explained that he did not know how new goals could be set up in June for a September evaluation and that he instead would prefer a similar set-up to that used last year. Duffy suggested working through the discussion one meeting per month over the next three months and highlighted the need for time to allow for meaningful accomplishment of goals.

Griggs clarified that he was not suggesting changing anything and that they could continue to use the same form for the Town Manager evaluation. Griggs reiterated that the contract asks for the Selectboard and Town Manager to set goals together. Griggs shared that he did not think “dividing the board” was useful.

Duffy responded that the goals on the template that were carried over from the last year were good and reasonable goals. Duffy shared that they had missed the timing of “trying to do this” last fall. Duffy referenced goals from the previous year’s document that were ongoing and shared that he did not want to make changes that he found to be unsound. Duffy stated that he did not mean to divide the board but that he wanted to hear from Swett and Gere about their reflections on the process.

Swett spoke in favor of setting the Town Manager’s next round of goals in September right after his evaluation. Swett reflected that what Griggs had put together were not specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-based (SMART) goals but were still valid components of doing a good job. Swett highlighted that the updated evaluation form provided by Duffy in the April 22nd packet had been considered “good enough” by a previous Selectboard and suggested using it for his evaluation in September. Swett voiced support for committing time each month to plan for the Town Manager’s next evaluation and goals. Swett suggested possibly adding a smaller goal or two that would be achievable in the three or so remaining months, upon agreement by the Selectboard and Town Manager.

Gere explained that he had not reviewed the evaluation form but that he hoped the form would include meeting the professional standards of the job, adherence to the law, and ability to accommodate whatever unique characteristics the town had. Gere shared that he had trouble with micromanagement, and having too loose an interpretation of the “deep inner goals” the Town Manager should have towards benefitting the town, which would be impossible to evaluate. Gere advocated for coming back again with new summaries of individual goal ideas to discuss with the Town Manager leading up to September.

Layton suggested that in addition to ongoing professional requirements and usual management goals, critical areas could be considered personnel and unexpected disasters. Layton stated that Duffy had completely

stabilized personnel, and that critical focus could be placed on infrastructure or whatever else that is “bubbling up from below.” Layton suggested deciding on whether they would want a SMART framework for goals, which could narrow down the Selectboard’s broad ideas.

Classon pointed out that Gere had spoken a lot about behavior goals, which were more subjective but important and could be judged across the whole year.

Gere cautioned that some aspects of behavior would be more a question of contract renewal.

Griggs pointed out that they kept returning to the discussion of evaluation, which was not on the agenda. Griggs reiterated that he was not rejecting the existing evaluation form and that he was just trying to talk about goals.

Duffy expressed confusion at Griggs’s comments and stated that broad, overarching goals were not SMART goals. Duffy stated that he would want to know “what those objectives are to get to those goals and how that’s going to be evaluated before we agree to them.” Duffy asked that Gere read the current draft of the evaluation and goals and suggested that the Selectboard return at the next meeting to align.

Peter Orner expressed his lack of understanding at the discussion. Orner shared that the town has certain expectations and that he thought it fair for the Selectboard to raise those issues whenever. Orner gave the example of pedestrian walkability and the need to implement a plan to make it more walkable. Orner commended Duffy on his communication.

Layton shared that she did not agree with Griggs that Duffy was looking to divide the Selectboard.

Classon asked what the Selectboard’s commitment was in terms of evaluation come September.

Griggs stated that they would put the topic on the agenda and that it may require an executive session.

12. Approve Minutes **Timestamp: 2:16:23**

Duffy asked that the wording be modified to clarify that he was allowing the petition from the United Federation of Police Officers to move forward. The minutes incorrectly stated that he supported the response to a request for petition.

Duffy stated that he did not think that item 10, Department Reports, had been discussed. Duffy referenced the note on the minutes that stated, “see above,” which directed the reader to the previous item, the Town Manager’s report. Duffy stated that he thought they normally had at least an acknowledgement of the other reports that had been submitted but that they did not in the meeting. Duffy suggested amending the minutes to state that department reports were skipped or missed.

I move to approve the minutes of the regular Selectboard meeting of May 27, 2026 as amended to state that the Town Manager was neutral on the petition and there was no discussion of department reports. – Layton moved (2nd Classon) Vote: yes (unanimous)

Classon read through the language preceding the entrance into executive session and shared his concern that there may have been action items and some “definitive calls” made in the executive session but not disclosed in public session.

Duffy stated his confusion on what this had to do with the minutes.

Classon stated that he did not want the minutes to be an unfaithful recollection of what was discussed. Gere stated that he did not believe any actionable direction was decided by the Selectboard and that he thought a straw poll was “treading along the edges but outside of the area of concern.” Swett stated that he thought no action was taken as there was no motion and no vote.

Classon shared that he knew Griggs had reached out to the lawyers. Griggs shared that he had not yet gotten a response and that he was “not ready to change the minutes.”

Classon shared that he had doubt that decisions were discussed and decided upon in a meeting, despite it being in a straw poll. Griggs reminded Classon that it was an executive session and to be careful in discussing it.

Duffy shared that he thought it had gotten a “little bit inappropriate” and that the purpose of the minutes was to reflect what was said in a meeting, not intent.

Classon reiterated doubts that “decisions which may ultimately come across our table as warrant articles to be approved in future were discussed and decided upon at that meeting.”

I approve the minutes of the Special Selectboard meeting of May 27, 2026 as presented – Layton moved (2nd Gere) Vote: yes (Layton, Swett, Gere, Griggs), no (Classon)

13. AP Warrants **Timestamp: 2:36:05**

Selectboard members and Duffy discussed the wording of the draft motions and their accuracy.

Treasurer Cheryl Lindberg explained that they should have had another warrant from another reserve fund to approve that night with an expenditure and one fewer item on the general fund warrant.

Duffy advocated for being made aware of that sort of issue earlier to allow for more efficient correction.

Griggs handed the meeting over to Classon and retired for the evening.

Swett explained the updates to the line item coding in the updated motion wording.

*I move to approve AP warrant #1490 in the amount of \$109,612.63 with \$103,758.13 to be paid from the General Fund, and the Chase Site Service, Inc. invoice for the Mitchel Brook Culvert in the amount of \$5,854.50 to be re-classed from #01-5-703610.00 to the Culvert Fund account #54-5-703322.00 and to be paid from that fund. I move to approve AP Warrant #1491 in the amount of \$238.50 to be paid from the General Fund and AP Warrant #1492 in the amount of \$509.94 from The General Fund. – Swett moved (2nd Layton)
Vote: yes (Layton, Swett, Gere, Classon)*

Swett explained that he received confirmation that moving the warrants in the way done would provide sufficient financial oversight, despite the original issue in the line items.

Duffy shared that he thought Swett’s language was sufficient.

14. Receipt of Correspondence
Timestamp: 2:47:59

Classon read through the list of correspondence prepared by Griggs.

Swett clarified that it was up to the discretion of the Selectboard to pass along the warrant to impound unlicensed dogs and accompanying list of unlicensed dogs from the Town Clerk to the Police Chief.

Swett thanked Rosalinda for the reminder to work with respect.

I move to receive all correspondence. – Gere moved (2nd Layton) Vote: yes (Layton, Swett, Gere, Classon)

15. Adjournment
Timestamp: 2:53:52

I move to adjourn the meeting. – Swett moved (2nd Gere) Vote: yes (Layton, Swett, Gere, Classon)

Meeting adjourned at 9:32.

Minutes taken by Jenny Tolman.

Minutes approved on June 24, 2026

Kimo Griggs, Selectboard Chair