

**Agenda**

Bergman -motion

Barlow second

**Councilors** - Laura Sanchez-Parkinson, Melo Grant, Sara Carpenter, Mark Barlow, Allie Schacter, Ranjit Buddy Singh, Mayor Mulvaney-Stanak, Marek Broderick, Gene Bergman  
City Attorney Brown

**Other Project Team**

Kristen Shamis - outside council

Israel Maynard - Stantec

Peter Pochop - Vtrans

Matt Colburn - Vtrans

Jeff Blanchard - Vtrans

Corey Mims - DPW

Chapin Spencer - DPW

Laura Wheelock - DPW

**Interested Parties**

John Franco

**2.1 Necessity Hearing**

Overview of the Condemnation Process and State Statute by Kristen Shamis

Presentation for purpose of the project by Israel Maynard - Stantec (included in the Exhibits on Civic Clerk)

Question from Councilor Bergman about the statue relative to the document submitted by Attorney Franco. Kristen noted the contestation made by Franco was citing a different type of condemnation process, the

Matt Colburn - ROW agent with Vtrans, been with vtrans for 18 years, current position for 11 years.  
Testimony for minimal impact.

No questions about the Grant and Peter Pochop not called

Corey Mims

Sr Public Works Engineer

Project Supervisor

Notice of Hearing and Receipts all in evidence

Confirm posting at clerk office - yes

Did the city post it elsewhere - yes, 3 locations - 645 Pine and Library

Confirm posted in seven days - yes

Confirm planning commission - yes

Confirm by certified mail - yes

Interested Parties

Attorney John Franco for the owners of 20 Pine Street representing Church of Immaculate Conception-asked to have the image of the property and boundary displayed on the screen.

Question - what is the significance of the darker/thicker line on St Paul St vs the dotted line

IM - the darker line is the original ROW line of St. Paul St

Question

Franco - asked if city owns St Paul Street south of Cherry

Laura Wheelock - City Engineer - noted the city does own St. Paul St as ROW acquired under a Global Settlement

Franco - noted that this was recent and the City original turned over this area

Interested Parties taking testimony

We do not agree that we are condemning this parcel with the correct statute.

Noted his time in the city attorney office under Clavell it set up this area of the city as urban renewal and this area is reforming urban renewal area

Cited case law from 1971 with VT Gas that urban renewal condemnation prevails over other condemnation processes.

Councilor Questions

Bergman - statement a

Bergman makes a motion to close hearing and direct staff prepare finding of facts  
Second Schachter.

Roll call vote taken:

Barlow - yes

Bergman - yes

Broderick - yes

Carpenter - yes

Grant - yes

Sanchez-Parkinson - yes

Schachter - yes

Singh- yes

Mayor - yes

9 yes

4 absent

Close the hearing at 6:35pm

Item 3.1

Open the hearing at 6:35pm

Kristen - shares definitions on the determination of damages.

Submitted offer letters for the temporary and permanent easements

Corey - Sr Public Work Engineer, Project Supervisor

Can you confirm that offer letters were sent to property owner - yes

Kristen shared the waiver valuation sent to the property owner.

Jeff Blanchard - Vtrans ROW Acquisition chief

Did you approve the waiver valuation that was prepared by the City - yes

Jeff describes what a waiver valuation is used for, used for simpler acquisitions vs an appraisal.

Details of this valuation -

Review accuracy, temporary easements get a larger discount than permanent easements.

Confirmed signature of approval.

Does the taking impact the best use of the property - no

Attorney Franco - representing property at 20 Pine Street

When these calculations were made was it on the \$2M appraisal or was it calculated with the 87%

Jeff - yes

Franco - what is the common level of appraisal for 2026

Jeff - I do not have that on me.

Jeff looked up the common level of appraisal for 2026 - this is 79%

Franco - do we agree that this should be valued in 2026 since we are doing this work in 2026

Jeff - that is not something that I had calculated for previous evidence but did calculate it today, it totals \$6850

Staff agrees that we can use the value of \$6850

Councilor Question

Barlow - question about the letter objection to compensation relative to compensation noted in the letter.

Franco - not sure the has to do with the compensation part of the hearing, but also noted that the trust feels that the zoning issues nit picking - interested in a global settlement on the two issues.

Jessica - the item is currently pending in court, there is a settlement that the City offered to Attorney Franco

Laura Wheelock - noted that any compensation considering that only the highway portion would be grant eligible.

Barlow -

Motion - update the motion to approve a compensation of 6850 for the easements, and dismiss the enforcement action

Motion not seconded.

Bergman - not comfortable moving forward with this direction at this point without hearing from office of city attorney and

Bergman - Motion to continue on June 29th, 2026

Second by Singh - yes

Further discussion

Singh- not enough information on the intertwined items.

Schachter - should the motion direct staff the further testimony

Bergman - does not believe we need to be specific, and thinks we need executive session.

Brown - encouraged us to not connect the two items

Laura - provided testimony of the grant time line

Called the question for the motion: roll call vote taken:

Barlow - yes

Bergman - yes

Broderick - yes

Carpenter - yes

Grant - yes

Sanchez-Parkinson - absent

Schachter - yes

Singh - yes

Mayor - yes

8 yes

0 no

5 absent

Adjourned meeting - 7:11PM