

CITATION ERRORS

✘ Town Report Article 12 incorrectly cited 17 V.S.A. § 246(a)(1) → nonexistent

✘ Selectboard Validation incorrectly cited 17 V.S.A. § 2646(a)(1) → nonexistent

✔ **Correct citation is 17 V.S.A. § 2646a(a)(1)**

✘ Town Report Article 15 incorrectly cited 24 V.S.A. § 1692(a) → nonexistent

✘ Selectboard Validation incorrectly cited 24 V.S.A. § 1682(a) → Greensboro doesn't have auditors

✔ **Correct citation is probably either 24 V.S.A. § 1682 or 24 V.S.A. § 1682(b)**

I think you need to add another "Validation" item to the agenda for the next Selectboard meeting to correct the citation errors in the Town Report and at the Selectboard meeting on 4/8/26.

Caspian Dam and the Beach Property

At the 4/8/26 Selectboard meeting, MacNeil said that it is "Up to the voters whether or not they choose to acquire the property if it were offered to us." I don't believe this is correct, and I would ask that you please don't say this as it confuses voters and may cause them to ignore things that they should be paying attention to. I believe the Selectboard may be able to unilaterally make this decision; however, I think you should still ask the voters and should involve the public early in the process.

This beach issue is similar to the divisive issue Hardwick is now facing with their donated Town Forest. Hardwick's voters were not required to approve Hardwick's acquisition of the 330 acres.

Please proceed very carefully and transparently with the dam and beach property, make sure the public is aware of what is happening, and make sure the public is aware of the potential for huge future costs that may be placed on Greensboro's taxpayers. A posting on Front Porch Forum and Greensboro's website about this issue would seem to be appropriate.

In the same vein, I think you should make a post on Front Porch Forum and on Greensboro's website about the Planning Commission wanting to donate 7.5 acres of Greensboro's gravel pit for some sort of affordable housing development. This is an awful lot to ask of people when taxes and the cost of living are already so high.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR GREENSBORO SELECTBOARD adopted 4/8/26

The “Rules of Procedure for Greensboro Selectboard” that is in the Selectboard section of the Town’s website is old and it’s not the version that was in the Selectboard Packet for your 4/8/26 meeting, nor is it the version you approved on 4/8/26. When will the updated document appear on the Town’s website?

What is the “Basic Parliamentary Procedure” document dated 10/9/24 that is in the Selectboard section of the Town’s website? This policy has not been repealed, so we can only assume that it is still in effect. Do you intend to repeal this?

Here are a couple of more minor comments about the Rules of Procedure:

- In Section D.2. of the Rules of Procedure, the Town’s website should be updated from greensborovt.**org** to greensborovt.**gov**.
- In Section E.4.a. of the Rules of Procedure, the language saying “At least 24 hours” is not legal. A regular Selectboard meeting requires at least 48 hours notice. Also, what is the point of the entire section E.4.a.? I don’t understand why it’s in the document.

FUND BALANCE POLICY was adopted 4/8/26

The Fund Balance Policy is based on a template from VLCT that should have been customized to fit Greensboro’s situation and needs. This doesn’t seem to have been done, including the fact that at least some of VLCT’s boilerplate “Guidance” was left in the document.

Here’s the main problem: The Policy doesn’t specify a target amount, but instead only has a **minimum** amount—meaning you can have an infinite fund balance and still be in compliance with this policy. Greensboro already has much, much more money on hand than VLCT and other organizations consider to be prudent. So what exactly was the point of approving a policy? I think the Fund Balance Policy should specify an exact target, or a narrow range that has a lower and an upper bound.

Other problems with the policy:

- The policy seems to say different things with respect to how to calculate the amount needed:
 - One thing says “no less than two months of regular operating expenditures.”
 - But “Regular operating expenditures” is not defined anywhere.
 - Another thing says “approximately 17% of the most recent annual General Fund operating expenditures.”
 - But “Operating expenditures” is not defined anywhere.
 - And does this mean that anything related to the Highway Fund is excluded? The policy is not clear about whether the Highway Fund is part of what you were trying to include in your target fund balance.
- The Fund Balance Policy uses the word “expenditures” on several occasions. However, Greensboro’s new financial statements using the Modified Cash basis of accounting don’t have “expenditures,” but instead have “cash disbursements” and “other financing uses.” The Fund Balance Policy should use the same terminology as the audited financial statements so everyone has clear expectations about the Fund Balances and how they will be calculated and maintained over time.

I ask that you repeal the Fund Balance Policy that you approved on 4/8/26 or completely rework it so that it is clear to everyone, including the Selectboard and the Treasurer, what the policy actually means.