

## Minutes of the Vermont Passenger Tramway Board Meeting Held on: August 23, 2024, at 5 Green Mountain Dr. Montpelier VT.

## Meeting called to order by Commissioner Harrington at 1:03 p.m.

<u>Board Members present</u>: Tom Buchanan, Commissioner M. Harrington, Kirsten Ericksen, & Scott Reeves.

Others Present: Dirk Anderson (VDOL Tramway Director), Mike Nellis, Rob Swift, and Mike Morelli (VDOL Tramway Inspectors), Chad Wawrzyniak VDOL CFO, and N. Taraski, clerk. Joined Virtually: Alicia O'Gorman (Ski Vermont), Mike Pierce & Megan Altemose (S-6), and some other unidentified participants.

Commissioner M. Harrington welcomed everyone and read the agenda.

Commissioner Harrington allowed Board member T. Buchanan to bring up proposed edits of our prior May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024, meeting minutes as follows:

The discussion of the Stowe variance was related to a Vermont Tramway Rule, not the ANSI B77. That should be clarified, and whenever practical a rule should be listed in the minutes as written, rather than paraphrased. The minutes should also make clear what the proposed (and adopted) protocols are. This is an issue that affects many other ski areas. I think it's important to make clear what Stowe is doing so that other ski areas understand the specifics of that situation and variance approval. These are my proposed amendments with strikeouts (delete) and underscores (add):

## Variances:

Scott Reeves recused himself as board member to avoid bias. Leaving Gary Gendimenico and Mark Fletcher to present the variance request for Stowe Mountain pertaining to Code-requirements stating that any buildings or structures that are within 100 ft. of any part of the lift will need an alarm system tied into the lift per 3.05D ii of the ANSI B77 "any structure closer than 100 feet to any part of a passenger ropeway shall have a method to notify the operator of a fire (Vermont Tramway Rules 3.05 (d)(ii))." Stowe is requesting a variance based on the construction of private residences within 100 feet of the Adventure Triple lift line, over which Stowe Mountain Resort has no jurisdiction. In support of the variance request, Stowe Mountain Resort noted that each of the residences is easily visible from the lift loading and unloading stations, and then presented enhanced safety protocols to be implemented by its lift operators. Those protocols include training lift operators to scan the surrounding area and all structures for fire on a regular basis, and to stop loading the lift if a fire or fire alarm is detected.

[Scott: does the protocol being used also instruct lift attendants to report the fire, and should that be included in the description? Should we list the job titles for Gary Gendimenico and Mark Fletcher?]

The section about the report by Mike Nellis stated that 6 ski areas did not operate. I believe this should be 6 lifts. The proposed amendment is below:

28 Ski areas were inspected this year, with 6 ski areas lifts not operating or inspected.

Motion:	Second:	In Favor:
To Approve minutes with	By: Kirsten Ericksen	All
suggested Edits.		
By: T. Buchanan		

<u>Commissioner Harrington</u> gave a brief explanation about "Fee Due" as the statutory mechanism for funding the Department's Passenger Tramway Safety Program. The Fee Due is a monetary assessment on ski areas expressed as a dollar amount per linear foot of haul rope.

<u>D. Anderson</u> added an explanation that lift modifications and new construction add a multiplying factor to the Fee Due, such that years with a lot of construction activity tend to lower the Fee Due number.

<u>Chad Wawrzyniak</u> presented the FY 2024 budget, explaining how his projection will always have unexpected items such was the case for the 2024 year closing at \$22,500.00 under and there was a discussion on how the Department will absorb the shortage. After a couple of questions, we moved to his presentation for the proposed budget for the 2025 fiscal year. Included in the budget is level funding for the lift mechanic apprenticeship program at \$15,000.00.

<u>Commissioner Harrington</u> presented 3 different fee due amounts as follows:

\$550k = \$.80 x linear ft. should bring enough revenue to run the program.

\$563k = \$.82 x linear ft. should bring enough revenue to run the program and replace the oldest of the Department's ATVs.

 $$570k = $.83 x \text{ linear ft. should bring enough revenue to run the program, replace the oldest of the Department's ATVs, and build in a small reserve.$ 

After a lengthy discussion about, expenses such as office equipment (assets), overtime, and payroll a motion was made as follows:

Motion:	Second:	<u>In favor:</u>
To set the rate at \$.80x linear	By: Kirsten Ericksen	Ericksen, Reeves, Harrington
ft.		Opposed:
		Buchanan
By: S. Reeves		
		The Motion Passes 3-1.

There was an open discussion about reserves according to Statue.

Commissioner Harrington opened the floor for Public Comment and there was none.

Next Meeting was set for Sept. 19<sup>th</sup> at 1pm.

Motion:	Second:	In favor:
To Adjourn at 2:16 pm	S. Reeves	All
By: T. Buchanan		