DATE: Wednesday, September 6, 2017
TIME: 5:45 p.m.
PLACE: CCRPC offices; 110 W. Canal Street, Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
PRESENT: Chris Roy, Chair
Barbara Elliott, At-Large
Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer
John Zicconi, At-Large
Forest Cohen, Sr. Business Manager

The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy.

1. Changes to the agenda; Members’ Items. There were none.

2. Approval of August 2, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 2, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED WITH ANDY MONTROLL ABSTAINING.

3. Act 250 & Sec. 248 Applications.
   a. Potential Solar Array project for Colchester – “Preferred Site.” Regina explained that net metering projects in Vermont are capped at 150kW, unless they are located on a preferred site. Vermont’s net metering rules allow for net metering projects to be up to 500kW if they are located on certain sites (described in her memo) or a specific location identified in a joint letter of support from the municipal legislative body and the municipal and regional planning commission. The main applicant is the Town of Colchester and some of the material has been reviewed by the Selectboard. This is on an open space parcel, part of a PUD, which is owned by the town. Colchester selectboard and planning commission drafted a letter to the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) saying that the current Colchester Town Plan does not provide guidance on solar siting and therefore the Planning Commission does not have the basis to evaluate compliance or non-compliance; however the Colchester Selectboard has endorsed the project and will solicit community input on the siting of this proposed solar facility in a comprehensive manner more so than envisioned by a preferred site process. The Town is asking CCRPC if we would consider writing a similar letter in support of this project. Staff has reviewed the project in light of our draft Energy Plan; and under our current practice of development review and didn’t find any issues. This is in the rural planning area and we have in the past found solar projects to be okay in rural areas. We do not need action tonight. Colchester’s solar consultant prepared a draft letter for CCRPC consideration, acknowledging that we also don’t have a plan or process or procedure in place to identify something as a preferred site yet, but that we find the site to be appropriate. Regina said staff is fine with this as an approach, but wanted to check with Executive Committee. Chris Roy questioned the 150kW system which is okay on a preferred site. However, the letter is not consistent with powerpoint printout that says the project is 208kW. Regina will check on this. This is a municipal net metering project and he feels it’ll have public input on it. John Zicconi questioned whether this is indeed a good
site or just site that would provide a project that lowers their energy rate. Regina feels that
Colchester really wants to go with this type of project and has spent a lot of time researching
appropriate sites. Discussion continued about whether “preferred site,” since it doesn’t have
criteria or procedure yet, is as simple as when someone looks at it can say “yes that’s it.” Andy
Montroll asked if we have any criteria to judge these on yet. We don’t yet. We have our general
development review policy, but nothing in place to identify something as a preferred site for
solar. Regina said she understands there will be a public process and the town is okay with it,
and in the normal Act 250 review we put a good deal of weight into what the municipality
supports. John Zicconi said when we have dual sign-off with town and RPC he assumes that’s
there for checks and balances. Lengthy discussion continued. Do we feel we have something
that we’re comfortable with before we sign it? John Zicconi questioned whether they should do
the local public process before they go to the Public Utilities Commission, or should that go first.
Regina said she understands there will be a couple of meetings in Colchester in September, so
we won’t have final discussion until October for our action. After a brief discussion, Barbara
Elliott suggested changing the second from the last paragraph in the letter to PUC to read that
CCRPC is not against it, rather than is in support of it. Members agreed. Regina will check with
Colchester to see if that type of language would get them what they need to move this project
forward.

b. Cobble Hill Trailer Sales, Milton (4C1144-5). Regina noted that Lot #1 is Cobble Hill Trailer sales
and the boundary line will be expanded and become Mountain Transit. The Executive
Committee is being asked to ratify the letter sent to the DEC #4. JOHN ZICCONI MADE A
MOTION, SECONDED BY BRIAN BIGELOW, TO RATIFY THE LETTER SENT TO DEC #4. MOTION
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. ECOS Plan Update.
   a. Energy Element – draft policy statements. Members reviewed the second page of 3.2.2. The
   Energy Subcommittee came up with a way to eliminate “should” and “shall”. We need to say
   that there are places that we don’t want to see this, but there are places that we would like to
   see renewable energy projects. There are still some questions about how this will play out in
   the long term. Staff is checking in the Executive Committee to get their opinion on the tone of
   this. Chris Roy said he really likes it because there is an area of clear restrictions where we can
   say “no” and then everything else has a continuum of suggested things that we’re looking for.
   He feels it was a good approach. John Zicconi agreed and gives high praise for getting out of the
   “should” and “shall”. Staff will still refine this. The very clear constraint vs. suitability was
   Emily’s idea. Chris Roy is looking forward to the final draft to review at the board meeting.
   b. MTP – draft financial plan. Elenie presented revised material from what was in the packet. We
   have three elements we have to address: 1) funding reasonably expected to be available; 2)
   level of funding needed to operate and maintain the existing system; and 3) the difference
   between 1 and 2 and how this will be allocated to projects/strategies. First we determined the
   amount of federal funds Vermont received from 2010-2016 ($211,609,103). Then we reviewed
   the portion of all federal funds (except earmarks) that came to Chittenden County. Between
   FY1999 and FY2016 the average was 19.4%. VTrans has agreed to use that number although
   they reminded us that there are several big projects in the pipeline. Now that we know how
   much money we have, we need to decide how we divide that among the various categories,
   which we redefined. For planning purposes we’ll define 70% to go to maintenance and 30% for
   new/expansion projects with the possibility that we’ll go as high as 45% for new projects.
   Discussion ensued. It was noted that the percentages are over the period to 2050 and individual
years will fluctuate. Eleni said if the Executive Committee is comfortable with that ratio, staff will work out the details and bring more information next month.

c. **CEDS Update.** Regina noted that we’re updating Community Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) because it’s on the same five-year cycle as the ECOS plan. We’re meeting with GBIC and others and will bring something in October and then go to municipalities to either the economic development committees or planning commissions.

5. **Credit Card Account Officer’s Certificate.** Forest Cohen presented a form that we need to fill out for the credit cards we have. We’re looking for a motion to authorize Chris to sign it. (This was just brought to our attention recently although we’ve had the cards for several years since the merger.)

   **BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CHAIR, CHRIS ROY, TO SIGN THE FORM.**

   **BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

6. **Draft FY17 Financials.** Forest reviewed his memo in the packet, along with the financial statements. The bottom line is that we have $166,000 of income, unaudited. We did a good job of billing out our projects but fell short and only spent 95% of our expenses. We know when we earn this much it will affect our indirect rate two years down the road. Next year (FY18) will be a penalty year so we will have a lesser amount and have predicted a deficit. Our balance sheet is very strong with plenty of cash in the bank and no debt. Charlie said we made money in FY16 so that’s why we’re recovering less income in FY18. We also made money in FY17 so FY 19 will be another deficit year. We have been trying to be conservative. Charlie noted we talked to the Finance Committee and discussed that we could potentially review the rate at mid-year and perhaps adjust it then to reduce the income. Discussion ensued about having a three-year adjustment. Charlie said the RPCs have differing processes. After the merger we started with a high indirect rate and have been dealing ever since. Lengthy discussion continued. Charlie said VTrans is trying to be accommodating and are working with us. After further discussion, it was noted that there are pros and cons and perhaps we shouldn’t adjust the indirect rate at the mid-year. Talked about how it might work better if phased over two years.

7. **Executive Director’s Report.**

   a. **Building Homes Together Campaign- revised numbers.** Regina noted that we have revised numbers for FY16 and presented a revised chart showing the number and type of housing units built or demolished in 2016. There were 834 new homes (rather than the near 1,000 we reported earlier). The plan is to have a press conference on September 27th to report these numbers and the Governor will also talk about the housing bond passed by the Legislature earlier this year. Regina noted that two years ago 400, 2015- 600 and 2016 – 834. Regina said this chart is based on certificates of occupancy, so they are actually built; and it is based on the calendar year.

   b. **Clean Water Program Update.** Charlie noted we’ve started work on these and we have four applications totaling $70,000 which we are reviewing. We are also working on basin planning that we’ve been subcontracted to do. Our application is due next Friday. The state Clean Water Fund Board met yesterday and have not responded to our comments. Capital bond money – they received more revenue than what had been anticipated, so there might be more capital money going in there. The Grants-in-Aid Program has shown that most towns are getting things done. Sec. Moore was taxed with looking at long-term funding. One question is are we going to do a statewide parcel fee and it seems it’s years away because of what has to be done to put this in place and how to bill each property owner and not just those who pay taxes. There may be more information for the October Board meeting.
8. **Agenda Review – September 20th meeting.** Members reviewed the proposed agenda.

9. **Other Business.**
   a. Charlie noted there is a Union Municipal District Agreement and a draft funding MOU for the regional dispatch project. These were reviewed by municipal managers and attorneys. It then will go the Attorney General in September and then to selectboards to ask to get it on town meeting ballots. Brief discussion.
   b. John Zicconi asked is South Burlington has come to us with the airport ownership issue. Charlie said no. Brief discussion.

10. **Executive Session.** None needed.

11. **Adjournment.** JOHN ZICCONI MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN AT 7 P.M. ANDY MONTROLL SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc