

1 CHITTENDEN COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
2 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
3 MEETING MINUTES
4

5 Date: Wednesday, June 7, 2017
6 Time: 5:45 p.m.
7 Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
8 Present: Chris Roy, Chair Mike O'Brien, Vice-Chair
9 Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer Barbara Elliott, At-Large (5:50 p.m.)
10 Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
11 Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
12 Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
13 Forest Cohen, Business Manager Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
14 Bernie Ferenc, Transportation Business Manager
15

16 The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the chair, Chris Roy.
17

- 18 1. Changes to the Agenda; Members' Items. There were no changes to the agenda.
19
20 2. Approval of May 3, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O'BRIEN MADE A MOTION,
21 SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS
22 IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
23
24 3. Act 250 & Section 248 applications. There were none.
25
26 4. Administrative and Operating Procedures and Policies amendments.
27 a. Procurement Policy. Forest noted that we aligned our procedures to address the federal
28 regulations and State rules. We reviewed this with the Executive Committee previously.
29 (Barbara Elliott arrived.) When asked if we had any concerns about the changes, Charlie noted
30 that we tried to follow through and include what we already do. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A
31 MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O'BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE
32 PROCUREMENT POLICY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
33 b. Other amendments. Forest noted that we added a new position of Senior Business Manager
34 and revised the Transportation Business Manager and Finance Assistant positions slightly to
35 include reporting to Senior Business Manager. We updated the salary table; we updated
36 language in our backup procedures and added language regarding computer replacement
37 policy. There was a brief discussion about computer backup. We will ask Pam to revise the
38 language regarding backups. When asked about QuickBooks backup, Forest said it's backed up
39 in two different places, and there are 5-6 backups to the company file. Charlie noted that this
40 language is a recommendation on the IT side, not the accounting side. When asked if these
41 amendments need to be approved by the board, Charlie said the bylaws give the Executive
42 Committee authority to approve administrative policies. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION
43 TO APPROVE THESE CHANGES TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING PROCEDURES AND
44 POLICIES. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
45
46 5. Auditor Selection. Forest noted that we put out annual audit services out to bid, as recommended
47 by this committee. We received three proposals and the Finance Committee, Charlie, Bernie and
48 Forest reviewed them. The Finance Committee recommended we hire the incumbent, Sullivan

1 Powers and Company, with the request that we asked SPC to align the cost more closely with the
2 other responders since they weren't the low bidder. They subsequently reduced the cost by
3 \$2,500. We also asked that they have a different audit reviewer oversee our audit this year. Mike
4 noted based on professional interactions with the other two responders, and feedback from the
5 other RPCs, Charlie and Forest had indicated that they believe they would maintain a more positive
6 working relationship with Sullivan Powers & Co. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY
7 MIKE O'BRIEN, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AWARD SULLIVAN POWERS AND CO. THE
8 CONTRACT TO PROVIDE ANNUAL AUDITING SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AND SUBSEQUENT
9 YEARS AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE; AND, THAT A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS BE ISSUED AGAIN IN NO
10 MORE THAN FIVE YEARS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

11
12 6. CCRPC & ECOS Plan role regarding energy planning. Charlie referred to the memo in the packet and
13 explained that he'd like to propose a different recommendation, which is to hold off on additional
14 outreach to the municipalities until we have feedback from the Department of Public Service and to
15 allow staff to dig into the local constraints a bit further. With this information, we can provide the
16 Selectboards with a much clearer ask. At this stage, an ask about what level of authority we should
17 establish in the regional plan would be a bit too theoretical.

18
19 Chris believes there are three fundamental questions the RPC needs to decide about where we want
20 to be and how to get there:

- 21 1. Simply provide a framework and defer to the Towns for the specifics?
- 22 2. Take more of an advocacy role in the Plan; and if so, in which direction as there are opinions
23 on both sides?
- 24 3. Who are we going to take municipal input from? The legislative bodies, our Board
25 members? Our Board members need to represent the opinion of their municipality, unless the
26 legislative body defers to their representative.

27
28 Charlie added that another important factor to consider is the specific terminology the legislature
29 used to devise this system. "The Public Service Board shall give substantial deference to the **land**
30 **conservation measures** and specific policies contained in a duly adopted regional and municipal
31 plan..." Therefore, to gain substantial deference we likely need to more broadly define land
32 conservation measures that are relevant to all development rather than just wind and solar
33 generation facilities. This would broaden the approach that we've taken thus far.

34
35 Chris indicated that while identification of "no build" areas may meet a larger public good,
36 discerning the impact on landowners at the municipal level is a challenge and at the regional level
37 we are even farther removed from landowner ramifications. We should be wary of mapping
38 development restrictions across the county unless and until all relevant players are on board with
39 such a designation after adequate public notice and input.

40
41 Andy stated that we've traditionally supported our municipalities in development review. For us to
42 set up a system where we may oppose one of our municipalities on a proposed development would
43 be a real morass. We ought to avoid that situation. There was some discussion about the
44 challenges in this realm where there may be opposing municipal viewpoints, particularly regarding
45 wind turbines given potentially different financial and aesthetic impacts on host towns and nearby
46 communities. Mike agreed that we should stick with our current practice of supporting our
47 municipalities on development applications.

1
2 There was discussion about supporting municipal interests, but not advocating. There was a
3 suggestion to build upon the concept behind the planning area map and associated policy. In that
4 example, the planning areas are established based on local zoning, with a regional policy to build
5 80% within the areas planned for growth. Perhaps a similar method could be used for the 90%
6 renewable goal – build a regional framework from municipal input. There was general agreement
7 that CCRPC would work regionally to understand how we reach the energy goals and that we would
8 be supportive of town’s approach and that the regional plan would provide the general framework
9 for supporting municipalities in their approach to getting to 90% renewable.

10
11 7. Chair/Executive Director Report.

12 a. Water Quality Implementation Role. Charlie will keep members updated as things are
13 finalized. We’ve been managing the basin planning contract for all of the RPCs. We’ve
14 received Municipal Roads Grants and there is more capital money in the state budget and
15 they’re trying to decide how to get the money out there. There will be \$2.5 million available
16 through the RPCs to towns (about \$10-20,000 per project) with Northwest RPC taking the
17 lead on administering the funds. There is a third grant program that they constructed that
18 the RPCs applied for and Southern Windsor RPC will be the administrator on this one to deal
19 with the “go lists” of project ready to be constructed. There are also ecosystem restoration
20 grant fund available now. We will have another compliment of transportation-stormwater
21 grant programs after July 1st. We’re trying to tell them that this is not the time to have
22 municipalities complete applications for funding, as they are busy with construction projects
23 already in the pipeline.

24
25 8. Agenda Review for June 21, 2017 Annual Board Meeting. Bernie noted that this is indeed for 2017
26 and not 2016 as the draft agenda indicates. Barbara Elliott noted that the invitation that went out
27 to folks indicated that the social hour would begin at 5:30, with the business meeting at 7 p.m. and
28 guest speaker at 7:15 p.m. Members agreed we should be consistent with what invitees have
29 already seen. We will also make sure Julie Moore knows the correct time. So far there has not been
30 a great response to attend. Bernie will follow up with our board members.

31
32 9. Other Business.
33 a. Barbara suggested we make sure the list of upcoming meetings shows the 5:15 start time
34 for training in July. We will add this as another item.
35 b. Regina asked members if they were all available for the next Executive Committee meeting
36 since it’s scheduled for July 5th. Members present indicated they could attend.

37 10. Executive Session. Not needed.

38 11. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO AJOURN AT
39 6:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

40
41 Respectfully submitted,
42
43 Bernadette Ferenc