Date: Wednesday, June 7, 2017
Time: 5:45 p.m.
Place: CCRPC Offices; 110 W. Canal Street; Suite 202; Winooski, VT 05404
Present: Chris Roy, Chair    Mike O’Brien, Vice-Chair
         Brian Bigelow, Secretary-Treasurer    Barbara Elliott, At-Large (5:50 p.m.)
         Andy Montroll, Immediate Past Chair
Staff: Charlie Baker, Executive Director    Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
       Eleni Churchill, Transportation Program Manager
       Forest Cohen, Business Manager    Melanie Needle, Senior Planner
       Bernie Ferenc, Transportation 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 no changes to the agenda.

2. Approval of May 3, 2017 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2017 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 applications. There were none.

   a. Procurement Policy. Forest noted that we aligned our procedures to address the federal regulations and State rules. We reviewed this with the Executive Committee previously. (Barbara Elliott arrived.) When asked if we had any concerns about the changes, Charlie noted that we tried to follow through and include what we already do. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCUREMENT POLICY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
   b. Other amendments. Forest noted that we added a new position of Senior Business Manager and revised the Transportation Business Manager and Finance Assistant positions slightly to include reporting to Senior Business Manager. We updated the salary table; we updated language in our backup procedures and added language regarding computer replacement policy. There was a brief discussion about computer backup. We will ask Pam to revise the language regarding backups. When asked about QuickBooks backup, Forest said it’s backed up in two different places, and there are 5-6 backups to the company file. Charlie noted that this language is a recommendation on the IT side, not the accounting side. When asked if these amendments need to be approved by the board, Charlie said the bylaws give the Executive Committee authority to approve administrative policies. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THESE CHANGES TO THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES. BRIAN BIGELOW SECONDED AND THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Auditor Selection. Forest noted that we put out annual audit services out to bid, as recommended by this committee. We received three proposals and the Finance Committee, Charlie, Bernie and Forest reviewed them. The Finance Committee recommended we hire the incumbent, Sullivan
Powers and Company, with the request that we asked SPC to align the cost more closely with the other responders since they weren’t the low bidder. They subsequently reduced the cost by $2,500. We also asked that they have a different audit reviewer oversee our audit this year. Mike noted based on professional interactions with the other two responders, and feedback from the other RPCs, Charlie and Forest had indicated that they believe they would maintain a more positive working relationship with Sullivan Powers & Co. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY MIKE O’BRIEN, THAT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AWARD SULLIVAN POWERS AND CO. THE CONTRACT TO PROVIDE ANNUAL AUDITING SERVICES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE; AND, THAT A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS BE ISSUED AGAIN IN NO MORE THAN FIVE YEARS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

Chris believes there are three fundamental questions the RPC needs to decide about where we want to be and how to get there:
1. Simply provide a framework and defer to the Towns for the specifics?
2. Take more of an advocacy role in the Plan; and if so, in which direction as there are opinions on both sides?
3. Who are we going to take municipal input from? The legislative bodies, our Board members? Our Board members need to represent the opinion of their municipality, unless the legislative body defers to their representative.

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

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

Andy stated that we’ve traditionally supported our municipalities in development review. For us to set up a system where we may oppose one of our municipalities on a proposed development would be a real morass. We ought to avoid that situation. There was some discussion about the challenges in this realm where there may be opposing municipal viewpoints, particularly regarding wind turbines given potentially different financial and aesthetic impacts on host towns and nearby communities. Mike agreed that we should stick with our current practice of supporting our municipalities on development applications.
There was discussion about supporting municipal interests, but not advocating. There was a suggestion to build upon the concept behind the planning area map and associated policy. In that example, the planning areas are established based on local zoning, with a regional policy to build 80% within the areas planned for growth. Perhaps a similar method could be used for the 90% renewable goal – build a regional framework from municipal input. There was general agreement that CCRPC would work regionally to understand how we reach the energy goals and that we would be supportive of town’s approach and that the regional plan would provide the general framework for supporting municipalities in their approach to getting to 90% renewable.

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

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

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

10. Executive Session. Not needed.
11. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO AJOURN AT 6:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc