DATE:  Wednesday, September 9, 2015 
TIME:  2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. 
PLACE: CCRPC Offices, 110 West Canal Street, Suite 202, Winooski, VT

Members Present
Joss Besse, Bolton
Paul Conner, South Burlington
Ken Belliveau, Williston
Dana Hanley, Essex
Jeannine McCrumb, Charlotte
David White, Burlington
Alex Weinhagen, Hinesburg

Melissa Manka, Westford
Dean Pierce, Shelburne
Sarah Hadd, Colchester
Karen Purinton, Colchester

Staff
Regina Mahony, Planning Program Manager
Lee Krohn, Senior Planner

1. Welcome and Introductions
Joss Besse called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

2. Approval of July 8, 2015 Minutes
Paul Conner made a motion, seconded by Dean Pierce to approve the July 8, 2015 minutes. No further discussion. MOTION PASSED.

3. Permit Tracking Research Update
Lee Krohn provided an overview of his research to date on the permit tracking software systems. The options are quite varied in complexity and cost. Some use NMERC – the users have reported very differing opinions on the usefulness of this system, and you can’t attach documents. It is affordable (about $2,000), but not customizable. Lee received rave reviews from Barre City about their system, and experienced a live demo from Janet Shatney, Barre’s main user of the system. They use Citizen Serve – it is affordable (about $1,800 per year/per license), links to the grand list, customizable, 24-7 help response system, customizable forms, abutter landowner notification, town logo, etc. You can do a simple data dump into an excel spreadsheet if they go away or if it doesn’t work for you over time. Janet Shatney would be happy to answer questions as she has been using it for a number of years. The PAC verified that they would still like this information in a memo so that they can customize this for budget conversations with their Selectboards. CCRPC will provide this information in a memo to the municipalities. Jeannine reminded CCRPC Staff that Charlotte is also using a very simple access database – it can be clunky but helpful and is a good option for a small town. This will be added to the research spreadsheet/memo. Sarah asked about the software Citizen Serve uses to link to the grand list, and if that software is proprietary? This led to questions about whether Barre has a live link to the grand list or whether there is a regularly scheduled data dump. CCRPC will follow-up with these questions, prepare a memo and provide it to the PAC members.

4. Act 250 – Municipal Impact Fee Discussion
Regina explained, in some circumstances, the District Commission has begun to impose payment of fair share transportation mitigation fees to municipalities through the use of Act 145. We knew that this would be used for State capital projects with payment to VTrans, but not for municipal projects. Regina stated that we wanted to alert you of this because it is unclear whether this is being coordinated with the municipalities or not. Ken Belliveau mentioned the Transportation Improvement District demonstration project that CCRPC will be working on with Williston. The point is to clearly define the transportation improvement needs between both the State and the Municipality so that each development can be assessed a fair fee, and avoid “double dipping”. Regina Mahony explained that it may be a good idea for each municipality to review the draft permits to monitor this, however CCRPC will be doing the same and will alert each municipality when we see a draft condition. In addition, the PAC asked that we communicate with the District Commission and let them know that those conditions need to be coordinated with the municipalities.
5. Essex 2015 Comprehensive Plan

Joss Besse opened the public hearing. No one from the public was in attendance. The public comment period was closed.

Regina Mahony summarized the Staff comments that were completed by CCRPC Staff, Emily Nosse-Leirer. Regina mentioned that CCRPC Staff comments were previously provided to the Essex Planning Commission in time for their public hearing, and amendments were made accordingly as explained in the Staff report. Overall, the update looks great with an Action Plan in the front chapter and quite a reduction in content to make it more user friendly. Regina explained that Staff found that the Plan meets the requirements of the elements and is consistent with the goals, despite some of the responses in Essex’s Appendix A submittal.

Dana Hanley explained that there are sections that they felt should be improved somewhere down the line including JAM Golf outfall and agriculture. The main goal of this re-write was to make it more usable, shorter and strategic with the Action Plan. For the Action Plan they asked the Town Departments to give them a list of what they are actually going to do. Implementation is right up front, with funding options. They’ve received lots of positive feedback so far.

Alex Weinhagen asked about the maps. Dana Hanley explained that they are located within the text rather than at the end, and when it is graphically designed they will pop up and take up the whole page. Alex Weinhagen also asked how the Town is handling the existing agricultural land that isn’t protected by floodplains or other natural resource protections. Dana Hanley explained that they’ve worked on conservation subdivision regulations that are good, but tough. Brandy Saxton developed the state-of-the-art regulations. They ran into some opposition from the Public Works Department, and some developers. The density would have increased but it also would have really protected a number of resources. At that point the municipality was side-tracked by the Saxton Hill changes and haven’t been able to return to it yet. Alex Weinhagen expressed concern that some of the economic development goals could put some real growth pressure on the rural parts of Town.

Paul Conner asked about the tasks in the Action Plan - to what extent will the Selectboard vet those? Dana Hanley explained that these implementation actions are more up-front and center than they’ve been before, so she isn’t quite sure what they’ll want to do with them. Sarah Hadd expressed that it is really great to see a sustained vision in Essex, with a focus on implementing it.

Paul Conner made a motion, seconded by Sarah Hadd, that the PAC finds the draft 2016 Essex Town Plan, as submitted, meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC approval, and that the municipality's planning process meets all statutory requirements for CCRPC confirmation. Upon notification that the Plan has been adopted by the municipality, CCRPC staff will review the plan, and any information relevant to the confirmation process, for changes. If staff determines that changes are substantive, those changes will be forwarded to the PAC for review. Otherwise the PAC recommends that the Plan, and the municipal planning process, should be forwarded to the CCRPC Board for approval. No discussion. MOTION PASSED.

6. Regional Act 250/Section 248 Projects in the Horizon

- Didn’t get to this.

7. Other Business

a. Next meeting is on Veteran’s Day (November 11th) – this is a holiday for many members so CCRPC Staff will reschedule the November meeting.

b. Long Range Planning Committee Reconvened for ECOS Plan Updates – Regina Mahony explained that we need to do some amendments to the ECOS Plan and we need 1 or 2 PAC members. Jeannine McCrumb and Paul Conner will represent the PAC on the LRPC.

c. We also need UPWP Committee Reps. The PAC discussed that they are happy with Joss Besse and Ken
Belliveau remaining on the UPWP as they have in years past.

d. Melanie will soon be sending out requests for information on new development for 2014 to update the ECOS indicators.

7. **Adjourn**

Ken Belliveau made a motion, seconded by Paul Conner to adjourn the meeting. No discussion. MOTION PASSED. The meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m. The next meeting date is to be determined.

Respectfully submitted, Regina Mahony