The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by the Chair, Chris Roy. Several Executive Committee members joined the meeting via conference call due to the inclement weather.

1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items: The agenda was changed to move item 5. Act 250 recommendations before item 4. Banking change resolutions.

2. Approval of January 2, 2019 Executive Committee Minutes. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 2, 2019 WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS WRITTEN.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications.
   a. Act 250 Hearing, Snyder Finney Crossing; Williston, #4Co887-1R-N. Regina noted that this is basically a renewal of their Findings of Fact from the master plan, which need to be renewed every five years. This project is located on Williston Road and Holland Lane in Williston. The master plan has been approved by the Williston Development Review Board, but each phase is subject to local review as they are proposed. CCRPC staff thinks it’s fine and we generally concur with the Traffic Impact Assessment. CATHERINE McMAINS MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO THE ACT 250 COORDINATOR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

   Chris Roy recused himself from discussion/action on the next two items. Mike O’Brien took over as chair.

   b. Section 248 Advance Notice of Petition; Underhill GLC Solar-150kW; Underhill#19-0292-AN. Regina noted that this is a solar project on Beartown Road in Underhill. The Executive Committee has reviewed this before. As demonstrated in our preferred site letter, CCRPC is highly supportive of projects sited on previously developed sites like this parcel, which is a former landfill. This is the notice that they intend to submit a petition to the PUC. On the second page, we are requesting more information on the impact this project will have on slopes over 15%, including any plans to retain vegetation, stabilize the slopes after clearing and whether the full extent of clearing is required for the project. Catherine noted that in the beginning of the letter it says the Town of Underhill is still reviewing this notice and asked how that will affect our review. Regina said that is correct, but since it’s on town land she doesn’t think there will be an issue. If we send this letter tomorrow, we will remove the highlight on
that sentence. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO APPROVE THE LETTER TO GREEN LANTERN SOLAR. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

c. Act 250 Possible Hearing, Costco, Colchester - #4C0288-19F and #4C0288-19G. Regina said this deals with Costco’s request to open gas pumps on off-peak hours. We don’t have anything in the packet because we’re not sure what will happen. We were waiting to see what comments VTrans would submit, and they didn’t submit any yet. Since then it was determined not to hold a hearing right now. February 4th was the date for parties to submit comments; and February 15 is deadline for rebuttal on those comments. We don’t have anything to bring to the table right now. She believes it will go to hearing at some point.

5. Act 250 Recommendations. Regina distributed a revised document as Emma reviewed the original and made some wording changes. The Ad Hoc Act 250 Committee met twice and put these overarching statements together. They thought it would be a more effective way to get input from the full board. The bill itself is still in draft form and will probably change a great deal over time. The Ad Hoc Committee will continue to meet to review things as the bill moves forward. These recommendations are being reviewed by the Executive Committee, the Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) and the full board at its February meeting. Regina reviewed the intent of each of the nine recommendations.

1. The proposed bill does not define how we develop areas that are designated for growth. In general, the state permit process should encourage development in appropriately planned places and discourage development outside of those areas. The recommendation then describes why the enhanced designation concept as proposed in unworkable. The burden of all Act 250 criteria would just shift to the municipal level instead. Catherine McMains noted that most of the towns do not have the staff to do the review of Act 250.

2. Any changes should include a defined review process and how to get there. The paradigm under the proposed change, Act 250 would continue in areas that we want to protect.

3. In general, we support this but it needs to go along with a better #1.

4. The expansion of climate change, energy efficiency and forest block criteria, which have accompanying fees, would make development more costly and hinder the desperate need for affordable housing.

5. Deals with the order in which the design for projects is reviewed in Act 250. We recommend that Act 250 rely more on conceptual plans as opposed to engineer-sealed plan with more detail. Land Use permits should then include conditions of obtaining the other permits. This would ensure a more resident-friendly, efficient and less costly state permitting process. Brief discussion ensued.

6. Talks about mapping. This proposal takes a state-level, top down approach to mapping and we recommend that we use the local and regional maps to help develop state level maps, because of the extensive public involvement (especially with landowners) in developing the local/regional maps.

7. Asks the legislature to work out further details before adopting new concepts, which could exacerbate existing inflated housing costs for Vermonters.

8. Urges the legislature to consider a phased approach and make changes a little more piecemeal. If all this change should happen at once, we could see things come to a halt for some time and it could disrupt the market and limit the development of affordable housing we really need. Brief discussion.

9. Deals with the appeals process that allows coordination or consolidation of appeals of various permits to ensure consistency in decision-making and prevent unaligned requirements between Environmental Court and Environmental Resources Board decisions.
Catherine thought that the whole idea of this Act 250 Review Committee was to make the whole process easier. Brief discussion ensued about the appeals process. Members suggested some clarifying language to a couple recommendations, as well as a statement at the beginning showing the overall goals of these comments. That the overall intent is to make the process more efficient and effective. Regina will provide a memo that goes along with these recommendations. The Ad Hoc Act 250 committee thought that as we get more versions of the bill, we could bring in more defined recommendations. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, THAT THIS BE SENT TO THE PAC FOR THEIR MEETING NEXT WEEK AND TO THE BOARD, INCLUDING PAC CHANGES FOR THEIR FEBRUARY MEETING. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Banking Change Resolutions. Forest noted that last month we suggested the concept of changing our banking to Opportunities Credit Union (OCU). Their mission is aligned with our ECOS Strategy to support low-income, new Americans and keeping the money local. We did more analysis and found that we could reduce fees and increase interest earned by switching to OCU. We also wanted to ensure that we could still collateralize our funds to protect funds over the FDIC/NCUA limit from catastrophic events. OCU would take out a line of credit to cover that and would absorb the cost. If we increase the amount later, we would have to pay a fee. Staff feels it’s a good idea. We would transfer our checking account and combine our savings account (local dues) and our money market funds into a money market account at OCU. We would leave our CD’s where they are at North Country Savings. Charlie again disclosed that he is the chair of OCU board and joined that board because it aligns with our mission and goals. Brief discussion. BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Executive Director’s Update:
   a. FY2020 UPWP Update. The UPWP committee held it’s first meeting on January 24th and will meet again on February 22nd. We have approximately $1.25 million available for consultant/partner projects and we received requests totally $1.5 million. Staff has already reduced the number of regional projects to try to get down to the available PL funds and at this point are within $40,000. There are a lot of transportation and water quality project requests, but not many requests for planning and zoning assistance.
   b. ECOS Annual Report. We are still meeting with partners to complete the Annual Report and hope to have it available soon.
   c. Legislative update: Charlie noted that he anticipates testifying at the legislature regarding our recommendations for Act 250 shortly after our board meeting. Other bills he’s following include: 1. ANR’s efforts to get water quality funding out locally – the delivery system; and there is a lot of conversation around how to do that. 2. There is another bill about to be proposed that would increase the percentage of the Property Transfer Tax that would be awarded to the RPCs.

7. CCRPC February 20, 2019 Agenda review. Chris Roy will not be attending this meeting, so Mike O’Brien will chair it. Members reviewed the proposed agenda and agreed to ask Burlington Public Works to give a presentation on the Champlain Parkway and other city projects in the pipeline.

8. Other Business. There was no other business.

9. Executive Session. None needed.
10.  **Adjournment.** MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE MCMAINS, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:31 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc