1. Changes to the Agenda; Members’ Items. There were no changes to the agenda.

2. Approval of February 6, 2019 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes. ANDY MONTROLL MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY CATHERINE McMAINS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 6, 2019 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES, WITH CORRECTIONS IF ANY. Barbara had minor grammatical corrections that she gave to Bernie to insert into the draft minutes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.

3. Act 250 & Section 248 Applications – previously reviewed. Regina noted that the Executive Committee members had reviewed these letters via email and approved them and the letters have been sent. The Executive Committee needs to ratify the approvals of the letters at this meeting.
   a. §248 Advance Notice; GMP Solar Canopy; Colchester #19-0385-AN.
   b. §248 Petition; Jolina Court Solar; Richmond; #19-0452-NM.
   c. Act 250 Hearing; JJJ South Burlington, LLC/Cider Mill II; South Burlington, #4C1128-5

   BARBARA ELLIOTT MADE A MOTION, SECONDED B ANDY MONTROLL, TO RATIFY THE LETTERS FOR THE THREE PROJECTS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Updated Act 250 Recommendations. Regina noted that the board approved eight recommendations to the legislature regarding the proposed Act 250 revisions. The Ad Hoc Act 250 committee has added two new recommendations. One of the proposals in the large draft bill (19-0040) includes a provision requiring that, in order to be used in Act 250, local and regional plans must be approved as consistent with the statutory planning goals. It suggests the Environmental Board serve this function. The Vermont Planners Association (VPA) notes that most local plans are approved by regional planning commissions, and this requirement would be an incentive for municipalities to seek plan review and approval. Since regional plans have no existing approval process, the bill needs to establish the right review/approval process. VPA feels that since regional plans are used in the Act 250 regulatory process under Criterion 10, the Environmental Board should not be reviewing and approving regional plans. The second recommendation deals with appeals for regional plan approvals. Suggested language is:

   #9 “CCRPC supports the position of the Vermont Planners Association regarding regional plan approvals which is to modify the bill language so that regional plans are reviewed and approved by a Development Cabinet; or some similar instrument of the State that is expanded for this function to include representatives with planning expertise – e.g. directors of two adjacent regional planning
commissions, a representative from the VT Planners Association, and a representative from the VT Association of Planning and Development Agencies.” After a brief discussion, members agreed to amend the second line to read “...plans are reviewed for compliance with statutory planning goals and approved by a Development Cabinet...” Regina noted that the Development Cabinet, though not active, is in statute (3 V.S.A. §2293) for the purpose of collaboration and consultation among State agencies and departments.

#10. “Clarify and add to existing statute (Title 24, Chapter 117, Section 4476) to make the existing Environmental Court hear appeals for regional plan approvals and for regional approval and/or confirmation of local plans and the local planning process.”

MICHAEL O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY BARBARA ELLIOTT, TO RECOMMEND BOARD APPROVAL OF THESE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Chair/Executive Director’s Report.
   a. FY20 UPWP Update. Charlie reported that the UPWP committee will hold its final meeting tomorrow. We have a pretty good draft document and will review a request from UVM. We added six new stormwater projects. The Executive Committee will review the draft UPWP at the April meeting to make a recommendation to the Board.
   b. Legislative Update. Charlie thinks the Act 250 amendments will be a two-year process as there is no formal bill yet, so we will have more time to review and update our position as changes are made. We do hope there will be a bill by spring. The other significant bill is S.96 dealing with clean water service providers. The Senate is likely to vote it over to the House on Friday without including any funding recommendations. The bill includes the idea to distribute funding through a clean water service provider and they’d default to RPCs to do that. However, the service provider would also have to deal with ongoing operation and maintenance of these projects, which is not appealing to the RPCs. Catherine McMains mentioned H.353 which deals with weatherization and energy issues.

6. Other Business. There was no further business.

7. Executive Session. There was none needed.

8. Adjournment. MIKE O’BRIEN MADE A MOTION, SECONDED BY ANDY MONTROLL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:55 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Bernadette Ferenc