

**Mad River Valley Planning District
Steering Committee
February 18, 2016**

Present were:

Fayston: Jared Cadwell, Select Board; Carol Chamberlin, Planning Commissioner
Waitsfield: Kari Dolan, Select Board; Steve Shea, Planning Commissioner
Warren: Bob Ackland, Select Board; Jim Sanford, Planning Commissioner
CVRPC: Laurie Emery
Sugarbush: Margo Wade
Chamber of Commerce: Peter MacLaren
MRVPD: Joshua Schwartz; Dara Torre

Others: John Hoogenboom, Moretown Select Board; Robert Cook, Fayston.

Bob Ackland suggested that with all the work that needs to be done the Steering Committee could use an extra meeting within the next month. He recommended that we consider this need at the end of tonight's discussion.

The minutes of the January 21, 2016 Steering Committee were accepted as written.

Executive Director's Highlights: J. Schwartz stated that the subcommittee on hiring a second staff member has met several times and drafted a job description.

Staff Position: Discussion ensued on the draft job description and the work that a planning coordinator (or other title) would do. A draft job announcement was reviewed with discussion on where the ad would be placed. Websites such as the New England Chapter of the American Planning Association, other New England APA chapter websites, VT Technical College, VT Law School, Jobs in VT, UVM, and Champlain College were suggested. Concern was expressed on directing the position to just planners or requiring two years of planning experience. It was agreed to change the language to relevant experience or something similar and to advertise as widely as possible.

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Revisions and the MRVPD Data Report: The MOU revision committee has developed recommendations for language and data changes to the MOU. Many of the data points are also included in the Data Report, along with data on housing, census, commuting, etc. The discussion will incorporate both documents in order to see the ties between the two.

Reviewing the points in the table outlining the MOU changes, it was asked whether the monitoring day data is useful to the Planning District or not. It's of use to Sugarbush and they will continue to collect it; it's used in the permitting process among other uses. However, it's not necessary for the Planning District to have the monitoring day data and hence it could be removed from the MOU. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to remove the requirement for monitoring day data from the MOU.

The following changes were also recommended:

- a new data point on transportation be added regarding commuting in/out of the Valley and the number of residents who live and work in the Valley.
- the language in the MOU regarding traffic counters be modified to remove the counter at the Sugarbush Access Road west of Route 100.

- That monthly electrical peak demand and total utilization be continued and add MRV town data;
- Remove the requirement to maintain an annual record of capacity at Irasville and Madbush Green Mountain Power substations;
- Delete Roxbury and Granville from the school enrollment requirement and add statewide trend data;
- Add total number and type of police calls and report the crimes against property and against people data rather than the more detailed data;
- Continue to collect the Valley ambulance service calls, and add emergency calls made by the fire departments.
- Building permits—only report the number in each of the three towns and delete the requirement to report on Waterbury, Duxbury, Roxbury, Moretown, and Granville.
- In the Data Report, there will be data regarding single family residential units on construction costs, number of primary units sold, number of vacation units sold, and median sales price.
- Remove town expenditure data from the MOU.
- Remove the requirement for Sugarbush to report on the annual contributions it makes to Valley organizations. This data includes lift tickets and day passes and is not of use to the Planning District.
- Remove from the MOU the requirement for Sugarbush to report on the number of its employees who have children enrolled in Valley schools;
- Edit the language in the MOU about Sugarbush surveying/reporting location of employee residences in summer and peak winter employment and change language to year round and seasonal, and add housing cost burden data.
- Add median rent and owner cost data to the median housing data number of seasonal and year round housing units; break the data into affordable housing using the HUD definition of no more than 30% of one's income is spent on housing costs.;
- Edit the requirement on the protected lands database to delete Roxbury and change the provider of the data to be the Mad River Watershed Conservation Partnership which collects the data currently.
- Add comfortable carrying capacity to the annual reports on the total number of skier days;
- Edit the language regarding monthly summary of total wastewater flows; after discussion it was agreed that this is data used by the Planning District and can be deleted from the MOU. Sugarbush has to collect it for their permitting needs and utilization/capacity determinations.
- Remove Granville, Waterbury, Duxbury, and Roxbury from the current population reports;
- Add “research data sources” to the poverty indicators data to assess what is the most useful data.

- 1st and 3rd quarter employment and wage reports—edit Department of Employment and Training to Department of Labor.
- Maintain reporting on monthly sales tax and meals and rooms tax receipts.

The Data Report includes the number of businesses by industry in the Valley, the number of jobs by industry, annual wages by industry, annual average wage by industry adjusted for inflation, tax receipts by source by town, meals, room, and alcohol receipts in total by town and also adjusted for inflation, quarterly tax receipts for the 1st and 3rd quarters, births and deaths in the Mad River Valley, Mad Bus total ridership (which is generally 60,000 per season).

Members were asked to provide comments; staff will be finalizing the data report by spring.

It was moved, seconded, and voted unanimously to amend the MOU as discussed.

Vision and Vitality Update: As a result of the Vision and Vitality workshops, the group has established the following:

- four asset groups formed: Food, Recreation, Wellness, and Innovation Economy;
- refocused mission to support the asset groups, market the Valley, and providing business support; and
- addressing key challenges as identified: transportation, affordable housing, and downtown.

The group has developed an economic dashboard to track the economic vitality of the Valley month by month.

As a result of the VVSC deliberations, they are making the following recommendations:

- disband the VVSC and form an economic development committee (EDC);
- EDC would research and make recommendations for evolving the governance and funding models for the MRVPD and the MRVCC, although the model doesn't have to be limited to just those organizations if appropriate;
- EDC membership should follow what the VVSC is: representatives of the MRVPD, MRVCC, and key community members at large; and
- VVSC current members are willing to continue as members of the EDC; there are also others who have expressed interest. It would be beneficial if the MRVPD and MRVCC provided input on membership of the EDC.

The EDC is willing to develop a preliminary report on the MOU and funding structure of the MRVPD, and the budget challenges of the MRVCC. A report could be available by June 2016. In addition, the EDC would continue its public outreach to keep the community informed.

Discussion ensued on the recommendations of the VVSC noting that waiting for a report or model for financing and governance until June could make it difficult to act in time for the next budget development if the recommended model needed vetting.

It was suggested that the EDC could work under the auspices of the Planning District and assist in the development of a funding model through the process already developed by the VVSC. After further discussion, the VVSC suggested that they could meet more often than once a month and get an interim report to the Planning District in two months. It was stated that the Planning District needs a plan that can be reviewed and be able to move forward with the governance structure.

It was agreed that the EDC will work on a model and bring it forward as quickly as possible, and that they do not want the value of the Planning District diluted by whatever model is developed. Meanwhile the Planning District can continue its work on the MOU. It was suggested that we need to think wholistically.

It was agreed that the MRVPD Steering Committee will meet on March 2, 6:30 to 9:00 p.m. at the General Wait House to work on the MOU; nothing else will be on the agenda. Bob Ackland will circulate a draft to review.

The Planning District will also meet Thursday, March 17, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Emery