

From: Allen, Susan [Susan.Allen@state.vt.us]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 2:23 PM
To: Richards, Alyson; Gray, Laura
CC: Miller, Elizabeth; London, Sarah; Coriell, Scott; Johnson, Justin
Subject: CONF: Land Use

The consensus (including ACCD, ANR, AOT, AG) was that for this year, DEC permit was the best place to start. David has worked hard to get enviros on board (all but CLF, and Sandy MIGHT be quiet on it, just not sure yet), and Pat has worked with the biz community to get some buy-in. They are hoping that getting that through this year will pave the way for broader reform either the following year or in the near future. I have mentioned this to the Governor and think he's on board, **but Liz might have a better sense.**

Sue

From: Richards, Alyson
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 2:15 PM
To: Gray, Laura; Allen, Susan
Cc: Miller, Elizabeth; London, Sarah; Coriell, Scott; Johnson, Justin
Subject: RE: Land Use Meeting January 6

I'm a bit worried about the DEC permit reform vs. Act 250 permit reform, since the Governor said if we're going to go for it, he wants to go for the whole thing – he thinks it will be just as controversial either way so if it's actually achievable, go for Act 250 permits.

Is David Mears certain that the DEC-only route is doable but Act 250 is not?

Sorry if I'm way off on this – haven't been in all the conversations.

We definitely need to give Ron an answer either way so he doesn't work at cross purposes with DEC.

From: Gray, Laura
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 1:54 PM
To: Allen, Susan
Cc: Miller, Elizabeth; London, Sarah; Richards, Alyson; Coriell, Scott; Johnson, Justin
Subject: Land Use Meeting January 6

1. **For Innaugural impact fee:**

Deb is concerned that we call it a fee, and legally she's not sure we can call it a fee, thinks it should be a tax, and doesn't want us to get into the argument about fee/versus tax.

2. David went over the TMDL overview sheet he passed around and Chuck/Ag brought up the idea of having a literal package possibly in one bill and knowingly breaking off pieces into cap budge/fee bills/pics. Also importance of intent statement at the top of the substantive bill. Everyone agreed must be on same page with messaging. **Suggestion came up to have Sue/Shap/Campbell/DEC meeting**

about how to strategically push this package forward even though Finance and Management says it's not possible to put everything in one bill.

3. We also went over David's DEC permit reform guidance doc. Everyone was in agreement, but Ron later lobbied me that going forward with ACT 250 permit reform is the right thing to do because SHupe is on board and he thinks he can get torti too. He thinks he has fixed whatever the roadblocks were three years ago. Have the document Ron gave me, if you are interested, but I think we need to give him an answer either way soon because his "i am just feeling this out" could be perceived as lobbying/pushing behind the scenes.

4. Chuck is very concerned about prime ag/soil and solar decommissioning on farms. Lots of issues here. Ag also doesn't have capacity to provide guidance on 248 projects.

4. Current Use: land use change tax, posted land, all issues that will come up. Chuck thinks current use issue in speech re: farm offenders we should have clear strategy of here's this idea and working with others versus, this is the best thing since sliced bread and i am fully behind it.